Appendix J

Transportation

Appendix J.1

Updated LADOT Assessment Letter

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

13400 West Maxella Avenue LADOT Case No. CTC20-109212

To: Milena Zasadzien, Senior City Planner Department of City Planning

From: Robert Sanchez, Transportation Engineer Department of Transportation

Subject: REVISED TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED MIXED USE PROJECT AT 13400 WEST MAXELLA AVENUE (ENV-2016-3343-EIR/ CPC-2016-3341-GPA-VZC-HD-MCUP-CDP-MEL-SPR)

LADOT requests that our revised assessment letter, dated May 3, 2022, for the proposed mixed-use development at 13400 Maxella Avenue be rescinded, for the reasons described below, and replaced with the attached revised assessment letter.

On August 26, 2021, LADOT issued an assessment letter for the proposed mixed-use project at 13400 Maxella Avenue. The assessment was based on the transportation analysis report prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan (LLG), dated April 29, 2021, and subsequent revision dated July 6, 2021. The revision included a project specific methodology for analyzing the potential overall VMT impact of the project. The methodology suggested an overall VMT reduction calculation instead of a land-use specific VMT calculation, as currently used in the LADOT VMT Calculator tool and required by LADOT's Transportation Assessment Guidelines.

Subsequent to this initial review, DOT received a request to revisit the project specific methodology used to analyze the project's VMT impact and it was determined that, although the VMT calculation delivers a delivers a mathematical resultant that achieves a lower total VMT when averaged across all land uses when compared to a project that equated the respective VMT thresholds, to simply combine these resultants into an overall project calculation would negate the build environment details used to identify the land-use specific VMT thresholds the City developed which is an imperative part of the analysis.

As noted in the Technical Advisory document on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, released by the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) in December of 2018, "Combining land uses for VMT analysis is not recommended. Different land uses generate different amounts of VMT, so the outcome of such an analysis could depend more on the mix of uses than on their travel efficiency. As a result, it could be difficult or impossible for a lead agency to connect a significance threshold with an environmental policy objective (such as a target set by law), inhibiting the CEQA imperative of identifying a project's significant impacts and providing mitigation where feasible. Combining land uses for a VMT analysis could streamline certain mixes of uses in a manner disconnected from policy objectives or environmental outcomes. Instead, OPR recommends <u>analyzing each use separately</u>, or simply focusing analysis on the dominant use, and comparing each result to the appropriate threshold."

Therefore, in accordance with the OPR guidance sighted above, DOT issued a revised assessment letter dated May 3, 2022. Subsequent to the issuance of the May 3, 2022 assessment letter, LLG prepared an updated VMT analysis for the project's Option B, dated October 26, 2022. The updated VMT analysis describes the project's commitment to participating in the Metro Universal College Student Transit Pass

(U-Pass) program. We request that you please replace the aforementioned May 3, 2022 assessment letter, in its entirety, with the attached revised assessment letter.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

13400 West Maxella Avenue LADOT Case No. CTC20-109212

| Date: | August 26, 2021 |
|----------|--|
| | Revised May 3, 2022 |
| | Revised November 16, 2022 |
| To: | Milena Zasadzien, Senior City Planner |
| | Department of City Planning Robert Sanchez (Nov 4, 2022 14 PST) |
| From: | Robert Sanchez, Transportation Engineer |
| | Department of Transportation |
| Subject: | REVISED TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED MIXED USE PROJECT AT 13400 WEST MAXELLA AVENUE (ENV-2016-3343-EIR/ CPC-2016-3341- |

GPA-VZC-HD-MCUP-CDP-MEL-SPR)

The Department of Transportation (DOT) has completed its review of the transportation analysis prepared by Linscott, Law, & Greenspan, Engineers (LLG), dated April 29, 2021, with a subsequent revision dated July 6, 2021 for the proposed mixed use project located at 13400 West Maxella Avenue. In compliance with SB 743, a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis is required to identify the project's alignment with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) mandates to promote the reduction of green-house gas emissions, access to diverse land uses, and the development of multi-modal networks. Subsequent to the preparation of the July 6, 2021 transportation analysis, LLG prepared an updated VMT analysis for the project's Option B dated October 26, 2022. The significance of a project's impact in this regard is measured against the VMT thresholds established in DOT's Transportation Assessment Guidelines (TAG), as described below.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

A. <u>Project Description</u>

The project proposes to construct a new mixed use residential and commercial development on the southwest corner of Glencoe Avenue and Maxella Avenue with the following two land use options:

1. <u>Option A</u>: consists of the construction of a mixed-use development including 592 market-rate residential apartment dwelling units, 66 affordable housing dwelling units, 13,650 square feet of restaurant floor area, and 13,650 square feet of commercial floor area. Parking for Option A will be provided in two subterranean levels and two abovegrade levels of parking within each of the three buildings. Option A proposes to provide a total of 1,217 parking spaces. Vehicular access for Option A will be provided via two access points along the east side of Ocean Way, one driveway along the south side of Maxella Avenue, one driveway along the west side of Glencoe Avenue, and one entry/exit driveway located along the southern boundary of the project site as shown in the site plan for the project provided as **Attachment "A"** to this report. The proposed land uses under Option A are expected to be fully build out and occupied by the year 2026.

2. <u>Option B</u>: consists of the construction a mixed-use development including 382 market rate residential apartment dwelling units, 43 affordable housing dwelling units, 20,000 square feet of restaurant floor area, 20,000 square feet of commercial floor area, and 90,000 square feet of office use. Parking for Option B will be provided in an onsite parking garage with one level of at-grade parking and three levels of subterranean parking. Option B proposes to provide a total of 1,287 parking spaces. Vehicular access for Option B will be provided via three access points along the east side of Ocean Way, one driveway along the south side of Maxella Avenue, and one driveway along the west side of Glencoe Avenue, along the southern boundary of the project site as shown in the site plan for the project provided as **Attachment "B**" to this report. The proposed land uses under Option B are expected to be fully build out and occupied by the year 2026.

The project site includes approximately 6.06 acres of land and is currently improved with 100,781 square feet of commercial floor area and surface parking areas. The project proposes to remove the existing improvements on the site and construct a mixed-use development under one of the two proposed development options.

B. <u>Freeway Safety Analysis</u>

Per the interim guideline for Freeway Safety Analysis memorandum issued by DOT on May 1, 2020 to address Caltrans safety concerns on freeways, the study addresses the project's effects on vehicle queueing on freeway off-ramps. Such an evaluation measures the project's potential to lengthen a forecasted off-ramp queue and create speed differentials between vehicles exiting the freeway off-ramp and vehicles operating on the freeway mainline.

The evaluation included in the assessment by LLG, identified the project trips expected to be added to nearby freeway off-ramps serving the project site. It was determined that as the SR-90 ("Marina freeway") is an at-grade roadway in the immediate project site vicinity, these nearby intersections are not considered to be freeway off-ramps. As there are no freeway off-ramps located in the immediate project site area, neither Option A nor Option B will add 25 or more trips to any nearby freeway off-ramps. Therefore, a freeway ramp analysis is not required.

C. <u>Trip Generation</u>

Option A is expected to potentially generate a net increase of 1,379 new daily vehicle trips, a net increase of 222 new AM peak hour trips (67 inbound and 155 outbound), and a net increase of 50 new PM peak hour trips (58 inbound and -8 outbound). A copy of the proposed weekday AM and PM peak hour trip generation table under Option A can be found in **Attachment "C"** to this report.

Option B is expected to generate a net increase of 1,979 new daily vehicle trips, a net increase of 231 new AM peak hour trips (114 inbound and 117 outbound), and a net increase of 59 new PM peak hour trips (36 inbound and 23 outbound). A copy of the proposed weekday AM and PM peak hour trip generation table under Option B can be found in **Attachment "D"** to this report. The weekday AM and PM peak hour trip generation estimates are based on rates published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, 2017.

D. <u>CEQA Screening Threshold</u>

Prior to accounting for trip reductions resulting from the application of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategies, a trip generation analysis was conducted to determine if the project would exceed the 250 daily vehicle trips screening threshold. Using the City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator tool, which draws upon local trip generation information and trip rate estimates published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, and based on sociodemographic data and the built environment factors of the project's surroundings, it was determined that the project <u>does</u> exceed the net 250 daily vehicle trips threshold under both proposed project options. This determination is based on the latest VMT calculator version 1.3 at the time the transportation analysis was submitted and accepted by DOT. A copy of the VMT calculator screening pages, with the corresponding net daily trip estimates under both Option A and Option B are provided, as **Attachment "F"** correspondingly, to this report.

E. <u>Transportation Impacts</u>

On July 30, 2019, pursuant to SB 743 and the recent changes to Section 15064.3 of the State's CEQA Guidelines, the City of Los Angeles adopted VMT as the criteria used to determine transportation impacts under CEQA. The new DOT TAG provides instructions on preparing transportation assessments for land use proposals and defines the significant impact thresholds.

The DOT VMT Calculator tool measures project impact in terms of Household VMT per Capita, and Work VMT per Employee. DOT identified distinct thresholds for significant VMT impacts for each of the seven Area Planning Commission (APC) areas in the City. For the West Los Angeles APC area, in which the project is located, the following thresholds have been established:

- Household VMT per Capita: 7.4
- Work VMT per Employee: 11.1

As cited in the VMT Analysis report prepared by LLG, the proposed project is projected to have:

Under Option A, prior to the consideration of any TDM measures, a Household VMT per capita of 6.9 which is less than the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 7.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita, and a less than significant impact for the Daily Work VMT per employee for the retail component since the project's retail portion is less than the 50,000 square feet threshold. Therefore, it is concluded that implementation of the project under Option A would result in no significant VMT impact. A copy of the VMT Calculator summary impact report for Option A is provided as **Attachment "G"** to this letter.

Under Option B, prior to the consideration of any TDM measures, a Household VMT per capita portion of 6.8 which is less than the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 7.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita, and a Work VMT per employee of 14.5 which is greater than the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee. Taking into consideration the TDM measures being proposed by the project, the estimated Household VMT per Capita for Option B is reduced to 5.4, which us further below the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 7.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita. The estimated Work VMT per Employee for Option B is reduced to 11.6, which is greater than the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee.

Under Option B, the project proposes the implementation of a combination of transit, education and encouragement, commute trip reductions, bicycle parking and infrastructure, and neighborhood infrastructure TDM strategies that are forecasted to further reduce the project Household VMT to 5.4.

For the project's Work VMT, the measures described in the paragraph above would essentially "max-out" the allowable 20% TDM strategies in the VMT Calculator. The VMT Calculator estimates that Option B would generate a Total Home Based Work Attraction VMT of 5,574, resulting in a Total Work Based VMT per Employee of 11.6 Daily VMT per Employee, which would exceed the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee.

To mitigate the remaining Daily Work VMT per Employee impact under Option B, the project would need to implement supplemental TDM measures to achieve approximately a 4% reduction in Total Home Based Work Attraction VMT. The project proposes to participate in a pilot program similar to the new Metro Universal College Student Transit Pass (U-Pass) program. The U-Pass program is a strategy identified in the VMT Mitigation Program Pilot Project (Fehr & Peers, June 2021, U-Pass Study) that has potential to reduce regional VMT through subsidizing transit passes for college students in Los Angeles County. The project would contribute a fee to the pilot program based on the VMT reduction needed to eliminate the impact and bring the Household VMT per Capita under the threshold. To calculate the fee amount, a ratio of 10.79 student transit passes per one (10.79:1) daily VMT reduction was identified in the U-Pass Study. This means that for every 10.79 student passes funded, the project could eliminate one daily VMT from its calculated impact. Based on the U-Pass Study, the average invoiced fee for each student transit pass using the "opt-in" mechanism is \$94.18 per semester. However, after discussion with LADOT and Metro, it was proposed to use a lower "opt-out" rate for the pilot program, which would cost \$7.00 per student per year.

As only the project's Daily Work VMT per Employee would exceed the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold, only the project's Total Home Based Work Attraction VMT was considered for the VMT reduction. Thus, instead of daily trips, the credits would be applied to the Total Home Based Work Attraction VMT to achieve a VMT reduction of approximately 4%. The project, prior to any mitigation, would generate a Total Home Based Work Attraction VMT of 6,968. To fully mitigate the VMT impact, the project would need to reduce Total Home Based Work Attraction VMT to 5,328. The mitigations included within the VMT Calculator would reduce the Total Home Based Work Attraction VMT from 6,968 to 5,574. Therefore, an additional 246 Daily Work VMT would need to be reduced to mitigate the VMT impact. A full mitigation of daily VMT would require the project to fund 2,654 student passes annually at a rate of \$7.00 per pass. The total cost for this program would be \$18,578.00 annually.

The \$18,578.00 fee calculated above will be a required annual payment from the project to Metro for a minimum of seven years. The fee would continue to be required until the project's non-supplemental mitigation measures described above are alone sufficient to reduce the project's VMT to less than significant in the version of the VMT calculator that is current at the time of future analysis. However, if a VMT impact were to remain based on the version of the VMT calculator that is current at the time of future analysis, the annual fee amount would be adjusted proportionally based on the Total Home Based Work Attraction required to reduce the impact to a less than significant level. Revisions to the VMT calculator are cyclical and include additions and alterations to transit systems, land uses, and travel behaviors that may show that the project, without the supplemental mitigation measure, does not exceed future VMT thresholds. The project's proposed TDM measures would mitigate its significant VMT impact and no further mitigations would be required. A copy of the VMT Calculator summary reports is provided as **Attachment "H"** to this report.

F. Access and Circulation

During the preparation of the new CEQA guidelines, the State's Office of Planning and Research stressed that lead agencies can continue to apply traditional operational analysis requirements to inform land use decisions provided that such analyses were outside of the CEQA process. The authority for requiring non-CEQA transportation analysis and requiring improvements to address potential circulation deficiencies, lies in the City of Los Angeles' Site Plan Review authority as established in Section 16.05 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC). Therefore, DOT continues to require and review a project's site access, circulation, and operational plan to determine if any access enhancements, transit amenities, intersection improvements, traffic signal upgrades, neighborhood traffic calming, or other improvements are needed. In accordance with this authority, the project has completed an access and circulation analysis for both Option A and Option B using a "level of service" screening methodology that indicates that the trips generated by the proposed development will likely result in adverse circulation conditions at the project adjacent intersection of Glencoe Avenue and Glencoe Avenue Southerly Driveway/Villa Velletri Driveway, and at the intersection of Glencoe Avenue and Mindanao Way under both Options. A copy of the study analysis report tables that summarize these potential queueing and/or operational deficiencies are provided as Attachment "I" (Option A) and Attachment "J" (Option B) to this report.

PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

A. CEQA Related Mitigation

Consistent with City policies on sustainability and smart growth, and with DOT's trip reduction and multi-modal transportation goals, the project's mitigation program first focuses on developing a trip reduction program and on solutions that promote other modes of travel. To off-set the expected significant impacts identified in the project's VMT analysis for Option B (since Option A as proposed results in a less than significant VMT impact), DOT recommends that the applicant be required to implement the following Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies as mitigation: 1. <u>Transit – Transit Subsidies</u>

This TDM strategy involves the subsidization of transit fare for residents and employees of Option B. The subsidy will be proactively offered to each resident and employee at least once annually for a minimum of five years. At the time of initial opening, Option B will offer a daily transit subsidy to all (i.e., 100%) residents and employees of \$2.98 per day.

2. Education and Encouragement – Promotions and Marketing

Option B will utilize promotional and marketing tools to educate and inform residents and employees about alternative transportation options and the effects of their travel choices. Rather than two-way communication tools or tools that would encourage an individual to consider a different mode of travel at the time the trip is taken (i.e., smartphone application, daily email, etc.), this TDM strategy includes passive educational and promotional materials, such as posters, information boards, or a website with information that residents and employees can choose to read at their own leisure.

- 3. <u>Commute Trip Reductions Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommute Program</u> The strategy encourages employees to work alternative schedules or telecommute, including staggered start times, flexible schedules, or compressed work weeks. At the time of initial opening of the development, Option B will offer 1.5 days per week of telecommuting to at least 5% of all employees.
- 4. <u>Bicycle Infrastructure Include Bike Parking per LAMC</u> Option B is required to provide 200 bicycle parking spaces (19 short-term and 181 longterm) for the residential component, and 67 bicycle parking spaces (29 short-term spaces and 38 long-term) for the restaurant, commercial, and office components. Therefore, under Option B, the project will provide the LAMC-required number of shortterm and long-term bicycle parking spaces: an overall total of 267 bicycle parking spaces (48 short-term and 219 long-term) on-site thus meeting the code required spaces. This measure helps reduce peak-hour vehicle trips by making commuting by bicycle easier and more convenient.
- 5. <u>Bicycle Infrastructure Include Secure Bike Parking and Showers per LAMC</u> This strategy involves implementation of additional end-of-trip bicycle facilities to support safe and comfortable bicycle travel by providing amenities at destinations. This strategy applies to projects that include bicycle parking onsite per LAMC. Projects providing long-term bicycle parking secured from the general public in accordance with LAMC Section 12.21A.16(d)(2) and showers in accordance with LAMC Section 91.6307 qualify for this measure. These improvements help reduce peak-hour vehicle trips by making commuting by bicycle easier and more convenient. Under Option B, the project is committed to provide short-term and long-term bicycle parking in accordance with LAMC Section 12.21A.16(d)(2). In addition, Option B will provide showers in accordance with LAMC Section 91.6307.
- <u>Neighborhood Infrastructure Pedestrian Network Improvements</u>
 This strategy involves implementation of pedestrian network improvements throughout

and around the Project Site that encourage people to walk. This includes internally linking all uses within the Project Site with pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks and connecting the Project Site to the surrounding pedestrian network. Option B includes pedestrian access points directly to sidewalks on the adjacent streets, including Maxella Avenue, and Glencoe Avenue. Additionally, Option B will improve existing sidewalks or construct new sidewalks on the above-mentioned streets adjacent to the Project Site. Furthermore, Option B will add street trees and landscaping, including a park along the Project Site's easterly frontage, to enhance the pedestrian network and improve exterior lighting along the sidewalks to improve safety.

7. <u>Supplemental Mitigation Measures – Metro U-Pass Program</u>

The project proposes to participate in the Metro U-Pass program, which has the potential to reduce regional VMT through subsidizing transit passes for college students in Los Angeles County. The project will fund 2,654 student passes annually at a rate of \$7.00 per pass. The total cost for this program would be \$18,578.00 annually. The \$18,578.00 fee calculated above will be a required annual payment from the project to Metro for a minimum of seven years. The fee would continue to be required until the project's non-supplemental mitigation measures described above are alone sufficient to reduce the project's VMT to less than significant in the version of the VMT calculator that is current at the time of future analysis. Additionally, if an impact were to remain based on the version of the VMT calculator that is current at the time of future analysis, the fee would be adjusted proportionally based on the Total Home Based Work Attraction required to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

B. Operational Improvements (Non-CEQA Analysis)

In the Traffic Study report prepared by LLG, the analysis included a review of current operational deficiencies and potential future deficiencies that may result from the project considering both proposed Options. To address these deficiencies, the applicant should be required to implement the following operational improvements (the project must coordinate with Culver City to determine appropriate traffic operational improvements within their jurisdiction):

- 1. <u>Glencoe Avenue and Mindanao Way Intersection Implement Left-Turn Phasing</u> The project shall assume full responsibility for implementing protected/permissive leftturn phasing for the northbound direction, as well as implementing overlap right-turn phasing for the eastbound direction at the intersection of Glencoe Avenue and Mindanao Way. The implementation of this improvement is in alignment with the improvements identified in the Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan and should be coordinated with the DOT Western District office. If at the time of project approval, the above traffic signal improvements have been funded by others, the DOT shall require a similar nearby measure of equivalent value in the vicinity of the project.
- <u>Glencoe Avenue and Glencoe Avenue Southerly Project Driveway/Villa Velletri Driveway</u> <u>Intersection – Pedestrian Crosswalk/ Traffic Signal Relocation</u> The project shall assume full responsibility for the design and relocation of the existing signalized Glencoe Avenue midblock crossing to the north to align with the Glencoe

Avenue Southerly Project Driveway intersection. The resulting lane configuration on the northbound and southbound approaches of Glencoe Avenue would provide one leftturn lane, one through lane, and one shared through/right-turn lane. No changes to the eastbound Glencoe Avenue Southerly Project Driveway and westbound Villa Velletri approaches are proposed. Changes to the existing traffic signal equipment needed in conjunction with the recommended improvements would also be implemented as part of the improvement. In addition, crosswalks would be installed on both the northbound and southbound Glencoe Avenue approaches. The implementation of this improvement is in alignment with the project improvements identified in the Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan and should be coordinated with the DOT Western District office.

3. <u>Ocean Way and Maxella Avenue Intersection-New Traffic Signal/Relocate Ped-Crosswalk</u> The project shall assume full responsibility for the design and implementation of roadway striping changes along Maxella Avenue at the Ocean Way intersection. Specifically, the existing signalized crosswalk located approximately 100 feet west of the east leg of the intersection will be removed, and crosswalks will be installed at the Ocean Way and Maxella Avenue intersection. Additionally, the Applicant, in consultation with LADOT, will install a traffic signal at the intersection with controlled crossing devices (e.g., signalized crosswalks). The implementation of this improvement is in alignment with the project improvements identified in the Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan and should be coordinated with the DOT Western District office.

4. <u>Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program</u>

In addition to the TDM strategies cited above, DOT further recommends that the project prepare and submit a TDM program to DOT for review <u>prior</u> to the issuance of the first building permit for this project with a final TDM program to be approved by DOT <u>prior</u> to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy. The TDM program should include not only the TDM strategies identified to mitigate Project VMT impacts but should also consider and include all of the VMT Calculator TDM strategies that can potentially reduce the Project's VMT footprint.

C. Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) Fee

Pursuant to Section 6 of the CTC SP Ordinance No. 186104 authorizing the TIA Fee Programs Ordinance No. 186105, an applicant for a project within the Specific Plan area, except as exempted, shall pay, or guarantee payment of a TIA Fee prior to issuance of any building permit. Applicable fee rates are identified in the TIA Fee Table of Ordinance No. 186105. In addition, credit for affordable housing units can be granted as detailed in Section D.3.b.i of Ordinance No. 186105. The applicable fee for the proposed project (Option B) has been determined as follows:

Proposed Use:

| 382 Apartment units x \$4,720 per unit [Full TIA fee applicable on or after October 26, 2020] | \$ 1,803,040 |
|--|--------------|
| 40,000 sq. ft. Retail x \$13,561 per 1000 sq. ft. | \$ 542,440 |

| 90,000 sq. ft. Office x \$23,724 per 1000 sq. ft. | | \$ 2,135,160 |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
| -43 Affordable u | nits x [2 x (\$4,720 per unit)] | -\$ 450,920 |
| Subtotal Proposed TIA Fee | | \$ 4,029,720 |
| <u>Existing Use (credit)</u> 100,781 sq. ft. o | f Retail x \$13,561 per 1000 sq. ft. | -\$ 1,366,691 |
| Subtotal Existing TIA Fee | | -\$ 1,366,691 |
| Total Estimated TIA Fee | | <u>\$ 2,663,029</u> |

D. Implementation of Physical Improvements

The applicant shall be responsible for the cost and implementation of any traffic signal equipment modifications and bus stop relocations associated with the proposed transportation improvements and enhancements described above. All improvements, enhancements, and associated traffic signal work within the City of Los Angeles must be guaranteed through Bureau of Engineering's (BOE) B-Permit process, prior to the issuance of any building permits and **completed** prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy. Temporary certificates of occupancy may be granted in the event of any delay through no fault of the applicant, provided that, in each case, the applicant has demonstrated reasonable efforts and due diligence to the satisfaction of DOT. Prior to setting the bond amount, BOE shall require that the developer's engineer or contractor email DOT's B-Permit Coordinator at ladot.planprocessing@lacity.org to arrange a pre-design meeting to finalize the proposed design needed for the project. If a proposed traffic corrective measure does not receive the required approval during plan review, a substitute corrective measure may be provided subject to the approval of LADOT or other governing agency with jurisdiction over the corrective condition location, upon demonstration that the substitute measure is correctively equivalent or superior to the original measure in addressing the project's corrective traffic condition. To the extent that a corrective measure proves to be infeasible and no substitute corrective measure is available, then the identified corrective condition would remain.

E. Construction Impacts

DOT recommends that a construction work site traffic control plan be submitted to DOT's Citywide Temporary Traffic Control Section or Permit Plan Review Section for review and approval prior to the start of any construction work. Refer to http://ladot.lacity.org/what-we-do/plan-review to determine which section to coordinate review of the work site traffic control plan. The plan should show the location of any roadway or sidewalk closures, traffic detours, haul routes, hours of operation, protective devices, warning signs and access to abutting properties. DOT also recommends that all construction related traffic be restricted to off-peak hours to the extent feasible.

F. Highway Dedication And Street Widening Requirements

In order to mitigate potential access and circulation impacts, the applicant may be required to make highway dedications and improvements. The applicant shall consult the Bureau of Engineering (BOE) for any highway dedication or street widening requirements. These

requirements must be guaranteed before the issuance of any building permit through the Bpermit process of the BOE. They must be constructed and completed prior to the issuance of any certificate of occupancy to the satisfaction of DOT and BOE.

G. Parking Analysis

The project is proposing to provide a minimum Code-required total of 1,217 parking spaces under Option A, and a total of 1,287 parking spaces under Option B. Also, an overall minimum Code-required total of 267 bicycle parking spaces (48 short-term and 219 long-term) will be provided on site within parking garage. The applicant should check with the Department of Building and Safety on the number of Code-required parking spaces needed for the project.

H. Project Access

Project access to the site will be provided for Option A and Option B as follows:

For Option A, vehicular access will be provided via two access points along the east side of Ocean Way, one driveway along the south side of Maxella Avenue, one driveway along the west side of Glencoe Avenue, and one entry/exit driveway located along the southern boundary of the project site, and for Option B, vehicular access will be provided via three access points along the east side of Ocean Way, one driveway along the south side of Maxella Avenue, and one driveway along the south side of Maxella Avenue, and one driveway along the south side of Maxella Avenue, and one driveway along the west side of Glencoe Avenue, along the southern boundary of the project site.

I. Driveway Access and Circulation

The proposed site plan is acceptable to DOT; however, review of the study does not constitute approval of the driveway dimensions and internal circulation schemes. Those require separate review and approval and should be coordinated with DOT's West LA/Coastal Development Review Section (7166 W Manchester Ave, @ 213-485-1062). In order to minimize potential building design changes, the applicant should contact DOT for driveway width and internal circulation requirements so that such traffic flow considerations are designed and incorporated early into the building and parking layout plans. All new driveways should be Case 2 driveways and any security gates should be a minimum 20 feet from the property line. All truck loading and unloading should take place on site with no vehicles backing into the project from public streets via any of the project driveways.

J. Development Review Fees

An ordinance adding Section 19.15 to the Los Angeles Municipal Code relative to application fees paid to DOT for permit issuance activities was adopted by the Los Angeles City Council in 2009 and updated in 2014. This ordinance identifies specific fees for traffic study review, condition clearance, and permit issuance. The applicant shall comply with any applicable fees per this ordinance.

If you have any questions, please contact me or Pedro Ayala at (213) 485-1062.

RS:pa

Attachments

c: Alan Como, Marcus Woersching, DCP
 Jason Douglas, Eric Bruins, Len Nguyen, Council District No. 11
 Rudy Guevara, DOT
 Mike Patonai, Oscar Gutierrez, BOE
 Jason Shender, Linscott, Law, & Greenspan, Engineers

13400 W. Maxella Ave.: Mixed-Use - Paseo Marina project (CTC19-109212)

Attachment "A"



LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

PASEO MARINA PROJECT

-6-

g

color

exhibits

₽

09:32:54 jshender

12/11/2020

o:\0265\dwg\f2-2.dwg

13400 W. Maxella Ave.: Mixed-Use - Paseo Marina project (CTC19-109212)

Attachment "B"



LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

PASEO MARINA PROJECT

-8-

10:36:21 jshender IIg exhibits color.ctb

o:\0265\dwg\f2-3.dwg 11/11/2020

27-Apr-21

| | | AM PEAK HOUR | | PM PEAK HOUR | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|--------------|----------|--------------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| | | VOLUMES [2] | | VOLUMES [2] | | [2] | |
| LAND USE | SIZE | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL |
| Proposed Project | | | | | | | |
| Apartments [3] | 592 DU | 55 | 158 | 213 | 159 | 101 | 260 |
| Affordable Family Housing [4] | 66 DU | 13 | 21 | 34 | 14 | 11 | 25 |
| Restaurant [5] | 13,650 GSF | 75 | 61 | 136 | 82 | 51 | 133 |
| Commercial [6] | 13,650 GLSF | <u>8</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>13</u> | 25 | <u>27</u> | <u>52</u> |
| Subtotal | | 151 | 245 | 396 | 280 | 190 | 470 |
| Internal Capture [7] | | (17) | (27) | (44) | (64) | (43) | (107) |
| Transit Trips (15%) [8] | | (18) | (30) | (48) | (30) | (20) | (50) |
| Subtotal Project Driveway Trips | | 116 | 188 | 304 | 186 | 127 | 313 |
| Existing Land Use | | | | | | | |
| Commercial [5] | (100,781) GLSF | (59) | (36) | (95) | (184) | (200) | (384) |
| Existing Transit Trips [8] | | | | | | | |
| Commercial (15%) | | 9 | 5 | 14 | 28 | 30 | 58 |
| Subtotal Existing Driveway Trips | | (50) | (31) | (81) | (156) | (170) | (326) |
| NET INCREASE DRIVEWAY TRIPS | | 66 | 157 | 223 | 30 | (43) | (13) |
| Proposed Pass-By Trips [9] | | | | | | | |
| Restaurant (20%) | | (11) | (9) | (20) | (11) | (7) | (18) |
| Commercial (50%) | | (3) | (2) | (5) | (8) | (9) | (17) |
| Subtotal | | (14) | (11) | (25) | (19) | (16) | (35) |
| Existing Pass-By Trips (9) | | | | | | | |
| Commercial (30%) | | 15 | 9 | 24 | 47 | 51 | 98 |
| NET INCREASE "OFF-SITE" TRIPS | | 67 | 155 | 222 | 58 | (8) | 50 |

Table 2-1 OPTION A TRIP GENERATION [1]

[1] Sources: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, 2017.

[2] Trips are one-way traffic movements, entering or leaving.

- [2] This are one-way failed internetics, energing of reaving.[3] ITE Land Use Code 221 (Multifamily Housing [Mid-Rise]) trip generation average rates.
- AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.36 trips/dwelling unit; 26% inbound/74% outbound
- PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.44 trips/dwelling unit; 61% inbound/39% outbound
- [4] City of Los Angeles Affordable Housing (Family) trip generation average rates.
- AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.52 trips/dwelling unit; 38% inbound/62% outbound
- PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.38 trips/dwelling unit; 55% inbound/45% outbound
- [5] ITE Land Use Code 932 (High-Turnover [Sit-Down] Restaurant) trip generation average rates.
 AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 9.94 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 55% inbound/45% outbound
 PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 9.77 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 62% inbound/38% outbound
- [6] ITE Land Use Code 820 (Shopping Center) trip generation average rates.
- AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.94 trips/1,000 SF of leasable area; 62% inbound/38% outbound - PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 3.81 trips/1,000 SF of leasable area; 48% inbound/52% outbound
- [7] The internal capture reduction for the residential, restaurant, retail, and office is based on the synergy between all the land uses provided within the Project Site, and determined via NCHRP 684 Internal Capture Estimation Tool (12% for AM Peak Hour and 24% for PM Peak Hour).
- [8] A 15% transit use reduction applied based on the Project Site being located within 1/4 mile of a Big Blue Bus rapid stop. The trip reduction for transit trips has been applied to the proposed Project and existing land uses based on the *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2020 for developments within a 1/4 mile walking distance of a transit station or a Rapid Bus stop.
- [9] Pass-by trips are made as intermediate stops on the way from an origin to a primary trip destination without a route diversion. Pass-by trips are attracted from traffic passing the site on an adjacent street or roadway that offers direct access to the site. The trip reduction for pass-by trips has been applied to the restaurant and commercial components of the Project based on the *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2020 for High Turnover Restaurant, Shopping Center less than 50,000 sf, and Shopping Center 100,000 to less than 300,000 sf.



20-Apr-21

| | | AM PEAK HOUR | | | PM PEAK HOUR | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|--------------|-----------|-------|--------------|--------------|-------|--|
| | | VOLUMES [2] | | | V | OLUMES | [2] | |
| LAND USE | SIZE | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | |
| Proposed Project | | | | | | | | |
| Apartments [3] | 382 DU | 36 | 102 | 138 | 102 | 66 | 168 | |
| Affordable Family Housing [4] | 43 DU | 8 | 14 | 22 | 9 | 7 | 16 | |
| Restaurant [5] | 20,000 GSF | 109 | 90 | 199 | 121 | 74 | 195 | |
| Commercial [6] | 20,000 GLSF | 12 | 7 | 19 | 36 | 40 | 76 | |
| Office [7] | 90,000 GSF | <u>89</u> | <u>15</u> | 104 | 17 | 87 | 104 | |
| Subtotal | | 254 | 228 | 482 | 285 | 274 | 559 | |
| Internal Capture [8] | | (59) | (51) | (110) | (86) | (83) | (169) | |
| Transit Trips (15%) [9] | | (28) | (24) | (52) | (29) | (28) | (57) | |
| Subtotal Project Driveway Trips | | 167 | 153 | 320 | 170 | 163 | 333 | |
| Existing Land Usa | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial [5] | (100,781) GLSF | (59) | (36) | (95) | (184) | (200) | (384) | |
| Existing Transit Trins [9] | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial (15%) | | 9 | 5 | 14 | 28 | 30 | 58 | |
| Subtotal Existing Driveway Trips | • | (50) | (31) | (81) | (156) | (170) | (326) | |
| NET INCREASE DRIVEWAY TRIPS | | 117 | 122 | 239 | 14 | (7) | 7 | |
| Proposed Dass Py Trins [10] | | | | | | | | |
| Postaurant (20%) | | (14) | (12) | (26) | (14) | (0) | (23) | |
| Commercial (50%) | | (14) | (12) | (20) | (14) | (12) | (23) | |
| Subtotal | | (18) | (14) | (22) | (25) | (12) (21) | (23) | |
| Subtotal | | (18) | (14) | (32) | (23) | (21) | (40) | |
| Existing Pass-By Trips [10] | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial (30%) | | 15 | 9 | 24 | 47 | 51 | 98 | |
| NET INCREASE "OFF-SITE" TRIPS | | 114 | 117 | 231 | 36 | 23 | 59 | |

Table 2-2 OPTION B TRIP GENERATION [1]

[1] Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, 2017.

2] Trips are one-way traffic movements, entering or leaving.

[3] ITE Land Use Code 221 (Multifamily Housing [Mid-Rise]) trip generation average rates. - AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.36 trips/dwelling unit; 26% inbound/74% outbound DM Deak Hour Trip Rate: 0.44 trips/dwelling unit; 61% inbound/20% outbound

- PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.44 trips/dwelling unit; 61% inbound/39% outbound
 [4] City of Los Angeles Affordable Housing (Family) trip generation average rates.
 AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.52 trips/dwelling unit; 38% inbound/62% outbound
- AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.52 trips/dwelling unit; 38% inbound/62% outbound
 PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.38 trips/dwelling unit; 55% inbound/45% outbound
 ITE Land Use Code 932 (High-Turnover [Sit-Down] Restaurant) trip generation avoid
- [5] ITE Land Use Code 932 (High-Turnover [Sit-Down] Restaurant) trip generation average rates.
 AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 9.94 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 55% inbound/45% outbound
 PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 9.77 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 62% inbound/38% outbound
- [6] ITE Land Use Code 820 (Shopping Center) trip generation average rates.
 AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.94 trips/1,000 SF of leasable area; 62% inbound/38% outbound
 PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 3.81 trips/1,000 SF of leasable area; 48% inbound/52% outbound
- [7] ITE Land Use Code 710 (General Office Building) trip generation average rates.
 AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 1.16 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 86% inbound/14% outbound
 PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 1.15 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 16% inbound/84% outbound
- [8] The internal capture reduction for the residential, restaurant, retail, and office is based on the synergy between all the market-rate apartments, restaurant, commercial, and office land uses provided within the Project Site, and determined via NCHRP 684 Internal Capture Estimation Tool (24% for AM Peak Hour and 31% for PM Peak Hour).
- [9] A 15% transit use reduction applied based on the Project Site being located within 1/4 mile of a Big Blue Bus rapid stop. The trip reduction for transit trips has been applied to the proposed Project and existing land uses based on the *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2020 for developments within a 1/4 mile walking distance of a transit station or a Rapid Bus stop. The transit reduction was not applied to the affordable housing component of the Project, per the *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2020.
- [10] Pass-by trips are made as intermediate stops on the way from an origin to a primary trip destination without a route diversion. Pass-by trips are attracted from traffic passing the site on an adjacent street or roadway that offers direct access to the site. The trip reduction for pass-by trips has been applied to the restaurant and commercial components of the Project based on the *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2020 for High Turnover Restaurant, Shopping Center less than 50,000 sf, and Shopping Center 100,000 to less than 300,000 sf.



Project Screening Criteria: Is this project required to conduct a vehicle miles traveled analysis?

Existing Land Use

Project Information



Is the project replacing an existing number of residential units with a smaller number of residential units AND is located within one-half mile of a fixed-rail or fixed-guideway transit station?

O No

O Yes

| Land Use Type | | Value | Unit | | |
|-------------------------|---|---------|------|---|--|
| Retail General Retail | ▼ | 100.781 | ksf | + | |
| Retail General Retail | | 100.781 | ksf | | |
| | | | | | |

Click here to add a single custom land use type (will be included in the above list)

Proposed Project Land Use

| Land Use Type | | Value | Unit | |
|---|----|-----------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Retail General Retail | - | 13.65 | ksf | • |
| Housing Multi-Family Housing Affordable Housing - Family Retail High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurar Retail General Retail | nt | 592 66 13.65 13.65 | DU DU ksf ksf | |

Project Screening Summary

| Existing Land Use | Proposed Project | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| 3,595 Daily Vehicle Trips | 4,974 Daily Vehicle Trips | | | | |
| 29,609 Daily VMT | 37,347 Daily VMT | | | | |
| Tier 1 Scree | ning Criteria | | | | |
| Project will have less residential units compared to existing residential units & is within one-half mile of a fixed-rail station. | | | | | |
| The net increase in daily tri | ps < 250 trips | 1,379 Net Daily Trips | | | |
| The net increase in daily VN | /T ≤ 0 | 7,738 Net Daily VMT | | | |
| The proposed project consists of only retail27.300land uses ≤ 50,000 square feet total.ksf | | | | | |
| The proposed project is required to perform VMT analysis. | | | | | |

Click here to add a single custom land use type (will be included in the above list)





Project Screening Criteria: Is this project required to conduct a vehicle miles traveled analysis?

Existing Land Use

Project Information



Is the project replacing an existing number of residential units with a smaller number of residential units AND is located within one-half mile of a fixed-rail or fixed-guideway transit station?

| Land Use Type | | Value | Unit | | |
|-------------------------|---|---------|------|--|--|
| Retail General Retail | - | 100.781 | ksf | | |
| Retail General Retail | | 100.781 | ksf | | |
| | | | | | |

Click here to add a single custom land use type (will be included in the above list)

Proposed Project Land Use

| Land Use Type | | Value | Unit | |
|--|---|-------|------|---|
| Office General Office | - | 90 | ksf | • |
| Housing Multi-Family | | 382 | DU | |
| Housing Affordable Housing - Family | | 43 | DU | |
| Retail High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant | | 20 | ksf | |
| Retail General Retail | | 20 | ksf | |
| Office General Office | | 90 | ksf | |

Existing Proposed Project Land Use 3,595 5,574 Daily Vehicle Trips Daily Vehicle Trips 29,609 45.178 Daily VMT Daily VMT **Tier 1 Screening Criteria** Project will have less residential units compared to existing residential units & is within one-half mile of a fixed-rail station. **Tier 2 Screening Criteria** 1.979 The net increase in daily trips < 250 trips Net Daily Trips 15,569 The net increase in daily VMT ≤ 0 Net Daily VMT

The proposed project consists of only retail40.000land uses $\leq 50,000$ square feet total.ksf

The proposed project is required to perform VMT analysis.



Project Screening Summary



Project Information



| Proposed Project Land Use Type | Value | Unit |
|--|-------|------|
| Housing Multi-Family | 592 | DU |
| Housing Affordable Housing - Family | 66 | DU |
| Retail High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant | 13.65 | ksf |
| Retail General Retail | 13.65 | ksf |

TDM Strategies

Select each section to show individual strategies Use 🗹 to denote if the TDM strategy is part of the proposed project or is a mitigation strategy



Analysis Results

| Proposed Project | With Mitigation |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 4.974 | 4.974 |
| Daily Vehicle Trips | Daily Vehicle Trips |
| 37,347 | 37,347 |
| Daily VMT | Daily VMT |
| 6.9 | 6.9 |
| Houseshold VMT per Capita | Houseshold VMT per Capita |
| N/A | N/A |
| Work VMT | Work VMT |
| Per | |
| Significant V | /MT Impact? |
| Household: No | Household: No |
| Threshold = 7.4 | Threshold = 7.4 |
| 15% Below APC | 15% Below APC |
| Work: N/A | Work: N/A |
| Threshold = 11.1 | Threshold = 11.1 |
| 15% Below APC | 15% Below APC |
| | |

Measuring the Miles



Project Information



| Proposed Project Land Use Type | Value | Unit |
|--|-------|------|
| Housing Multi-Family | 382 | DU |
| Housing Affordable Housing - Family | 43 | DU |
| Retail High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant | 20 | ksf |
| Retail General Retail | 20 | ksf |
| Office General Office | 90 | ksf |

TDM Strategies - Max Mitigation Reduction

Select each section to show individual strategies Use I/ to denote if the TDM strategy is part of the proposed project or is a mitigation strategy



With Proposed **Mitigation** Project 5.574 4.459 Daily Vehicle Trips Daily Vehicle Trips 36.142 45.178 Daily VMT Daily VMT 6.8 5.4 Houseshold VMT Houseshold VMT per Capita per Capita 14.5 11.6 Work VMT Work VMT per Employee per Employee **Significant VMT Impact?** Household: No Household: No Threshold = 7.4Threshold = 7.415% Below APC 15% Below APC Work: Yes Work: Yes Threshold = 11.1Threshold = 11.1 15% Below APC 15% Below APC

Analysis Results



| | | TRAFFIC | PEAK | YEA | YEAR 2020 EXISTING YEA LAY [2] LOS [3] QUEUE [4] DEI 64.4 F 215.0 6 155.5 F 430.0 11 25.0 C 112.5 2 | | | XISTING | W/ PROJECT | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | O PROJECT | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE V | / PROJECT | YEAR 2026 F IMF | UTURE W PROVEME | PROJECT + NTS |
|-----|---|---------------|----------|---------------|--|-----------------|---------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|---------|------------------|----------------|----------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| 1 | Walgrove Avenue / Washington Boulevard (Unsignalized) | SB Left/Right | AM PM | 64.4 155.5 | F F | 215.0 430.0 | 68.2 160.8 | F F | 222.5 435.0 | 138.1 291.2 | F F | 335.0 610.0 | 149.2 300.0 | F F | 347.5 620.0 | | | |
| | (Chargenanices) | EB Left | AM PM | 25.0 18.1 | C C | 112.5 67.5 | 25.6 18.4 | D C | 117.5 70.0 | 33.9 23.0 | D C | 157.5 95.0 | 35.1 23.5 | E C | 162.5 95.0 | | | - |
| 2 | Lincoln Boulevard / Marina Pointe Drive - Maxella Avenue (Signalized) | NB Left | AM PM | 44.6 47.2 | D D | 73.9 122.9 | 44.6 47.2 | D D | 73.9 122.9 | 46.0 47.8 | D D | 78.4 130.4 | 46.0 47.8 | D D | 78.4 130.4 | | | |
| | | NB Through | AM PM | 140.5 76.7 | F F | 1225.2 814.0 | 140.5 76.7 | F F | 1225.2 814.0 | 176.2 123.0 | F F | 1459.9 1111.2 | 176.2 123.0 | F F | 1459.9 1111.2 | | | - |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 22.2 24.0 | C C | 234.3 293.7 | 22.6 24.4 | C C | 245.9 306.5 | 22.9 26.0 | C C | 257.0 355.3 | 23.3 26.5 | C C | 268.8 369.4 | | | |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 33.8 33.6 | C C | 62.7 53.2 | 33.8 33.7 | C C | 65.4 55.8 | 33.9 33.7 | C C | 68.0 59.5 | 33.9 33.8 | C C | 70.8 62.2 | | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 40.2 45.0 | D D | 493.7 598.6 | 40.2 45.0 | D D | 493.7 598.6 | 42.1 51.1 | D D | 540.5 684.3 | 42.1 51.1 | D D | 540.5 684.3 | | | |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 45.3 54.3 | D D | 511.9 627.2 | 45.3 54.3 | D D | 511.9 627.2 | 48.7 64.6 | D E | 564.8 732.8 | 48.7 64.6 | D E | 564.8 732.8 | | | |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 45.6 45.9 | D D | 99.3 113.1 | 45.6 45.9 | D D | 99.3 113.1 | 45.8 46.1 | D D | 106.2 120.0 | 45.8 46.1 | D D | 106.2 120.0 | | | - |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 45.6 45.1 | D D | 104.4 84.0 | 45.6 45.1 | D D | 104.4 84.0 | 45.7 45.2 | D D | 111.3 89.5 | 45.7 45.2 | D D | 111.3 89.5 | - | | |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 7.1 6.5 | A A | 140.9 71.9 | 7.1 6.5 | A A | 140.9 71.9 | 7.2 6.5 | A A | 150.2 76.2 | 7.2 6.5 | A A | 150.2 76.2 | | | |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 52.3 74.1 | D E | 175.0 332.5 | 52.8 73.7 | D E | 187.8 330.8 | 59.6 108.8 | E F | 254.3 457.8 | 61.7 108.1 | E F | 268.1 455.2 | - | | |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 51.1 66.4 | D E | 139.2 302.4 | 51.3 66.3 | D E | 145.1 301.8 | 52.5 79.8 | D E | 182.3 363.3 | 52.7 79.6 | D E | 188.5 362.5 | - | | |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 35.7 37.8 | D D | 141.0 223.3 | 36.1 37.8 | D D | 156.2 222.1 | 36.1 38.4 | D D | 157.5 241.4 | 36.4 38.3 | D D | 172.9 240.3 | | - | - |
| 3 | Del Rey Avenue / Maxella Avenue (Invinentized) | SB Left/Right | AM PM | 11.8 17.0 | B C | 15.0 70.0 | 12.0 17.0 | B C | 17.5 70.0 | 13.4 21.4 | B C | 32.5 100.0 | 13.6 21.5 | B C | 32.5 102.5 | | | |
| | (Onsignan280) | EB Left | AM PM | 8.5 8.9 | A A | 10.0 7.5 | 8.6 8.9 | A A | 12.5 7.5 | 8.7 9.3 | A A | 12.5 10.0 | 8.8 9.3 | A A | 12.5 10.0 | | | - |

| | | TRAFFIC | BEAK | VEAD | 2020 EVIS | TINC | VE A D 2020 E | VISTING | W BRO IFCT | VE A D 2026 E | UTUDE W | OPPOIECT | VEAD 2026 | EUTUDE W/ | PROJECT | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W/ | PROJECT + |
|-----|---|------------|----------|--------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|---------|----------------|---------------|---------|----------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|-------------|----------|-----------|
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| 4 | Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue | NB Left | AM PM | 14.3 20.5 | B C | 10.0 20.0 | 11.0 10.9 | B B | 28.5 23.9 | 16.2 27.2 | C D | 15.0 35.0 | 10.9 11.0 | B B | 31.7 28.3 | - | | |
| | (Unsignalized w/o Project; Signalized w/ Project) | NB Right | AM PM | 9.8 10.4 | A B | 7.5 5.0 | 11.4 10.8 | B B | 34.1 18.3 | 10.1 10.8 | B B | 7.5 7.5 | 11.0 10.9 | B B | 36.8 22.2 | - | | |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | | | | 12.3 13.6 | B B | 78.5 125.1 | | | - | 12.7 14.2 | B B | 91.5 147.4 | - | | |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | | | | 12.4 13.7 | B B | 76.3 119.0 | | | - | 12.8 14.4 | B B | 88.8 139.4 | - | | |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 8.2 8.8 | A A | 2.5 5.0 | 13.8 16.3 | B B | 16.9 27.0 | 8.3 9.1 | A A | 2.5 5.0 | 14.5 18.1 | B B | 19.9 37.5 | - | | |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | | | | 11.5 12.1 | B B | 54.2 77.7 | | | - | 11.7 12.5 | B B | 60.5 94.3 | | | |
| 5 | Maxella Avenue Driveway / Maxella Avenue (Unsignalized) | NB Right | AM PM | 9.4 9.9 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.5 9.9 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.6 10.2 | A B | 0.0 0.0 | 9.8 10.2 | A B | 0.0 0.0 | - | | |
| 6 | Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue | NB Left | AM PM | 17.9 22.4 | B C | 59.4 77.2 | 18.2 22.9 | B C | 60.2 78.2 | 19.3 30.5 | B C | 67.2 116.9 | 19.7 31.7 | B C | 68.1 119.3 | - | | |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 18.6 13.0 | B B | 280.9 151.8 | 20.2 13.0 | C B | 304.6 150.5 | 21.9 13.5 | C B | 327.0 174.9 | 24.7 13.5 | C B | 359.7 173.3 | - | | |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 19.5 25.9 | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 19.5 25.9 | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 20.6 27.4 | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 20.6 27.4 | - | | |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 24.1 16.8 | C B | 44.2 22.7 | 25.3 16.8 | C B | 45.5 22.7 | 26.7 18.0 | C B | 51.1 27.4 | 28.1 17.9 | C B | 53.0 27.3 | - | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 12.5 13.9 | B B | 128.1 189.4 | 12.6 14.1 | B B | 132.9 194.3 | 12.9 15.1 | B B | 145.6 218.0 | 13.0 15.4 | B B | 150.6 224.0 | - | | |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 12.6 14.0 | B B | 122.7 180.2 | 12.6 14.2 | B B | 127.4 186.5 | 12.9 15.2 | B B | 139.3 208.9 | 13.0 15.5 | B B | 144.2 214.8 | - | | |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 13.4 15.4 | B B | 47.9 72.3 | 13.8 15.4 | B B | 57.2 72.0 | 14.0 16.8 | B B | 57.6 90.4 | 14.4 16.8 | B B | 67.3 89.9 | - | | |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 11.3 11.8 | B B | 38.6 57.2 | 11.3 11.7 | B B | 41.1 56.8 | 11.4 12.0 | B B | 45.3 68.3 | 11.5 12.0 | B B | 47.9 67.7 | - | | |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 12.0 12.9 | B B | 55.2 81.0 | 12.2 12.9 | B B | 59.0 81.0 | 12.4 13.2 | B B | 66.9 89.5 | 12.5 13.2 | B B | 70.8 89.5 | - | | |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 12.5 13.9 | B B | 27.5 44.7 | 12.6 13.9 | B B | 27.6 44.5 | 12.9 14.5 | B B | 29.6 48.9 | 13.0 14.5 | B B | 29.9 48.9 | - | | |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 11.1 11.6 | B B | 31.7 52.6 | 11.1 11.6 | B B | 32.9 53.3 | 11.2 11.8 | B B | 35.7 61.0 | 11.2 11.9 | B B | 37.0 61.7 | - | | |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 11.3 11.8 | B B | 32.5 50.1 | 11.3 11.8 | B B | 32.5 50.7 | 11.4 12.0 | B B | 35.4 57.8 | 11.4 12.1 | B B | 35.5 58.6 | - | | |
| 7 | Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Northerly Driveway | NB Left | AM PM | | | | 9.7 10.9 | A B | 2.5 5.0 | | | | 10.0 11.5 | B B | 2.5 5.0 | | | |
| | (Unsignalized) | EB Right | AM PM | | - | | 11.8 12.9 | B B | 7.5 5.0 | | - | | 12.3 13.6 | B B | 7.5 7.5 | | | |

| | | | r – – | | YEAR 2020 EXISTING YEA | | | | | | | | | | | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | 13-Apr-21 |
|-----|---|---------------|----------|---------------|------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------|----------------|----------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|----------|-----------------|--------------|---------|----------------|
| | | TRAFFIC | PEAK | YEAF | R 2020 EXIS | STING | YEAR 2020 E | XISTING | W/ PROJECT | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | O PROJECT | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE V | V/ PROJECT | IMF | ROVEME | NTS |
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| 8 | Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Southerly Driveway - Villa | NB Left | AM PM | 9.5 10.9 | A B | 2.5 5.0 | 9.8 10.9 | A B | 2.5 5.0 | 9.9 11.5 | A B | 2.5 7.5 | 10.2 11.5 | B B | 2.5 5.0 | 9.1 11.8 | A B | 8.9 23.0 |
| | (Unsignalized; Signalized w/ Improvements) | NB Through | AM PM | - | | | - | | | | | - | | | - | 6.9 6.2 | A A | 145.5 96.3 |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | | | | | | | | - | - | | | - | 6.9 6.2 | A A | 145.3 95.8 |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 9.4 8.5 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.5 8.6 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.6 8.8 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.7 8.8 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 8.1 7.0 | A A | 1.3 4.2 |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | | | | - | | | | | - | | | - | 7.3 8.1 | A A | 165.6 212.7 |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | | | | - | | | | | - | | | - | 7.3 8.1 | A A | 163.9 209.4 |
| | | EB Left/Right | AM PM | 28.3 118.5 | D F | 10.0 142.5 | 42.3 116.7 | E F | 50.0 137.5 | 35.3 230.9 | E F | 12.5 200.0 | 59.8 227.0 | F F | 67.5 192.5 | 28.8 29.8 | C C | 60.0 95.1 |
| | | WB Left/Right | AM PM | 23.2 21.4 | C C | 7.5 5.0 | 25.8 21.9 | D C | 10.0 5.0 | 27.3 25.5 | D D | 10.0 5.0 | 30.8 26.1 | D D | 12.5 5.0 | 27.9 27.7 | C D | 18.5 10.0 |
| 9 | Mindanao Way/ Glencoe Avenue | NB Left | AM PM | 195.5 54.1 | F D | 892.7 276.3 | 216.5 64.1 | F E | 970.9 309.6 | 283.1 101.4 | F F | 1182.0 397.3 | 306.7 120.5 | F F | 1264.2 453.8 | 22.1 23.3 | C C | 303.4 187.2 |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 20.9 19.1 | C B | 233.0 133.3 | 20.9 19.1 | C B | 233.0 133.3 | 21.4 19.4 | C B | 251.8 152.4 | 21.4 19.4 | C B | 251.8 152.4 | 15.1 17.4 | B B | 211.3 142.5 |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 21.0 19.1 | C B | 225.5 129.9 | 21.0 19.1 | C B | 225.5 129.9 | 21.5 19.4 | C B | 243.0 147.9 | 21.5 19.4 | B B | 243.0 147.9 | 15.2 17.4 | B B | 204.0 138.3 |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 25.9 21.7 | C C | 6.1 7.0 | 25.9 21.7 | C C | 6.1 7.0 | 26.9 22.4 | C C | 7.0 8.6 | 26.9 22.4 | C C | 7.0 8.6 | 29.3 26.6 | C C | 7.4 9.5 |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 19.7 20.6 | B C | 171.2 218.4 | 19.7 20.7 | B C | 173.5 220.3 | 20.0 21.1 | B C | 189.3 240.8 | 20.0 21.2 | C C | 191.2 242.9 | 35.2 34.1 | D C | 249.0 305.0 |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 19.7 20.6 | B C | 161.9 210.0 | 19.8 20.7 | B C | 163.7 211.4 | 20.0 21.2 | C C | 178.3 230.8 | 20.1 21.2 | C C | 180.1 232.5 | 35.5 34.3 | D C | 237.5 291.8 |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 14.3 16.0 | B B | 42.5 86.1 | 14.5 16.1 | B B | 50.1 85.5 | 14.7 16.8 | B B | 51.8 98.6 | 15.0 16.9 | B B | 59.9 98.1 | 21.4 19.1 | C B | 74.3 105.9 |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 12.7 13.6 | B B | 73.6 122.1 | 12.8 13.6 | B B | 78.3 122.1 | 13.0 13.9 | B B | 86.0 135.4 | 13.0 13.9 | B B | 90.8 135.4 | 18.6 15.7 | B B | 113.0 146.7 |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 19.4 28.6 | B C | 295.3 473.9 | 21.4 28.3 | C C | 341.4 469.8 | 20.9 35.3 | C D | 330.7 567.3 | 23.3 35.0 | C D | 381.3 561.7 | 11.2 17.7 | B B | 259.1 398.8 |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 14.1 17.5 | B B | 25.8 83.0 | 14.3 17.5 | B B | 26.0 83.0 | 14.6 18.5 | B B | 29.3 99.3 | 14.7 18.5 | B B | 29.4 99.3 | 20.9 21.1 | C C | 36.5 107.3 |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 12.4 12.6 | B B | 57.0 66.0 | 12.5 12.6 | B B | 58.0 67.1 | 12.5 12.8 | B B | 61.6 74.8 | 12.5 12.8 | B B | 62.4 76.1 | 17.8 14.5 | B B | 77.7 82.2 |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 12.5 12.6 | B B | 56.7 64.9 | 12.5 12.7 | B B | 57.5 66.2 | 12.5 12.8 | B B | 61.0 73.7 | 12.6 12.8 | B B | 62.0 74.8 | 17.8 14.5 | B B | 77.2 81.0 |

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

| | | TRAFFIC DE AV. VE AD 1010 EVETING VE AD 1010 EVETING W/BROLEGT VE AD 1010 EUTIDE W/O BROLEGT. VE AD 1010 EUTIDE W/O BROLEGT. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13-Apr-21 |
|----|----------------------------------|--|----------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------------|---------|------------------|----------------|---------|------------------|----------------|----------|------------------|-------------|---------|-----------|
| | | TRAFFIC | | | | TRIC | VE + D 4040 F | | U BBO IE OT | | | | | | DBO IEGT | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | PROJECT + |
| NO | INTERSECTION | IKAFFIC | PEAK | YEAF DELAV [2] | LOS 131 | OUFUE MI | YEAR 2020 E | LOS 131 | OUFUE M | YEAR 2026 F | LOS 131 | OUFUE MI | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE W | OUFUE MI | DELAV [2] | LOS 131 | OUFUE MI |
| 10 | Mindanao Way/ SR-90 Westbound | NB Left | AM PM | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 14.6 | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 14.6 | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 15.4 | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 15.4 | | | |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 14.0 13.4 | B B | 158.0 120.6 | 14.1 13.4 | B B | 159.6 121.7 | 14.3 13.8 | B B | 174.0 136.9 | 14.3 13.8 | B B | 175.2 138.1 | - | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 31.0 51.3 | C D | 257.8 478.2 | 31.8 51.0 | C D | 274.1 476.1 | 32.2 73.0 | C F | 282.9 607.0 | 33.2 72.4 | C F | 300.2 603.5 | - | - | |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 33.7 62.4 | C E | 267.8 520.3 | 34.9 62.0 | C E | 286.2 518.0 | 35.6 84.7 | D F | 295.5 650.1 | 37.0 84.1 | D F | 315.1 646.8 | - | - | |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 26.8 23.1 | C C | 330.0 251.9 | 26.8 23.1 | C C | 330.0 251.9 | 29.4 25.1 | C C | 369.5 297.5 | 29.4 25.1 | C C | 369.5 297.5 | - | - | |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 97.0 31.6 | F C | 969.8 442.1 | 99.7 32.1 | F C | 990.5 449.0 | 130.4 47.2 | F D | 1222.9 594.9 | 133.3 48.9 | F D | 1246.0 609.9 | - | - | |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 160.0 23.8 | F C | 1250.5 243.7 | 166.8 24.3 | F C | 1296.3 252.5 | 200.3 25.6 | F C | 1525.8 277.0 | 207.2 26.2 | F C | 1573.6 286.4 | - | - | |
| 11 | Mindanao Way/ SR-90 Eastbound | NB Through | AM PM | 197.8 144.4 | F F | 760.8 587.7 | 200.6 146.3 | F F | 770.1 594.2 | 241.2 200.4 | F F | 902.7 768.5 | 244.0 202.5 | F F | 912.2 775.4 | | 1 1 | |
| | (Signalized) | NB Right | AM PM | 474.9 394.0 | F F | 1498.1 1261.5 | 474.9 394.0 | F F | 1498.1 1261.5 | 539.1 497.8 | F F | 1683.9 1564.6 | 539.1 497.8 | F F | 1683.9 1564.6 | - | | |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 27.7 33.3 | C C | 197.3 303.4 | 28.4 33.2 | C C | 214.8 302.5 | 28.4 36.8 | C D | 215.8 343.2 | 29.2 36.7 | C D | 233.9 341.7 | - | - | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 17.5 18.7 | B B | 304.5 344.5 | 17.6 18.7 | B B | 307.3 344.5 | 18.4 20.6 | B C | 336.3 403.2 | 18.5 20.6 | B C | 339.2 403.2 | - | - | |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 17.9 17.8 | B B | 17.3 10.3 | 17.9 17.8 | B B | 17.3 10.3 | 18.0 17.8 | B B | 20.9 11.5 | 18.0 17.8 | B B | 20.9 11.5 | - | - | |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 40.1 35.9 | D D | 518.7 474.6 | 40.1 35.9 | D D | 518.7 474.6 | 57.4 46.2 | E D | 668.3 574.1 | 57.4 46.2 | E D | 668.3 574.1 | - | | |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 40.3 35.9 | D D | 517.7 473.0 | 40.3 35.9 | D D | 517.7 473.0 | 57.8 46.3 | D D | 668.1 573.4 | 57.8 46.3 | E D | 668.1 573.4 | - | 1 1 | |

Table 5-2 (Continued) SUMMARY OF DELAYS, LEVELS OF SERVICE, AND VEHICLE QUEUING [1] WEEKDAY AM AND PM PEAK HOURS OPTION A

>

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13-Apr-21 |
|-----|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|--------------|---------|----------------|--------------|----------|----------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| | | TRAFFIC | PEAK | YEAI | R 2020 EXIS | TING | YEAR 2020 E | XISTING V | V/ PROJECT | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | O PROJECT | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE W | // PROJECT | YEAR 2026 F IMF | UTURE W/ ROVEMEN | PROJECT + TS |
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| 12 | Mindanao Way⁄ La Villa Marina | NB Left | AM PM | 9.3 9.5 | AA | 10.6 12.3 | 9.3 9.5 | AA | 10.6 12.3 | 9.4 9.7 | AA | 11.2 13.6 | 9.4 9.7 | A | 11.2 13.6 | | | |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 14.7 13.5 | B B | 302.9 258.9 | 14.7 13.5 | B B | 303.8 260.0 | 15.5 14.5 | B B | 332.4 297.6 | 15.5 14.5 | B B | 333.9 298.8 | | | |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 14.7 13.5 | B B | 299.3 254.6 | 14.7 13.5 | B B | 300.7 255.7 | 15.6 14.6 | B B | 328.7 293.1 | 15.6 14.6 | B B | 330.2 294.3 | - | | |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 6.9 6.6 | A A | 14.1 30.1 | 6.9 6.6 | A A | 14.1 30.1 | 7.6 7.6 | A A | 15.1 32.1 | 7.6 7.6 | A A | 15.1 32.1 | - | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 5.3 5.6 | A A | 139.4 153.7 | 5.4 5.6 | A A | 140.7 153.7 | 5.6 6.0 | A A | 156.3 183.4 | 5.6 6.0 | A A | 158.4 183.4 | - | | |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 5.3 5.6 | A A | 138.1 153.1 | 5.4 5.6 | A A | 139.5 153.1 | 5.6 6.0 | A A | 155.0 182.8 | 5.6 6.0 | A A | 157.1 183.4 | - | | |
| | | EB Left/Through/Right | AM PM | 32.1 32.7 | C C | 24.6 49.3 | 32.1 32.7 | C C | 24.6 49.3 | 32.1 32.8 | C C | 26.4 52.0 | 32.1 32.8 | C C | 26.4 52.0 | | | |
| | | WB Left/Through/Right | AM PM | 45.0 34.4 | D C | 236.9 112.5 | 45.0 34.4 | D C | 236.9 112.5 | 49.2 34.6 | D C | 260.0 119.6 | 49.2 34.6 | D C | 260.0 119.6 | | | |

[1] Pursuant to LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines, July 2020, the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology for signalized and unsignalized intersections was utilized to calculate vehicle queuing.

Control delay reported in seconds per vehicle.
 Signalized Intersection Levels of Service were based or

| ection Levels of Service were based on the follow | ing criteria: | Unsignalized Intersection Levels of Service wer | re based on the following criteria: |
|---|---------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Control Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Control Delay (s/veh) | LOS |
| <= 10 | Α | <= 10 | Α |
| > 10-20 | В | > 10-15 | В |
| > 20-35 | С | > 15-25 | С |
| > 35-55 | D | > 25-35 | D |
| > 55-80 | E | > 35-50 | E |
| > 80 | F | > 50 | F |
| | | | |

[4] The 95th percentile queue is the maximum back of queue with 95th percentile traffic volumes. The HCM 6th Edition methodology worksheets report queues in number of vehicles, however an average vehicle length of 25 feet was assumed for analysis purposes. The reported queues therefore represent the calculated maximum back of queue in feet.

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13-Apr-21 |
|-----|---|---------------|----------|---------------|------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|---------|------------------|----------------|----------|------------------|-------------|---------|------------|
| | | TDAFFIC | DEAL | VEAD | 2 2020 EVB | TINC | VEAD 2020 E | VISTING | V/OPTION P | VE AD 2026 E | UTUDE W | O OPTION P | VE AD 2026 | EUTUDE V | OPTION P | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | OPTION B + |
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | OUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | OUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | OUEUE 141 | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | OUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | OUEUE [4] |
| 1 | Walgrove Avenue / Washington Boulevard | SB Left/Right | AM PM | 64.4 155.5 | F | 215.0 430.0 | 70.7 158.9 | F F | 227.5 432.5 | 138.1 291.2 | F F | 335.0 610.0 | 156.3 296.8 | F | 355.0 615.0 | | | |
| | (Unsignalized) | EB Left | AM PM | 25.0 18.1 | C C | 112.5 67.5 | 26.2 18.3 | D C | 120.0 67.5 | 33.9 23.0 | D C | 157.5 95.0 | 36.1 23.2 | E C | 165.0 95.0 | - | | |
| 2 | Lincoln Boulevard / Marina Pointe Drive - Maxella Avenue | NB Left | AM PM | 44.6 47.2 | D D | 73.9 122.9 | 44.6 47.2 | D D | 73.9 122.9 | 46.0 47.8 | D D | 78.4 130.4 | 46.0 47.8 | D D | 78.4 130.4 | | | - |
| | (Signanzed) | NB Through | AM PM | 140.5 76.7 | F F | 1225.2 814.0 | 140.5 76.7 | F F | 1225.2 814.0 | 176.2 123.0 | F F | 1459.9 1111.2 | 176.2 123.0 | F F | 1459.9 1111.2 | | | |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 22.2 24.0 | C C | 234.3 293.7 | 22.9 24.2 | C C | 256.0 301.1 | 22.9 26.0 | C C | 257.0 355.3 | 23.6 26.3 | C C | 279.5 363.3 | - | | - |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 33.8 33.6 | C C | 62.7 53.2 | 33.9 33.6 | C C | 67.5 54.7 | 33.9 33.7 | C C | 68.0 59.5 | 34.0 33.8 | C C | 72.9 61.1 | - | | - |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 40.2 45.0 | D D | 493.7 598.6 | 40.2 45.0 | D D | 493.7 598.6 | 42.1 51.1 | D D | 540.5 684.3 | 42.1 51.1 | D D | 540.5 684.3 | - | - | - |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 45.3 54.3 | D | 511.9 627.2 | 45.3 54.3 | D | 511.9 627.2 | 48.7 64.6 | D E | 564.8 732.8 | 48.7 64.6 | DE | 564.8 732.8 | - | | - |
| | | EB Lett | AM PM | 45.6 45.9 | D | 99.3 113.1 | 45.6 45.9 | D | 99.3 113.1 | 45.8 | D | 106.2 120.0 | 45.8 46.1 | D | 106.2 120.0 | - | - | - |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 45.6 45.1 | D | 104.4 84.0 | 45.6 45.1 | D | 104.4 84.0 | 45.7 45.2 | D | 111.3 89.5 | 45.7 45.2 | D | 111.3 89.5 | - | - | - |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 7.1 6.5 | A | 140.9 71.9 | 7.1 6.5 | A | 140.9 71.9 | 7.2 6.5 | A | 150.2 76.2 | 7.2 6.5 | A | 150.2 76.2 | - | - | - |
| | | WB Lett | AM PM | 52.3 74.1 | E | 332.5 | 52.6 74.5 | E | 184.5 334.0 | 59.6 108.8 | F | 254.3 457.8 | 61.1 109.6 | F | 264.5 460.2 | - | - | - |
| | | WB Ihrough | AM PM | 51.1 66.4 | E | 302.4 | 51.2 66.6 | E | 303.1 | 52.5 79.8 | E | 182.3 363.3 | 52.6 80.0 | F | 364.2 | - | - | - |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 35.7 37.8 | D | 141.0 223.3 | 36.0 37.9 | D | 152.3 224.4 | 36.1 38.4 | D | 157.5 241.4 | 36.4 38.4 | D | 169.0 242.3 | - | - | - |
| 3 | Del Rey Avenue / Maxella Avenue (Unsionalized) | SB Left/Right | AM PM | 11.8 17.0 | B C | 15.0 70.0 | 12.0 17.1 | B C | 17.5 70.0 | 13.4 21.4 | B C | 32.5 100.0 | 13.6 21.6 | B C | 32.5 102.5 | | | |
| | (enspirated) | EB Left | AM PM | 8.5 8.9 | A A | 10.0 7.5 | 8.6 8.9 | A A | 12.5 7.5 | 8.7 9.3 | A A | 12.5 10.0 | 8.8 9.4 | A A | 12.5 10.0 | - | | |

Table 5-3 SUMMARY OF DELAYS, LEVELS OF SERVICE, AND VEHICLE QUEUING [1] WEEKDAY AM AND PM PEAK HOURS OPTION B

~

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | OPTION B + |
|-----|---|---------------------|--------------|-------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| NO. | INTERSECTION | TRAFFIC MOVEMENT | PEAK HOUR | YEAI DELAY [2] | R 2020 EXIS LOS [3] | STING QUEUE [4] | YEAR 2020 E DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | V/ OPTION B QUEUE [4] | YEAR 2026 F DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | O OPTION B QUEUE [4] | YEAR 2026 1 DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | IMP DELAY [2] | ROVEME LOS [3] | NTS QUEUE [4] |
| 4 | Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue | NB Left | AM PM | 14.3 20.5 | B | 10.0 | 10.9 | B | 26.5 25.9 | 16.2 27.2 | CD | 15.0 35.0 | 10.8 | B | 29.9 30.3 | - | | |
| | (Unsignalized w/o Project; Signalized w/ Project) | NB Right | AM | 9.8 | A | 7.5 | 11.2 | В | 32.0 | 10.1 | В | 7.5 | 11.0 | В | 34.8 | - | | |
| | | EB Through | AM | | | | 12.4 | В | 20.3 82.9 | | | - | 12.8 | в | 24.3 96.2 | - | - | - |
| | | ED Dight | PM | | | | 13.5 | В | 122.6 | | | - | 14.2 | В | 144.7 | - | | |
| | | ED Right | PM | | | | 13.7 | В | 117.0 | | - | - | 14.3 | В | 137.2 | - | | - |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 8.2 8.8 | A A | 2.5 5.0 | 14.0 16.1 | B B | 18.0 26.3 | 8.3 9.1 | A A | 2.5 5.0 | 14.7 17.9 | B B | 21.1 36.7 | - | - | |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | | | | 11.5 12.1 | B B | 54.2 77.7 | | | - | 11.7 12.5 | B B | 60.5 94.3 | - | | |
| 5 | Maxella Avenue Driveway / Maxella Avenue (Unsignalized) | NB Right | AM PM | 9.4 9.9 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.5 9.9 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.6 10.2 | A B | 0.0 0.0 | 9.7 10.2 | A B | 0.0 0.0 | | - | |
| 6 | Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue | NB Left | AM PM | 17.9 22.4 | B C | 59.4 77.2 | 18.5 22.7 | B C | 60.7 77.9 | 19.3 30.5 | B C | 67.2 116.9 | 20.0 31.2 | B C | 68.8 118.3 | | | |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 18.6 13.0 | B B | 280.9 151.8 | 19.8 13.0 | B B | 299.1 154.0 | 21.9 13.5 | C B | 327.0 174.9 | 24.0 13.6 | C B | 352.3 177.5 | - | | |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 19.5 25.9 | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 19.5 25.9 | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 20.6 27.4 | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 20.6 27.4 | | | |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 24.1 16.8 | C B | 44.2 22.7 | 25.1 16.9 | C B | 45.3 22.8 | 26.7 18.0 | C B | 51.1 27.4 | 27.8 18.1 | C B | 52.5 27.5 | | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 12.5 | B | 128.1 | 12.7 | B | 137.1 | 12.9 | B | 145.6 | 13.0 | B | 155.0 | - | - | |
| | | SB Right | AM | 12.6 | В | 122.7 | 12.7 | В | 131.5 | 12.9 | В | 139.3 | 13.1 | В | 148.0 | - | - | |
| | | EB Left | AM | 13.4 | В | 47.9 | 13.7 | В | 55.0 | 14.0 | В | 57.6 | 14.3 | В | 65.2 | - | | |
| | | EB Through | AM | 15.4 | В | 38.6 | 15.5 | В | 40.7 | 16.8 | В | 90.4 45.3 | 17.0 | в | 92.4 47.1 | - | - | - |
| | | FB Right | PM AM | 11.8 | B | 57.2 | 11.8 | B | 57.8 | 12.0 | B | 68.3 66.9 | 12.0 | B | 68.8 69.7 | - | - | - |
| | | 22 Right | PM | 12.9 | В | 81.0 | 12.9 | B | 81.5 | 13.2 | В | 89.5 | 13.2 | В | 89.9 | - | - | |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 12.5 | B | 27.5 44.7 | 12.6 | B | 27.6 44.7 | 12.9 | B | 29.6 48.9 | 12.9 14.6 | B | 29.8 49.0 | - | - | - |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 11.1 11.6 | B B | 31.7 52.6 | 11.2 11.6 | B B | 33.7 53.1 | 11.2 11.8 | B B | 35.7 61.0 | 11.2 11.9 | B B | 37.4 61.5 | - | - | - |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 11.3 11.8 | B B | 32.5 50.1 | 11.3 11.8 | B B | 32.5 50.5 | 11.4 12.0 | B B | 35.4 57.8 | 11.4 12.1 | B B | 35.9 58.4 | - | | - |
| 7 | Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Northerly Driveway | NB Left | AM PM | | | | | | - | | | - | | | - | | | |
| | (Unsignalized) | EB Right | AM PM | | | | | | - | | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13-Apr-21 |
|----|---|---------------|----------|---------------|------------|----------------|---------------|----------|-----------------|----------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|----------|-----------------|--------------|---------|----------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | OPTION B + |
| | | TRAFFIC | PEAK | YEAH | R 2020 EXI | STING | YEAR 2020 1 | EXISTING | W/ OPTION B | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | O OPTION B | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE V | W/ OPTION B | IMI | ROVEME | NTS |
| NC | D. INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| 8 | Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Southerly Driveway - Villa | NB Left | AM PM | 9.5 10.9 | A B | 2.5 5.0 | 10.0 11.2 | A B | 7.5 10.0 | 9.9 11.5 | A B | 2.5 7.5 | 10.4 11.8 | B B | 7.5 10.0 | 14.7 18.9 | B B | 36.1 49.8 |
| | (Unsignalized; Signalized w/ Improvements) | NB Through | AM PM | | | | | | | | | | | | | 9.9 8.8 | A A | 183.0 116.0 |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | | | | - | | | | - | | | | | 9.9 8.8 | A A | 182.8 115.4 |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 9.4 8.5 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.4 8.5 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.6 8.8 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.6 8.7 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 11.6 10.0 | B A | 1.6 5.3 |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | | | | | | | | - | | | | | 10.3 11.6 | B B | 205.8 261.7 |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | | | | | - | | | - | | | | | 10.4 11.7 | B B | 202.0 256.0 |
| | | EB Left/Right | AM PM | 28.3 118.5 | D F | 10.0 142.5 | 35.7 162.8 | E F | 60.0 222.5 | 35.3 230.9 | E F | 12.5 200.0 | 50.7 311.3 | F F | 82.5 300.0 | 24.6 25.9 | C C | 79.8 132.5 |
| | | WB Left/Right | AM PM | 23.2 21.4 | C C | 7.5 5.0 | 29.5 24.2 | D C | 10.0 5.0 | 27.3 25.5 | D D | 10.0 5.0 | 36.0 29.5 | E D | 15.0 7.5 | 23.3 23.2 | C C | 16.7 9.0 |
| 9 | Mindanao Way/ Glencoe Avenue | NB Left | AM PM | 195.5 54.1 | F D | 892.7 276.3 | 234.5 59.2 | F E | 1037.7 293.5 | 283.1 101.4 | F F | 1182.0 397.3 | 326.7 111.5 | F F | 1333.7 427.1 | 22.0 23.4 | C C | 308.2 183.2 |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 20.9 19.1 | C B | 233.0 133.3 | 20.9 19.1 | C B | 233.0 133.3 | 21.4 19.4 | C B | 251.8 152.4 | 21.4 19.4 | C B | 251.8 152.4 | 14.8 17.6 | B B | 209.1 143.7 |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 21.0 19.1 | C B | 225.5 129.9 | 21.0 19.1 | C B | 225.5 129.9 | 21.5 19.4 | C B | 243.0 147.9 | 21.5 19.4 | C B | 243.0 147.9 | 14.8 17.6 | B B | 201.8 139.5 |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 25.9 21.7 | C C | 6.1 7.0 | 25.9 21.7 | C C | 6.1 7.0 | 26.9 22.4 | C C | 7.0 8.6 | 26.9 22.4 | C C | 7.0 8.6 | 29.2 26.7 | C C | 7.4 9.5 |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 19.7 20.6 | B C | 171.2 218.4 | 19.7 20.6 | B C | 175.4 219.4 | 20.0 21.1 | B C | 189.3 240.8 | 20.0 21.1 | C C | 192.7 242.2 | 35.2 34.1 | D C | 250.7 304.2 |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 19.7 20.6 | B C | 161.9 210.0 | 19.8 20.7 | B C | 164.8 211.0 | 20.0 21.2 | C C | 178.3 230.8 | 20.1 21.2 | C C | 181.6 231.6 | 35.4 34.3 | D C | 238.7 290.9 |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 14.3 16.0 | B B | 42.5 86.1 | 14.5 16.1 | B B | 48.2 87.0 | 14.7 16.8 | B B | 51.8 98.6 | 15.0 16.9 | B B | 57.9 99.3 | 21.8 19.0 | C B | 72.7 106.7 |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 12.7 13.6 | B B | 73.6 122.1 | 12.8 13.6 | B B | 77.0 122.7 | 13.0 13.9 | B B | 86.0 135.4 | 13.0 13.9 | B B | 89.5 136.0 | 18.9 15.5 | B B | 112.8 146.0 |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 19.4 28.6 | B C | 295.3 473.9 | 20.9 29.4 | C C | 330.7 485.7 | 20.9 35.3 | C D | 330.7 567.3 | 22.7 36.9 | C D | 369.6 583.1 | 11.1 18.1 | B B | 252.7 409.3 |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 14.1 17.5 | B B | 25.8 83.0 | 14.2 17.5 | B B | 25.9 83.0 | 14.6 18.5 | B B | 29.3 99.3 | 14.7 18.6 | B B | 29.4 99.3 | 21.3 20.8 | C C | 36.9 106.6 |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 12.4 12.6 | B B | 57.0 66.0 | 12.5 12.6 | B B | 58.5 66.5 | 12.5 12.8 | B B | 61.6 74.8 | 12.5 12.8 | B B | 63.1 75.6 | 18.1 14.3 | B B | 79.4 81.0 |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 12.5 12.6 | B B | 56.7 64.9 | 12.5 12.6 | B B | 58.0 65.6 | 12.5 12.8 | B B | 61.0 73.7 | 12.6 12.8 | B B | 62.5 74.2 | 18.2 14.3 | B B | 78.9 79.6 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13-Apr-21 |
|-----|----------------------------------|------------|----------|----------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|-----------|------------------|----------------|---------|------------------|----------------|----------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| | | TRAFFIC | PEAK | YEAI | R 2020 EXIS | STING | YEAR 2020 E | XISTING V | V/ OPTION B | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | O OPTION B | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE W | / OPTION B | YEAR 2026 F IMP | UTURE W/ ROVEME | OPTION B + NTS |
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| 10 | Mindanao Way/ SR-90 Westbound | NB Left | AM PM | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 14.6 | 31.5 31.7 | с с | 6.2 14.6 | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 15.4 | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 15.4 | | | |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 14.0 13.4 | B B | 158.0 120.6 | 14.1 13.4 | B B | 160.4 121.1 | 14.3 13.8 | B B | 174.0 136.9 | 14.4 13.8 | B B | 176.5 137.5 | - | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 31.0 51.3 | C D | 257.8 478.2 | 31.6 52.3 | C D | 270.7 484.8 | 32.2 73.0 | C F | 282.9 607.0 | 33.0 74.7 | C F | 296.2 616.3 | - | - | - |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 33.7 62.4 | C E | 267.8 520.3 | 34.6 63.5 | C E | 282.1 527.4 | 35.6 84.7 | D F | 295.5 650.1 | 36.7 86.3 | D F | 310.6 659.2 | - | - | - |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 26.8 23.1 | C C | 330.0 251.9 | 26.8 23.1 | C C | 330.0 251.9 | 29.4 25.1 | C C | 369.5 297.5 | 29.4 25.1 | C C | 369.5 297.5 | - | | - |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 97.0 31.6 | F C | 969.8 442.1 | 102.2 31.9 | F C | 1009.1 446.8 | 130.4 47.2 | F D | 1222.9 594.9 | 135.9 48.2 | F D | 1265.3 603.6 | - | - | - |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 160.0 23.8 | F C | 1250.5 243.7 | 172.8 24.1 | F C | 1337.4 248.7 | 200.3 25.6 | F C | 1525.8 277.0 | 213.4 26.0 | F C | 1616.4 282.6 | - | 1 1 | - |
| 11 | Mindanao Way/ SR-90 Eastbound | NB Through | AM PM | 197.8 144.4 | F F | 760.8 587.7 | 202.7 145.7 | F F | 777.0 592.0 | 241.2 200.4 | F F | 902.7 768.5 | 246.2 201.8 | F F | 919.4 773.1 | | | - |
| | (Signanizet) | NB Right | AM PM | 474.9 394.0 | F F | 1498.1 1261.5 | 474.9 394.0 | F F | 1498.1 1261.5 | 539.1 497.8 | F F | 1683.9 1564.6 | 539.1 497.8 | F F | 1683.9 1564.6 | - | | - |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 27.7 33.3 | C C | 197.3 303.4 | 28.2 33.6 | C C | 211.2 307.3 | 28.4 36.8 | C D | 215.8 343.2 | 29.0 37.3 | C D | 230.2 348.0 | - | - | - |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 17.5 18.7 | B B | 304.5 344.5 | 17.6 18.7 | B B | 306.8 345.5 | 18.4 20.6 | B C | 336.3 403.2 | 18.5 20.6 | B C | 338.6 404.4 | - | - | |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 17.9 17.8 | B B | 17.3 10.3 | 17.9 17.8 | B B | 17.3 10.3 | 18.0 17.8 | B B | 20.9 11.5 | 18.0 17.8 | B B | 20.9 11.5 | - | - | - |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 40.1 35.9 | D D | 518.7 474.6 | 40.1 35.9 | D D | 518.7 474.6 | 57.4 46.2 | E D | 668.3 574.1 | 57.4 46.2 | E D | 668.3 574.1 | - | | - |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 40.3 35.9 | D D | 517.7 473.0 | 40.3 35.9 | D D | 517.7 473.0 | 57.8 46.3 | D D | 668.1 573.4 | 57.8 46.3 | E D | 668.1 573.4 | - | - | - |

>

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13-Apr-21 |
|-----|-----------------|-----------------------|------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|----------|------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-------------|----------|------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W/ | OPTION B + |
| | | TRAFFIC | PEAK | YEA | R 2020 EXIS | TING | YEAR 2020 E | XISTING W | // OPTION B | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W/ | O OPTION B | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE W | OPTION B | IME | ROVEMEN | TS |
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Mindanao Way/ | NB Left | AM | 9.3 | А | 10.6 | 9.3 | А | 10.6 | 9.4 | А | 11.2 | 9.4 | Α | 11.2 | | | |
| | La Villa Marina | | PM | 9.5 | А | 12.3 | 9.5 | А | 12.3 | 9.7 | А | 13.6 | 9.7 | А | 13.6 | | | |
| | (Signalized) | | | | | - | | | - | | | | | | | | | |
| | (8) | NB Through | AM | 14.7 | В | 302.9 | 14.7 | В | 305.1 | 15.5 | В | 332.4 | 15.6 | В | 334.7 | | | |
| | | 0 | PM | 13.5 | в | 258.9 | 13.5 | в | 259.3 | 14.5 | В | 297.6 | 14.5 | в | 298.0 | | | |
| | | | | | - | | | - | | | - | | | - | | | | |
| | | NB Right | AM | 14.7 | в | 299.3 | 14.8 | в | 301.5 | 15.6 | В | 328.7 | 15.6 | в | 331.6 | | | |
| | | 0 | PM | 13.5 | в | 254.6 | 13.5 | в | 255.5 | 14.6 | В | 293.1 | 14.6 | в | 294.1 | | | |
| | | | | | - | | | - | | | - | | | - | | | | |
| | | SB Left | AM | 6.9 | А | 14.1 | 6.9 | А | 14.1 | 7.6 | А | 15.1 | 7.6 | А | 15.1 | | | |
| | | | PM | 6.6 | А | 30.1 | 6.6 | А | 30.1 | 7.6 | А | 32.1 | 7.6 | А | 32.1 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | SB Through | AM | 5.3 | А | 139.4 | 5.3 | А | 140.4 | 5.6 | А | 156.3 | 5.6 | А | 158.1 | | | |
| | | 0 | PM | 5.6 | А | 153.7 | 5.6 | А | 154.0 | 6.0 | А | 183.4 | 6.0 | А | 183.7 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | SB Right | AM | 5.3 | А | 138.1 | 5.4 | А | 139.2 | 5.6 | А | 155.0 | 5.6 | А | 156.7 | | | |
| | | 0 | PM | 5.6 | А | 153.1 | 5.6 | А | 153.4 | 6.0 | А | 182.8 | 6.0 | А | 183.1 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | EB Left/Through/Right | AM | 32.1 | С | 24.6 | 32.1 | С | 24.6 | 32.1 | С | 26.4 | 32.1 | С | 26.4 | | | |
| | | 0 0 | PM | 32.7 | С | 49.3 | 32.7 | С | 49.3 | 32.8 | С | 52.0 | 32.8 | С | 52.0 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | WB Left/Through/Right | AM | 45.0 | D | 236.9 | 45.0 | D | 236.9 | 49.2 | D | 260.0 | 49.2 | D | 260.0 | | | |
| | | | PM | 34.4 | c | 112.5 | 34.4 | с | 112.5 | 34.6 | С | 119.6 | 34.6 | Ċ | 119.6 | | | |
| | | | | - | | - | - | | - | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

[1] Pursuant to LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines, July 2020, the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology for signalized and unsignalized intersections was utilized to calculate vehicle queuing.

Control delay reported in seconds per vehicle.
 Signalized Intersection Levels of Service were based on

| ction Levels of Service were based on the followi | ng criteria: | Unsignalized Intersection Levels of Service were based on the following criteria: | | | | |
|---|--------------|---|-----|--|--|--|
| Control Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Control Delay (s/veh) | LOS | | | |
| <= 10 | А | <= 10 | A | | | |
| > 10-20 | В | > 10-15 | В | | | |
| > 20-35 | С | > 15-25 | С | | | |
| > 35-55 | D | > 25-35 | D | | | |
| > 55-80 | E | > 35-50 | E | | | |
| > 80 | F | > 50 | F | | | |

[4] The 95th percentile queue is the maximum back of queue with 95th percentile traffic volumes. The HCM 6th Edition methodology worksheets report queues in number of vehicles, however an average vehicle length of 25 feet was assumed for analysis purposes. The reported queues therefore represent the calculated maximum back of queue in feet.

Appendix J.2

Updated Option B VMT Analysis

MEMORANDUM

| To: | Pedro Ayala Los Angeles Department of Transportation | Date: | October 26, 2022 |
|----------|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| From: | David S. Shender, P.E. Jason A. Shender, AICP | LLG Ref: | 1-16-0265-1 |
| | Linscou, Law & Greenspan, Engineers | | |
| Subject: | Updated Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis Project (Option B), 13400 Maxella Avenu | s for the l le – CTC | Paseo Marina 20-109212 |

This memorandum has been prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers (LLG) to provide an updated Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) analysis for the proposed Paseo Marina project ("the Project") located at 13400 Maxella Avenue (the "Project Site") in the Palms – Mar Vista – Del Rey Community Plan area of the City of Los Angeles (the "City"). The Project Site is located within the City's Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan (CTCSP) area.

For this Project, LLG previously prepared a Transportation Assessment dated July 6, 2021 (the "2021 Transportation Assessment") based on the *Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2020 (the "TAG"). The findings of the 2021 Transportation Assessment were confirmed based on the LADOT assessment letter¹ dated May 3, 2022.

The 2021 Transportation Assessment evaluated the potential transportation impacts related to vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for two Project development scenarios: Option A and Option B. The 2021 Transportation Assessment determined that the Option A development would have a less than significant impact related to VMT. For the Option B development, the commercial component was determined to have a significant impact related to VMT which could not be fully mitigated based on the transportation demand management (TDM) measures provided in LADOT's VMT Calculator. These findings were confirmed in LADOT's May 3, 2022 assessment letter.

This memorandum has been prepared to provide an updated VMT analysis for the Project's Option B development to consider the effects of an additional TDM measure recently made available for consideration by LADOT in evaluating the potential mitigation of VMT effects related to development projects. The proposed development description for the Project's Option B scenario as evaluated in the 2021 Transportation Assessment has not changed, and the other analyses (i.e., the Threshold T-1 and T-3 analyses prepared for Option B) provided within the 2021 Transportation Assessment are still applicable.

LINSCOTT LAW & GREENSPAN

engineers

Engineers & Planners Traffic Transportation Parking

Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers 600 S. Lake Avenue Suite 500 Pasadena, CA 91106

626.796.2322 т 626.792.0941 F www.llgengineers.com

Pasadena Irvine San Diego

¹ Revised Transportation Impact Assessment for the Proposed Mixed Use Project Located at 13400 Maxella Avenue (ENV-2016-3343-EIR / CPC-2016-3341-GPA-VZC-HD-MCUB-CDP-MEL-SPR), LADOT, May 3, 2022.

Pedro Ayala October 26, 2022 Page 2

Project Description – Option B

For Option B, the Applicant proposes to remove the existing improvements on the Project Site and construct a mixed-use development consisting of 382 market-rate residential apartment dwelling units, 43 affordable housing dwelling units, 20,000 square feet of restaurant floor area, 20,000 square feet of commercial retail floor area, and 90,000 square feet of office floor area. Option B proposes to provide 1,287 parking spaces within an onsite parking garage with an at-grade level and three subterranean levels. The at-grade level of the parking garage will provide parking for the restaurant and commercial retail components of Option B, as well as for the leasing office associated with the residential component. The first subterranean level of the parking garage (Level B1) will provide parking for all components of Option B (i.e., residential, restaurant, commercial retail, and office). Level B2 will provide parking for the residential and office components of Option B. Level B3 will provide parking for the residential component of Option B. Construction and occupancy of Option B is proposed to be completed by the year 2026.

Updated VMT Analysis

A VMT calculation was prepared for the Project utilizing the City's VMT Calculator and was included in Appendix E of the 2021 Transportation Assessment. The VMT Calculator output is attached at the end of this memorandum for reference. As shown on Page 2 of the VMT Calculator output, the residential component of Option B, without consideration of the TDM measures described, the Project is forecast to generate the following:

- The estimated Daily Household VMT per Capita for Option B is 6.8, which is less than the West Los Angeles Area Planning Commission (APC) significance threshold of 7.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita. VMT impacts are therefore less than significant.
- The estimated Daily Work VMT per Employee for Option B is 14.5, which is greater than the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee, and therefore considered a significant impact.
- As stated in Section 2.9 of the 2021 Transportation Assessment, Option B includes six (6) transportation demand management (TDM) measures to be implemented as mitigation measures: Transit Subsidies; Promotions and Marketing; Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommuting Program; Include Bike Parking per the Los Angeles Municipal Code; Include Secure Bicycle Parking and Showers; and Pedestrian Network Improvements.
engineers

- Taking the TDM measures described above into consideration, the estimated Daily Household VMT per Capita for Option B is reduced to 5.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita, further below the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 7.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita.
- The estimated Daily Work VMT per Employee for Option B is reduced to 11.6 Daily Work VMT per Employee due to the TDM measures, which is greater than the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee and therefore still considered a significant impact.

Per the VMT Calculator output, the Project Site is located within a "Suburban Center," resulting in a 20 percent (20%) maximum allowable VMT reduction. As shown on Page 2 of the VMT Calculator output, the maximum work based TDM is achieved based on the selection of the six TDM measures listed above. As stated on Page 11 of the VMT Calculator output, Option B is estimated to have 480 total employees, and a Total Home Based Work Attraction VMT of 5,574, resulting in a Total Work Based VMT per Employee of 11.6 Daily VMT per Employee.

As stated previously, the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold is 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee. Multiplying 480 employees by the significance threshold of 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee results in a Total Home Based Work Attraction VMT of 5,328. Therefore, further supplemental mitigation would be required to achieve the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee. Stated otherwise, reducing the Total Home Based Work Attract VMT from 5,574 to 5,328, a reduction of 246 Daily Work VMT, would reduce the impact to less than significant.

Supplemental Mitigation Measure

As stated above, with consideration of the above TDM measures, the Option B Total Home Based Work Attraction VMT is 5,574. This would need to be reduced by a total of 246 Daily Work VMT in order to reduce the Option B Daily Work VMT per Employee impact to less than significant. To achieve this reduction, the Project proposes to participate in the Metro Universal College Student Transit Pass (U-Pass) program. The U-Pass program is a strategy identified in the *VMT Mitigation Pilot Program Project*² report (the "U-Pass Study") prepared by Fehr & Peers for SCAG and LADOT. Per the U-Pass Study, the U-Pass program has the potential to reduce regional VMT through subsidizing transit passes for college students throughout Los Angeles County. The Project would contribute a fee to the pilot program based on the VMT reduction needed to eliminate the impact and bring the equivalent Daily Work VMT per Employee to the West Los Angeles APC threshold of 11.1.

² VMT Mitigation Program Pilot Project, Fehr & Peers, June 2021.

The U-Pass Study states that for every 10.79 student passes funded, a project could eliminate one (1) daily VMT from its calculated impact. As Option B needs to reduce 246 daily VMT to achieve a less than significant impact, approximately 2,654 student passes would need to be funded annually in order to fully mitigate the impact. The U-Pass Study states that each pass would cost \$7.00 per student per year. Accordingly, the Project will contribute \$18,578.00 annually in order to fund the 2,654 student passes required to fully mitigate the Option B Daily Work VMT per Employee impact.

It is recommended that the Project shall be required to annually fund the purchase of student passes at a cost of \$18,578.00 for a minimum of seven (7) years. LADOT has acknowledged that future revisions to its VMT Calculator are expected and may include additions and alterations to transit systems, land uses, and travel behaviors that may show that the Project's Option B may not require supplemental mitigation such as the annual purchase of transit passes for students to not exceed future VMT thresholds. The Project's proposed TDM measures may be determined to be sufficient to mitigate its significant VMT impact and no further mitigations would be required, thereby eliminating the requirement to fund the annual purchase of the student transit passes. Otherwise, the annual fee of \$18,578.00 (or a portion thereof if it is determined that fewer than 246 daily VMT are needed to be reduced to result in a less than significant impact) would continue until the Project's Option B TDM measures are alone sufficient to reduce the Project's VMT to less than significant in the version of the VMT Calculator that is current at the time of future analysis.

Updated Cumulative VMT Analysis

As stated in the City's TAG document, analyses should consider both short-term and long-term project effects on VMT. Short-term effects are evaluated in the detailed Project-level VMT analysis summarized above. Long-term, or cumulative, effects are determined through a consistency check with the SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The RTP/SCS is the regional plan that demonstrates compliance with air quality conformity requirements and greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets. As such, projects that are consistent with this plan in terms of development, location, density, and intensity, are part of the regional solution for meeting air pollution and GHG goals. Projects that are deemed to be consistent would have a less than significant cumulative impact on VMT. Development in a location where the RTP/SCS does not specify any development may indicate a significant impact on transportation. However, as noted in the City's TAG document, for projects that do not demonstrate a project impact by applying an efficiency-based impact threshold (i.e., VMT per capita or VMT per employee) in the analysis, a less than significant project impact conclusion is sufficient in demonstrating there is no cumulative VMT impact. Projects that fall

under the City's efficiency-based impact thresholds are already shown to align with the long-term VMT and GHG reduction goals of SCAG's RTP/SCS.

Based on the above Project-related VMT analysis and the conclusions (i.e., which conclude that the Project, with the implementation of the six TDM mitigation measures and participation in the U-Pass program, falls under the City's efficiency-based impact thresholds and thus is already shown to align with the long-term VMT and GHG reduction goals of SCAG's RTP/SCS), no cumulative VMT impacts are anticipated. Therefore, a "less than significant" determination can be made as it relates to the Project's cumulative VMT impact.

Conclusions

This memorandum has been prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers (LLG) to provide an updated Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) analysis for the proposed Paseo Marina project located at 13400 Maxella Avenue in the Palms – Mar Vista – Del Rey Community Plan area of the City of Los Angeles (the "City"). The Project Site is located within the City's Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan area. The conclusions are as follows:

- Prior to the consideration of any supplemental mitigation measures, Option B's Daily Work VMT per Employee was greater than the Daily Work VMT per Employee threshold for the West Los Angeles APC.
- The Project will participate in the U-Pass program, which funds transit passes for college students throughout Los Angeles County, in order to reduce the Option B equivalent daily VMT contribution to a less than significant level.
- Per the U-Pass Study, 10.79 transit passes must be purchased in order to eliminate one daily VMT. As 246 daily VMT must be reduced to mitigate Project's Option B significant impact related to VMT, 2,654 student passes must be purchased.
- Based on the U-Pass Study, the total annual cost of funding 2,654 passes at \$7.00 per pass is \$18,578.00. The Project will contribute the required amount of \$18,578.00 to the U-Pass program annually for a minimum of seven (7) years. Future evaluations may be prepared using LADOT's VMT Calculator which may demonstrate that the Project's Option B TDM measures alone are sufficient to mitigate it significant VMT impact and that the purchase of transit passes for students is no longer required. Additionally, the annual fee may be reduced if it is determined that fewer than 246 VMT are needed to be reduced to achieve a less than significant impact.

- As the Project will participate in the U-Pass program, the Option B Daily Work VMT per Employee impact is considered to be fully mitigated and reduced to less than significant.
- Further, based on the Project-related VMT analysis and the conclusions reported herein (i.e., which conclude that the Project, with the implementation of the six TDM mitigation measures and participation in the U-Pass program, falls under the City's efficiency-based impact thresholds and thus are already shown to align with the long-term VMT and GHG reduction goals of SCAG's RTP/SCS), no cumulative VMT impacts are anticipated.

cc: File

APPENDIX E

LADOT VMT CALCULATOR OUTPUT OPTION B



Project Screening Criteria: Is this project required to conduct a vehicle miles traveled analysis?

Existing Land Use

Project Information



Is the project replacing an existing number of residential units with a smaller number of residential units AND is located within one-half mile of a fixed-rail or fixed-guideway transit station?

O No

• Yes

| Land Use Type | | Value | Unit | | |
|-------------------------|---|---------|------|---|--|
| Retail General Retail | - | 100.781 | ksf | • | |
| Retail General Retail | | 100.781 | ksf | | |
| | | | | | |

Click here to add a single custom land use type (will be included in the above list)

Proposed Project Land Use

| Land Use Type | | Value | Unit | |
|--|---|-------|------|---|
| Office General Office | - | 90 | ksf | + |
| Housing Multi-Family | | 382 | DU | |
| Housing Affordable Housing - Family | | 43 | DU | |
| Retail High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant | t | 20 | ksf | |
| Retail General Retail | | 20 | ksf | |
| Office General Office | | 90 | ksf | |

Project Screening Summary

| Existing Land Use | Proposed Project | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| 3,595 Daily Vehicle Trips | 5,574 Daily Vehicle Trips | | |
| 29,609 Daily VMT | 45,178 Daily VMT | | |
| Tier 1 Scree | ning Criteria | | |
| Project will have less residential units compared to existing residential units & is within one-half mile of a fixed-rail station. | | | |
| The net increase in daily trips < 250 trips 1,979 Net Daily Trips | | | |
| The net increase in daily VMT ≤ 0 15,569 Net Daily VM | | | |
| The proposed project consists of only retail40.000land uses < 50,000 square feet total. | | | |
| The proposed project is required to perform VMT analysis. | | | |

Click here to add a single custom land use type (will be included in the above list)



Project Information



| Proposed Project Land Use Type | Value | Unit |
|--|-------|------|
| Housing Multi-Family | 382 | DU |
| Housing Affordable Housing - Family | 43 | DU |
| Retail High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant | 20 | ksf |
| Retail General Retail | 20 | ksf |
| Office General Office | 90 | ksf |

TDM Strategies - Max Mitigation Reduction

Use 🗹 to denote if the TDM strategy is part of the proposed project or is a mitigation strategy

Select each section to show individual strategies

Analysis Results

| Max Home Based TDM A Max Work Based TDM Ac | chieve :hieve | Prop ed? d? | osed Project No No | With Mitigation Yes Yes | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| A | | Parking | | | | |
| Reduce Parking Supply | 100 | city code parking | g provision for th | ne project site | | |
| Proposed Prj Mitigation | 74 | actual parking p | rovision for the p | broject site | | |
| Unbundle Parking Proposed Prj Mitigation | 175 | monthly parking site | J cost (dollar) for | the project | | |
| Parking Cash-Out | 100 | percent of emplo | oyees eligible | | | |
| Price Workplace Parking | 6.00 100 | daily parkir percent of emplo parking | ng charge (dollar oyees subject to |) priced | | |
| Residential Area Parking Permits Proposed Prj Mitigation | 200 | _ cost (dollar | r) of annual perm | it | | |
| B Transit | | | | | | |
| C Educa | C Education & Encouragement | | | | | |
| D Com | nmute | e Trip Redu | ictions | | | |
| • | Shai | red Mobilit | у | | | |
| F Bi | icycle | Infrastruct | ture | | | |
| G Neighborhood Enhancement | | | | | | |

| Proposed Project | With Mitigation |
|---|---|
| 5,574 | 4,459 |
| Daily Vehicle Trips | Daily Vehicle Trips |
| 45,178 | 36,142 |
| Daily VMT | Daily VMT |
| 6.8 | 5.4 |
| Houseshold VMT | Houseshold VMT |
| per Capita | per Capita |
| 14.5 | 11.6 |
| Work VMT | Work VMT |
| per Employee | per Employee |
| | |
| Significant | /MT Impact? |
| Significant V Household: No | /MT Impact? Household: No |
| Significant N Household: No Threshold = 7.4 | VMT Impact? Household: No Threshold = 7.4 |
| Significant N Household: No Threshold = 7.4 15% Below APC | VMT Impact? Household: No Threshold = 7.4 15% Below APC |
| Significant N Household: No Threshold = 7.4 15% Below APC Work: Yes | VMT Impact? Household: No Threshold = 7.4 15% Below APC Work: Yes |
| Significant N Household: No Threshold = 7.4 15% Below APC Work: Yes Threshold = 11.1 | VMT Impact? Household: No Threshold = 7.4 15% Below APC Work: Yes Threshold = 11.1 |



Report 1: Project & Analysis Overview

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| Project Information | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|--------|----------|--|--|
| Land | Use Type | Value | Units | | |
| | Single Family | 0 | DU | | |
| | Multi Family | 382 | DU | | |
| Housing | Townhouse | 0 | DU | | |
| | Hotel | 0 | Rooms | | |
| | Motel | 0 | Rooms | | |
| | Family | 43 | DU | | |
| Affordable Housing | Senior | 0 | DU | | |
| Allordable Housing | Special Needs | 0 | DU | | |
| | Permanent Supportive | 0 | DU | | |
| | General Retail | 20.000 | ksf | | |
| | Furniture Store | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Pharmacy/Drugstore | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Supermarket | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Bank | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Health Club | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| Datall | High-Turnover Sit-Down | 20.000 | 1.0 | | |
| Retail | Restaurant | 20.000 | KST | | |
| | Fast-Food Restaurant | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Quality Restaurant | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Auto Repair | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Home Improvement | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Free-Standing Discount | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Movie Theater | 0 | Seats | | |
| Office | General Office | 90.000 | ksf | | |
| Office | Medical Office | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Light Industrial | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| Industrial | Manufacturing | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Warehousing/Self-Storage | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | University | 0 | Students | | |
| | High School | 0 | Students | | |
| School | Middle School | 0 | Students | | |
| | Elementary | 0 | Students | | |
| | Private School (K-12) | 0 | Students | | |
| Other | | 0 | Trips | | |

Project and Analysis Overview

Report 1: Project & Analysis Overview

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| Analysis Results | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Total Employees: 480 | | | | | |
| | Total Population: 996 | | | | |
| Propose | ed Project | With Mitigation | | | |
| 5,574 | Daily Vehicle Trips | 4,459 | Daily Vehicle Trips | | |
| 45,178 | Daily VMT | 36,142 | Daily VMT | | |
| 6.0 | Household VMT | 5.4 | Household VMT per | | |
| 6.8 | per Capita | 5.4 | Capita | | |
| | Work VMT | | Work VMT per | | |
| 14.5 | per Employee | 11.6 | Employee | | |
| | | | | | |
| Significant VMT Impact? | | | | | |
| | APC: West Los A | Angeles | | | |
| | Impact Threshold: 15% Belo | ow APC Average | | | |
| | Household = 7 | 7.4 | | | |
| | Work = 11.1 | L | | | |
| Propose | ed Project | With Mi | tigation | | |
| VMT Threshold | Impact | VMT Threshold | Impact | | |
| Household > 7.4 | No | Household > 7.4 | No | | |
| Work > 11.1 | Yes | Work > 11.1 | Yes | | |

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



Report 2: TDM Inputs

| Reduce parking supply Unbundle parking | Description City code parking provision (spaces) Actual parking provision (spaces) Monthly cost for parking (\$) | Proposed Project 0 0 0 | Mitigation: 0 0 |
|---|--|--|--|
| Reduce parking supply Unbundle parking | City code parking provision (spaces) Actual parking provision (spaces) Monthly cost for parking (\$) | 0 0 | 0 |
| Unbundle parking | Actual parking provision (spaces) Monthly cost for parking (\$) | 0 | 0 |
| Unbundle parking | Monthly cost for parking (\$) | | |
| Parking cash-out | parting (9) | \$0 | \$0 |
| | Employees eligible (%) | 0% | 0% |
| Price workplace parking | Daily parking charge \$0.00 Price workplace | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| | Employees subject to priced parking (%) | 0% | 0% |
| Residential area parking permits | Cost of annual permit (\$) | \$0 | \$0 |
| (| cont. on following page | :) | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | Price workplace parking Residential area parking permits | Price workplace parking (\$) Employees subject to priced parking (%) Residential area parking permits permit (\$) (cont. on following page | Price workplace parkingDaily parking charge (\$)\$0.00Employees subject to priced parking (%)0%Residential area parking permitsCost of annual permit (\$)\$0\$0\$0(cont. on following page) |

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| Strategy Type Description Proposed Project Mitigations | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------|--------|--|--|
| | | Reduction in headways (increase in frequency) (%) | 0% | 0% | | |
| | Reduce transit headways | Existing transit mode share (as a percent of total daily trips) (%) | 0% | 0% | | |
| Transit Implement neighborhod Transit subs | | Lines within project site improved (<50%, >=50%) | 0 | 0 | | |
| | Implement neighborhood shuttle | Degree of implementation (low, medium, high) | 0 | 0 | | |
| | | Employees and residents eligible (%) | 0% | 0% | | |
| | | Employees and residents eligible (%) | 0% | 100% | | |
| | Transit subsidies | Amount of transit subsidy per passenger (daily equivalent) (\$) | \$0.00 | \$2.98 | | |
| Education & | Voluntary travel behavior change program | Employees and residents participating (%) | 0% | 0% | | |
| Encouragement | Promotions and marketing | Employees and residents participating (%) | 0% | 100% | | |

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| TDM Strategy Inputs, Cont. | | | | | |
|--|---|--|------------------|--|--|
| Strate | gy Туре | Description | Proposed Project | Mitigations | |
| | Required commute trip reduction program | Employees participating (%) | 0% | 0% | |
| Alternation Schedule Telecome Reductions Employee vanpool of Ride-shar | Alternative Work | Employees participating (%) | 0% | 5% | |
| | Schedules and Telecommute Program | Type of program | 0 | 1.5 days of telecommuting per week | |
| | | Degree of implementation (low, medium, high) | 0 | 0 | |
| | Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle | Employees eligible (%) | 0% | 0% | |
| | | Employer size (small, medium, large) | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ride-share program | Employees eligible (%) | 0% | 0% | |
| Shared Mobility | Car share | Car share project setting (Urban, Suburban, All Other) | 0 | 0 | |
| | Bike share | Within 600 feet of existing bike share station - OR- implementing new bike share station (Yes/No) | 0 | 0 | |
| | School carpool program | Level of implementation (Low, Medium, High) | 0 | 0 | |
| | (1 | cont. on following page | :) | | |

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



Report 2: TDM Inputs

| TDM Strategy Inputs, Cont. | | | | |
|--|---|--|------------------|--|
| Strate | еду Туре | Description | Proposed Project | Mitigations |
| | Implement/Improve on-street bicycle facility | Provide bicycle facility along site (Yes/No) | 0 | 0 |
| Bicycle | icycle structure Include Bike parking per LAMC Include secure bike parking and showers | Meets City Bike Parking Code (Yes/No) | 0 | Yes |
| Infrastructure | | Includes indoor bike parking/lockers, showers, & repair station (Yes/No) | 0 | Yes |
| Traffic calming improvements Neighborhood Enhancement Pedestrian network improvements | Streets with traffic calming improvements (%) | 0% | 0% | |
| | improvements | Intersections with traffic calming improvements (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | Pedestrian network improvements | Included (within project and connecting off- site/within project only) | 0 | within project and connecting off-site |

Report 3: TDM Outputs

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| TDM Adjustments by Trip Purpose & Strategy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------|---------------------|----------|------------|------------|---------------------|----------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| | | | | | | Place type | : Suburban | Center | | | | | | |
| | | Ноте Ва | ased Work | Ноте Ва | ised Work | Home Bo | ised Other | Ноте Вс | ased Other | Non-Home Based Other | | Non-Home Based Other | | |
| | | Prod | uction Mitigated | Attro | Aitigated | Prod | uction Mitigated | Attro | action Mitigated | Proc | luction Mitigated | Attr | action Mitigated | Source |
| | | Proposed | wiitigateu | Proposed | wiitigated | Proposed | wiitigated | Proposed | wiitigateu | Proposed | wiitigated | Proposed | willigated | |
| | Reduce parking supply | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | _ |
| | Unbundle parking | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy |
| Parking | Parking cash-out | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | Appendix, Parking |
| | Price workplace parking | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1 - 5 |
| | Residential area parking permits | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |
| Transit | Reduce transit headways | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Stratogy |
| | Implement neighborhood shuttle | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | Appendix, Transit sections 1 - 3 |
| | Transit subsidies | 0% | 16% | 0% | 16% | 0% | 16% | 0% | 16% | 0% | 16% | 0% | 16% | - |
| Education & | Voluntary travel behavior change program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, Education & |
| Encouragement | Promotions and marketing | 0% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | Encouragement sections 1 - 2 |
| | Required commute trip reduction program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| Commute Trip Reductions | Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommute Program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, Commute Trip |
| Reductions | Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | - Reductions sections 1 - 4 |
| | Ride-share program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| | Car-share | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | TDM Strategy |
| Shared Mobility | Bike share | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | Appendix, Shared |
| | School carpool program | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | Mobility sections 1 - 3 |

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



Report 3: TDM Outputs

| TDM Adjustments by Trip Purpose & Strategy, Cont. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|--|-----------|----------------------|------------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|
| Place type: Suburban Center | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Home Bo Prod | ased Work luction | Home Based Work Attraction | | Home Based Other Home Based Other Production Attraction | | ased Other action | Non-Home Based Other Production | | Non-Home Based Other Attraction | | Source | |
| | | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | |
| | Implement/ Improve on-street bicycle facility | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | TDM Strategy |
| Bicycle Infrastructure | Include Bike parking per LAMC | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | Appendix, Bicycle Infrastructure |
| | Include secure bike parking and showers | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | sections 1 - 3 |
| Neighborhood Enhancement | Traffic calming improvements | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, |
| | Pedestrian network improvements | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 2.0% | Neighborhood Enhancement sections 1 - 2 |

| Final Combined & Maximum TDM Effect | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|------------------|--|----------|---|----------|---------------------|------------------------------------|-----------|------------------------------------|-----------|
| | Home Based Work Production | | Home Ba Attra | ed Work Home B ction Pro [,] | | used Other Home Based Ot uction Attraction | | sed Other Iction | Non-Home Based Other Production | | Non-Home Based Other Attraction | |
| | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated |
| COMBINED TOTAL | 0% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 0% | 19% |
| MAX. TDM EFFECT | 0% | 20% | 0% | 20% | 0% | 20% | 0% | 20% | 0% | 20% | 0% | 20% |

| = Minimum (X%, 1-[(1-A)*(1-B)]) | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| where X%= | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| PLACE | urban | 75% | | | | | |
| ТҮРЕ | compact infill | 40% | | | | | |
| MAX: | suburban center | 20% | | | | | |
| | suburban | 15% | | | | | |

Note: (1-[(1-A)*(1-B)...]) reflects the dampened combined effectiveness of TDM Strategies (e.g., A, B,...). See the TDM Strategy Appendix (*Transportation Assessment Guidelines Attachment G*) for further discussion of dampening.

> Report 3: TDM Outputs 10 of 13

Report 4: MXD Methodology

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| MXD Methodology - Project Without TDM | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--------|-------|------|--------|--------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Unadjusted Trips MXD Adjustment MXD Trips Average Trip Length Unadjusted VMT MXD VMT | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Home Based Work Production | 379 | -18.5% | 309 | 8.3 | 3,146 | 2,565 | | | | | |
| Home Based Other Production | 1,049 | -32.6% | 707 | 5.9 | 6,189 | 4,171 | | | | | |
| Non-Home Based Other Production | 1,358 | -6.1% | 1,275 | 7.4 | 10,049 | 9,435 | | | | | |
| Home-Based Work Attraction | 696 | -20.5% | 553 | 12.6 | 8,770 | 6,968 | | | | | |
| Home-Based Other Attraction | 2,457 | -26.3% | 1,810 | 7.5 | 18,428 | 13,575 | | | | | |
| Non-Home Based Other Attraction | 987 | -6.8% | 920 | 9.2 | 9,080 | 8,464 | | | | | |

MXD Methodology with TDM Measures

| | | Proposed Project | | Project with Mitigation Measures | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|--------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--|
| | TDM Adjustment | nt Project Trips Project VMT TE | | TDM Adjustment | Mitigated Trips | Mitigated VMT | |
| Home Based Work Production | 0.0% | 309 | 2,565 | -20.0% | 247 | 2,052 | |
| Home Based Other Production | 0.0% | 707 | 4,171 | -20.0% | 566 | 3,337 | |
| Non-Home Based Other Production | 0.0% | 1,275 | 9,435 | -20.0% | 1,020 | 7,548 | |
| Home-Based Work Attraction | 0.0% | 553 | 6,968 | -20.0% | 442 | 5,574 | |
| Home-Based Other Attraction | 0.0% | 1,810 | 13,575 | -20.0% | 1,448 | 10,860 | |
| Non-Home Based Other Attraction | 0.0% | 920 | 8,464 | -20.0% | 736 | 6,771 | |

| MXD VMT Methodology Per Capita & Per Employee | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Total Population: 996 | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Employees: 480 | | | | | | | | | |
| APC: West Los Angeles | | | | | | | | | |
| | Proposed Project | Project with Mitigation Measures | | | | | | | |
| Total Home Based Production VMT | 6,736 | 5,389 | | | | | | | |
| Total Home Based Work Attraction VMT | 6,968 | 5,574 | | | | | | | |
| Total Home Based VMT Per Capita | 6.8 | 5.4 | | | | | | | |
| Total Work Based VMT Per Employee | 14.5 | 11.6 | | | | | | | |

VMT Calculator User Agreement

The Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), in partnership with the Department of City Planning and Fehr & Peers, has developed the City of Los Angeles Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Calculator to estimate project-specific daily household VMT per capita and daily work VMT per employee for land use development projects. This application, the VMT Calculator, has been provided to You, the User, to assess vehicle miles traveled (VMT) outcomes of land use projects within the City of Los Angeles. The term "City" as used below shall refer to the City of Los Angeles. The terms "City" and "Fehr & Peers" as used below shall include their respective affiliates, subconsultants, employees, and representatives.

The City is pleased to be able to provide this information to the public. The City believes that the public is most effectively served when they are provided access to the technical tools that inform the public review process of private and public land use investments. However, in using the VMT Calculator, You agree to be bound by this VMT Calculator User Agreement (this Agreement).

VMT Calculator Application for the City of Los Angeles. The City's consultant calibrated the VMT Calculator's parameters in 2018 to estimate travel patterns of locations in the City, and validated those outcomes against empirical data. However, this calibration process is limited to locations within the City, and practitioners applying the VMT Calculator outside of the City boundaries should not apply these estimates without further calibration and validation of travel patterns to verify the VMT Calculator's accuracy in estimating VMT in such other locations.

Limited License to Use. This Agreement gives You a limited, non-transferrable, non-assignable, and nonexclusive license to use and execute a copy of the VMT Calculator on a computer system owned, leased or otherwise controlled by You in Your own facilities, as set out below, provided You do not use the VMT Calculator in an unauthorized manner, and that You do not republish, copy, distribute, reverse-engineer, modify, decompile, disassemble, transfer, or sell any part of the VMT Calculator, and provided that You know and follow the terms of this Agreement. Your failure to follow the terms of this Agreement shall automatically terminate this license and Your right to use the VMT Calculator.

Ownership. You understand and acknowledge that the City owns the VMT Calculator, and shall continue to own it through Your use of it, and that no transfer of ownership of any kind is intended in allowing You to use the VMT Calculator.

Warranty Disclaimer. In spite of the efforts of the City and Fehr & Peers, some information on the VMT Calculator may not be accurate. The VMT Calculator, OUTPUTS AND ASSOCIATED DATA ARE PROVIDED "as is" WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, whether expressed, implied, statutory, or otherwise including but not limited to, the implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose.

Limitation of Liability. It is understood that the VMT Calculator is provided without charge. Neither the City nor Fehr & Peers can be responsible or liable for any information derived from its use, or for any delays, inaccuracies, incompleteness, errors or omissions arising out of your use of the VMT Calculator or with respect to the material contained in the VMT Calculator. You understand and agree that Your sole remedy against the City or Fehr & Peers for loss or damage caused by any defect or failure of the

VMT Calculator, regardless of the form of action, whether in contract, tort, including negligence, strict liability or otherwise, shall be the repair or replacement of the VMT Calculator to the extent feasible as determined solely by the City. In no event shall the City or Fehr & Peers be responsible to You or anyone else for, or have liability for any special, indirect, incidental or consequential damages (including, without limitation, damages for loss of business profits or changes to businesses costs) or lost data or downtime, however caused, and on any theory of liability from the use of, or the inability to use, the VMT Calculator, whether the data, and/or formulas contained in the VMT Calculator are provided by the City or Fehr & Peers, or another third party, even if the City or Fehr & Peers have been advised of the possibility of such damages.

This Agreement and License shall be governed by the laws of the State of California without regard to their conflicts of law provisions, and shall be effective as of the date set forth below and, unless terminated in accordance with the above or extended by written amendment to this Agreement, shall terminate on the earlier of the date that You are not making use of the VMT Calculator or one year after the beginning of Your use of the VMT Calculator.

By using the VMT Calculator, You hereby waive and release all claims, responsibilities, liabilities, actions, damages, costs, and losses, known and unknown, against the City and Fehr & Peers for Your use of the VMT Calculator.

Before making decisions using the information provided in this application, contact City LADOT staff to confirm the validity of the data provided.

Print and sign below, and submit to LADOT along with the transportation assessment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

| You, the User | |
|----------------|--|
| By: | Jash |
| Print Name: | Jason Shender, AICP |
| Title: | Transportation Planner III |
| Company: | Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers |
| Address: | 20931 Burbank Boulevard, Suite C Woodland Hills, CA 91367 |
| Phone: | (818) 835-8648 |
| Email Address: | jshender@llgengineers.com |
| Date: | 6/21/2021 |
| | |

Appendix J.3

LADOT Assessment Letter

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

13400 West Maxella Avenue LADOT Case No. CTC20-109212

Date: August 26, 2021

Susan Jimenez, Administrative Clerk Department of City Planning

From:

To:

Robert Sanchez, Transportation Engineer Department of Transportation

Subject: TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED MIXED USE PROJECT AT 13400 WEST MAXELLA AVENUE (ENV-2016-3343-EIR/ CPC-2016-3341-GPA-VZC-HD-MCUP-CDP-MEL-SPR)

The Department of Transportation (DOT) has completed its review of the transportation analysis prepared by Linscott, Law, & Greenspan, Engineers (LLG), dated April 29, 2021, with a subsequent revision dated July 6, 2021 for the proposed mixed use project located at 13400 West Maxella Avenue. In compliance with SB 743, a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis is required to identify the project's alignment with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) mandates to promote the reduction of green-house gas emissions, access to diverse land uses, and the development of multi-modal networks. The significance of a project's impact in this regard is measured against the VMT thresholds established in DOT's Transportation Assessment Guidelines (TAG), as described below.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

A. <u>Project Description</u>

The project proposes to construct a new mixed use residential and commercial development on the southwest corner of Glencoe Avenue and Maxella Avenue with the following two land use options:

- 1. Option A: consists of the construction of a mixed-use development including 592 market-rate residential apartment dwelling units, 66 affordable housing dwelling units, 13,650 square feet of restaurant floor area, and 13,650 square feet of commercial floor area. Parking for Option A will be provided in two subterranean levels and two above-grade levels of parking within each of the three buildings. Option A proposes to provide a total of 1,217 parking spaces. Vehicular access for Option A will be provided via two access points along the east side of Ocean Way, one driveway along the south side of Maxella Avenue, one driveway along the west side of Glencoe Avenue, and one entry/exit driveway located along the southern boundary of the project site as shown in the site plan for the project provided as Attachment "A" to this report. The proposed land uses under Option A are expected to be fully build out and occupied by the year 2026.
- 2. <u>Option B</u>: consists of the construction a mixed-use development including 382 market rate residential apartment dwelling units, 43 affordable housing dwelling units, 20,000

square feet of restaurant floor area, 20,000 square feet of commercial floor area, and 90,000 square feet of office use. Parking for Option B will be provided in an onsite parking garage with one level of at-grade parking and three levels of subterranean parking. Option B proposes to provide a total of 1,287 parking spaces. Vehicular access for Option B will be provided via three access points along the east side of Ocean Way, one driveway along the south side of Maxella Avenue, and one driveway along the west side of Glencoe Avenue, along the southern boundary of the project site as shown in the site plan for the project provided as **Attachment "B"** to this report. The proposed land uses under Option B are expected to be fully build out and occupied by the year 2026.

The project site includes approximately 6.06 acres of land and is currently improved with 100,781 square feet of commercial floor area and surface parking areas. The project proposes to remove the existing improvements on the site and construct a mixed-use development under one of the two proposed development options.

B. Freeway Safety Analysis

Per the interim guideline for Freeway Safety Analysis memorandum issued by DOT on May 1, 2020 to address Caltrans safety concerns on freeways, the study addresses the project's effects on vehicle queueing on freeway off-ramps. Such an evaluation measures the project's potential to lengthen a forecasted off-ramp queue and create speed differentials between vehicles exiting the freeway off-ramp and vehicles operating on the freeway mainline.

The evaluation included in the assessment by LLG, identified the project trips expected to be added to nearby freeway off-ramps serving the project site. It was determined that as the SR-90 ("Marina freeway") is an at-grade roadway in the immediate project site vicinity, these nearby intersections are not considered to be freeway off-ramps. As there are no freeway off-ramps located in the immediate project site area, neither Option A nor Option B will add 25 or more trips to any nearby freeway off-ramps. Therefore, a freeway ramp analysis is not required.

C. <u>Trip Generation</u>

Option A is expected to potentially generate a net increase of 1,379 new daily vehicle trips, a net increase of 222 new AM peak hour trips (67 inbound and 155 outbound), and a net increase of 50 new PM peak hour trips (58 inbound and -8 outbound). A copy of the proposed weekday AM and PM peak hour trip generation table under Option A can be found in **Attachment "C"** to this report.

Option B is expected to generate a net increase of 1,979 new daily vehicle trips, a net increase of 231 new AM peak hour trips (114 inbound and 117 outbound), and a net increase of 59 new PM peak hour trips (36 inbound and 23 outbound). A copy of the proposed weekday AM and PM peak hour trip generation table under Option B can be found in **Attachment "D"** to this report. The weekday AM and PM peak hour trip generation estimates are based on rates published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, 2017.

D. <u>CEQA Screening Threshold</u>

Prior to accounting for trip reductions resulting from the application of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategies, a trip generation analysis was conducted to determine if the project would exceed the 250 daily vehicle trips screening threshold. Using the City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator tool, which draws upon local trip generation information and trip rate estimates published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, and based on sociodemographic data and the built environment factors of the project's surroundings, it was determined that the project <u>does</u> exceed the net 250 daily vehicle trips threshold under both proposed project options. This determination is based on the latest VMT calculator version 1.3 at the time the transportation analysis was submitted and accepted by DOT. A copy of the VMT calculator screening pages, with the corresponding net daily trip estimates under both Option A and Option B are provided, as **Attachment "E"** and **Attachment "F"** correspondingly, to this report.

E. <u>Transportation Impacts</u>

On July 30, 2019, pursuant to SB 743 and the recent changes to Section 15064.3 of the State's CEQA Guidelines, the City of Los Angeles adopted VMT as the criteria used to determine transportation impacts under CEQA. The new DOT TAG provides instructions on preparing transportation assessments for land use proposals and defines the significant impact thresholds.

The DOT VMT Calculator tool measures project impact in terms of Household VMT per Capita, and Work VMT per Employee. DOT identified distinct thresholds for significant VMT impacts for each of the seven Area Planning Commission (APC) areas in the City. For the West Los Angeles APC area, in which the project is located, the following thresholds have been established:

- Household VMT per Capita: 7.4
- Work VMT per Employee: 11.1

As cited in the VMT Analysis report prepared by LLG, the proposed project is projected to have:

Under Option A, prior to the consideration of any TDM measures, a Household VMT per capita of 6.9 which is less than the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 7.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita, and a less than significant impact for the Daily Work VMT per employee for the retail component since the project's retail portion is less than the 50,000 square feet threshold. Therefore, it is concluded that implementation of the project under Option A would result in no significant VMT impact. A copy of the VMT Calculator summary impact report for Option A is provided as **Attachment "G"** to this letter.

Under Option B, prior to the consideration of any TDM measures, a Household VMT per capita portion of 6.8 which is less than the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 7.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita, and a Work VMT per employee of 14.5 which is greater than the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee. Taking into consideration the TDM measures being proposed by the project, the estimated Household VMT per Capita for Option B is reduced to 5.4, which further below the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 7.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita. The estimated Work VMT per Employee for Option B is reduced to 11.6, which is greater than the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee. While the Option B Work VMT per Employee is greater than the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee. LLG has identified that the total VMT related to the residential and commercial components would fall below the total VMT that would be calculated using the applicable thresholds of significance for Option B based on the data provided in LADOT's VMT Calculator. As previously stated, the Household VMT per Capita for the residential component of Option B is calculated to be 5.4 with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, which is well below the threshold for the West Los Angeles APC of 7.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita. For the office component of Option B, the Work VMT per Employee value is calculated to be reduced from 14.5 to 11.6 with consideration of TDM measures. While the Work VMT per Employee value after application of TDM measures is greater than the threshold of 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee, a finding of a less than significant impact is made related to the Work VMT per Employee for Option B in consideration of the "excess" mitigation provided by the TDM measures recommended for Option B. This is demonstrated through the calculation of total VMT as detailed in a memorandum detailing the methodology for determining the less than significant impact that was submitted by LLG and was approved by LADOT on April 1, 2021.

Under Option B, the project proposes the implementation of a combination of transit, education and encouragement, commute trip reductions, bicycle parking and infrastructure, and neighborhood infrastructure TDM strategies that are forecasted to reduce the Project Household and Work VMTs to 5.4 and 11.6, respectively. The resulting Daily Household VMT per Capita for the residential component is substantially less than the threshold of significance for the West Los Angeles APC and therefore is deemed to offset the unmitigated portion of the Daily Work VMT per Employee related to the office component. Therefore, it is concluded that implementation of the Project under Option B would not result in a significant VMT impact with implementation of the proposed TDM strategies. A copy of the VMT Calculator summary reports is provided as **Attachment "H"** to this report.

F. Access and Circulation

During the preparation of the new CEQA guidelines, the State's Office of Planning and Research stressed that lead agencies can continue to apply traditional operational analysis requirements to inform land use decisions provided that such analyses were outside of the CEQA process. The authority for requiring non-CEQA transportation analysis and requiring improvements to address potential circulation deficiencies, lies in the City of Los Angeles' Site Plan Review authority as established in Section 16.05 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC). Therefore, DOT continues to require and review a project's site access, circulation, and operational plan to determine if any access enhancements, transit amenities, intersection improvements, traffic signal upgrades, neighborhood traffic calming, or other improvements are needed. In accordance with this authority, the project has completed an access and circulation analysis for both Option A and Option B using a "level of service" screening methodology that indicates that the trips generated by the proposed development will likely result in adverse circulation conditions at the project adjacent intersection of Glencoe Avenue and Glencoe Avenue Southerly Driveway/Villa Velletri Driveway, and at the intersection of Glencoe Avenue and Mindanao Way under both Options. A copy of the study analysis report tables that summarize these potential queueing and/or operational deficiencies are provided as Attachment "I" (Option A) and Attachment "J" (Option B) to this report.

PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

A. CEQA Related Mitigation

Consistent with City policies on sustainability and smart growth, and with DOT's trip reduction

and multi-modal transportation goals, the project's mitigation program first focuses on developing a trip reduction program and on solutions that promote other modes of travel. To off-set the expected significant impacts identified in the project's VMT analysis for Option B (since Option A as proposed results in a less than significant VMT impact), DOT recommends that the applicant be required to implement the following Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies as mitigation:

1. <u>Transit – Transit Subsidies</u>

This TDM strategy involves the subsidization of transit fare for residents and employees of Option B. The subsidy will be proactively offered to each resident and employee at least once annually for a minimum of five years. At the time of initial opening, Option B will offer a daily transit subsidy to all (i.e., 100%) residents and employees of \$2.98 per day.

2. Education and Encouragement – Promotions and Marketing

Option B will utilize promotional and marketing tools to educate and inform residents and employees about alternative transportation options and the effects of their travel choices. Rather than two-way communication tools or tools that would encourage an individual to consider a different mode of travel at the time the trip is taken (i.e., smartphone application, daily email, etc.), this TDM strategy includes passive educational and promotional materials, such as posters, information boards, or a website with information that residents and employees can choose to read at their own leisure.

- 3. <u>Commute Trip Reductions Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommute Program</u> The strategy encourages employees to work alternative schedules or telecommute, including staggered start times, flexible schedules, or compressed work weeks. At the time of initial opening of the development, Option B will offer 1.5 days per week of telecommuting to at least 5% of all employees.
- 4. <u>Bicycle Infrastructure Include Bike Parking per LAMC</u>

Option B is required to provide 200 bicycle parking spaces (19 short-term and 181 longterm) for the residential component, and 67 bicycle parking spaces (29 short-term spaces and 38 long-term) for the restaurant, commercial, and office components. Therefore, under Option B, the project will provide the LAMC-required number of shortterm and long-term bicycle parking spaces: an overall total of 267 bicycle parking spaces (48 short-term and 219 long-term) on-site thus meeting the code required spaces. This measure helps reduce peak-hour vehicle trips by making commuting by bicycle easier and more convenient.

5. Bicycle Infrastructure – Include Secure Bike Parking and Showers per LAMC This strategy involves implementation of additional end-of-trip bicycle facilities to support safe and comfortable bicycle travel by providing amenities at destinations. This strategy applies to projects that include bicycle parking onsite per LAMC. Projects providing long-term bicycle parking secured from the general public in accordance with LAMC Section 12.21A.16(d)(2) and showers in accordance with LAMC Section 91.6307 qualify for this measure. These improvements help reduce peak-hour vehicle trips by making commuting by bicycle easier and more convenient. Under Option B, the project is committed to provide short-term and long-term bicycle parking in accordance with LAMC Section 12.21A.16(d)(2). In addition, Option B will provide showers in accordance with LAMC Section 91.6307.

6. Neighborhood Infrastructure – Pedestrian Network Improvements

This strategy involves implementation of pedestrian network improvements throughout and around the Project Site that encourage people to walk. This includes internally linking all uses within the Project Site with pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks and connecting the Project Site to the surrounding pedestrian network. Option B includes pedestrian access points directly to sidewalks on the adjacent streets, including Maxella Avenue, and Glencoe Avenue. Additionally, Option B will improve existing sidewalks or construct new sidewalks on the above-mentioned streets adjacent to the Project Site. Furthermore, Option B will add street trees and landscaping, including a park along the Project Site's easterly frontage, to enhance the pedestrian network and improve exterior lighting along the sidewalks to improve safety.

B. Operational Improvements (Non-CEQA Analysis)

In the Traffic Study report prepared by LLG, the analysis included a review of current operational deficiencies and potential future deficiencies that may result from the project considering both proposed Options. To address these deficiencies, the applicant should be required to implement the following operational improvements (the project must coordinate with Culver City to determine appropriate traffic operational improvements within their jurisdiction):

1. <u>Glencoe Avenue and Mindanao Way Intersection - Implement Left-Turn Phasing</u> The project shall assume full responsibility for implementing protected/permissive leftturn phasing for the northbound direction, as well as implementing overlap right-turn phasing for the eastbound direction at the intersection of Glencoe Avenue and Mindanao Way. The implementation of this improvement is in alignment with the improvements identified in the Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan and should be coordinated with the DOT Western District office. If at the time of project approval, the above traffic signal improvements have been funded by others, the DOT shall require a similar nearby measure of equivalent value in the vicinity of the project.

2. <u>Glencoe Avenue and Glencoe Avenue Southerly Project Driveway/Villa Velletri Driveway</u> <u>Intersection – Pedestrian Crosswalk/ Traffic Signal Relocation</u> The project shall assume full responsibility for the design and relocation of the existing signalized Glencoe Avenue midblock crossing to the north to align with the Glencoe Avenue Southerly Project Driveway intersection. The resulting lane configuration on the northbound and southbound approaches of Glencoe Avenue would provide one leftturn lane, one through lane, and one shared through/right-turn lane. No changes to the eastbound Glencoe Avenue Southerly Project Driveway and westbound Villa Velletri approaches are proposed. Changes to the existing traffic signal equipment needed in conjunction with the recommended improvements would also be implemented as part of the improvement. In addition, crosswalks would be installed on both the northbound and southbound Glencoe Avenue approaches. The implementation of this improvement is in alignment with the project improvements identified in the Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan and should be coordinated with the DOT Western District office.

-6-

3. Ocean Way and Maxella Avenue Intersection-New Traffic Signal/Relocate Ped-Crosswalk The project shall assume full responsibility for the design and implementation of roadway striping changes along Maxella Avenue at the Ocean Way intersection. Specifically, the existing signalized crosswalk located approximately 100 feet west of the east leg of the intersection will be removed, and crosswalks will be installed at the Ocean Way and Maxella Avenue intersection. Additionally, the Applicant, in consultation with LADOT, will install a traffic signal at the intersection with controlled crossing devices (e.g., signalized crosswalks). The implementation of this improvement is in alignment with the project improvements identified in the Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan and should be coordinated with the DOT Western District office.

4. <u>Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program</u>

In addition to the TDM strategies cited above, DOT further recommends that the project prepare and submit a TDM program to DOT for review <u>prior</u> to the issuance of the first building permit for this project with a final TDM program to be approved by DOT <u>prior</u> to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy. The TDM program should include not only the TDM strategies identified to mitigate Project VMT impacts but should also consider and include all of the VMT Calculator TDM strategies that can potentially reduce the Project's VMT footprint.

C. Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) Fee

Pursuant to Section 6 of the CTC SP Ordinance No. 186104 authorizing the TIA Fee Programs Ordinance No. 186105, an applicant for a project within the Specific Plan area, except as exempted, shall pay, or guarantee payment of a TIA Fee prior to issuance of any building permit. Applicable fee rates are identified in the TIA Fee Table of Ordinance No. 186105. In addition, credit for affordable housing units can be granted as detailed in Section D.3.b.i of Ordinance No. 186105. The applicable fee for the proposed project (Option B) has been determined as follows:

| Proposed Use: | | 4 |
|------------------|--|-------------------|
| | 382 Apartment units x \$4,720 per unit [Full TIA fee applicable on or after October 26, 2020] | \$ 1,803,040 |
| | 40,000 sq. ft. Retail x \$13,561 per 1000 sq. ft. | \$ 542,440 |
| | 90,000 sq. ft. Office x \$23,724 per 1000 sq. ft. | \$ 2,135,160 |
| | -43 Affordable units x [2 x (\$4,720 per unit)] | -\$ 450,920 |
| Subtotal Propo | sed TIA Fee | \$ 4,029,720 |
| Existing Use (cr | <u>edit)</u> | |
| | 100,781 sq. ft. of Retail x \$13,561 per 1000 sq. ft. | -\$ 1,366,691 |
| Subtotal Existin | g TIA Fee | -\$ 1,366,691 |
| Total Estimated | <u>\$ 2,663,029</u> | |

D. Implementation of Physical Improvements

The applicant shall be responsible for the cost and implementation of any traffic signal equipment modifications and bus stop relocations associated with the proposed transportation improvements and enhancements described above. All improvements, enhancements, and associated traffic signal work within the City of Los Angeles must be guaranteed through Bureau of Engineering's (BOE) B-Permit process, prior to the issuance of any building permits and completed prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy. Temporary certificates of occupancy may be granted in the event of any delay through no fault of the applicant, provided that, in each case, the applicant has demonstrated reasonable efforts and due diligence to the satisfaction of DOT. Prior to setting the bond amount, BOE shall require that the developer's engineer or contractor email DOT's B-Permit Coordinator at ladot.planprocessing@lacity.org to arrange a pre-design meeting to finalize the proposed design needed for the project. If a proposed traffic corrective measure does not receive the required approval during plan review, a substitute corrective measure may be provided subject to the approval of LADOT or other governing agency with jurisdiction over the corrective condition location, upon demonstration that the substitute measure is correctively equivalent or superior to the original measure in addressing the project's corrective traffic condition. To the extent that a corrective measure proves to be infeasible and no substitute corrective measure is available, then the identified corrective condition would remain.

E. Construction Impacts

DOT recommends that a construction work site traffic control plan be submitted to DOT's Citywide Temporary Traffic Control Section or Permit Plan Review Section for review and approval prior to the start of any construction work. Refer to http://ladot.lacity.org/what-we-do/plan-review to determine which section to coordinate review of the work site traffic control plan. The plan should show the location of any roadway or sidewalk closures, traffic detours, haul routes, hours of operation, protective devices, warning signs and access to abutting properties. DOT also recommends that all construction related traffic be restricted to off-peak hours to the extent feasible.

F. Highway Dedication And Street Widening Requirements

In order to mitigate potential access and circulation impacts, the applicant may be required to make highway dedications and improvements. The applicant shall consult the Bureau of Engineering (BOE) for any highway dedication or street widening requirements. These requirements must be guaranteed before the issuance of any building permit through the B-permit process of the BOE. They must be constructed and completed prior to the issuance of any certificate of occupancy to the satisfaction of DOT and BOE.

G. Parking Analysis

The project is proposing to provide a minimum Code-required total of 1,217 parking spaces under Option A, and a total of 1,287 parking spaces under Option B. Also, an overall minimum Code-required total of 267 bicycle parking spaces (48 short-term and 219 long-term) will be provided on site within parking garage. The applicant should check with the Department of Building and Safety on the number of Code-required parking spaces needed for the project.

H. Project Access

Project access to the site will be provided for Option A and Option B as follows:

For Option A, vehicular access will be provided via two access points along the east side of Ocean Way, one driveway along the south side of Maxella Avenue, one driveway along the west side of Glencoe Avenue, and one entry/exit driveway located along the southern boundary of the project site, and for Option B, vehicular access will be provided via three access points along the east side of Ocean Way, one driveway along the south side of Maxella Avenue, and one driveway along the west side of Glencoe Avenue, along the south side of Maxella Avenue, and one driveway along the west side of Glencoe Avenue, along the southern boundary of the project site.

I. Driveway Access and Circulation

The proposed site plan is acceptable to DOT; however, review of the study does not constitute approval of the driveway dimensions and internal circulation schemes. Those require separate review and approval and should be coordinated with DOT's West LA/Coastal Development Review Section (7166 W Manchester Ave, @ 213-485-1062). In order to minimize potential building design changes, the applicant should contact DOT for driveway width and internal circulation requirements so that such traffic flow considerations are designed and incorporated early into the building and parking layout plans. All new driveways should be Case 2 driveways and any security gates should be a minimum 20 feet from the property line. All truck loading and unloading should take place on site with no vehicles backing into the project from public streets via any of the project driveways.

J. Development Review Fees

An ordinance adding Section 19.15 to the Los Angeles Municipal Code relative to application fees paid to DOT for permit issuance activities was adopted by the Los Angeles City Council in 2009 and updated in 2014. This ordinance identifies specific fees for traffic study review, condition clearance, and permit issuance. The applicant shall comply with any applicable fees per this ordinance.

If you have any questions, please contact me or Pedro Ayala at (213) 485-1062.

RS:pa

Attachments

c: Alan Como, Marcus Woersching, DCP
 Jason Douglas, Eric Bruins, Len Nguyen, Council District No. 11
 Rudy Guevara, DOT
 Mike Patonai, Oscar Gutierrez, BOE
 Jason Shender, Linscott, Law, & Greenspan, Engineers

13400 W. Maxella Ave.: Mixed-Use - Paseo Marina project (CTC19-109212)

Attachment "A"



LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

PASEO MARINA PROJECT

-6-

g

color

exhibits

₽

09:32:54 jshender

12/11/2020

o:\0265\dwg\f2-2.dwg

13400 W. Maxella Ave.: Mixed-Use - Paseo Marina project (CTC19-109212)

Attachment "B"



LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

PASEO MARINA PROJECT

-8-

10:36:21 jshender IIg exhibits color.ctb

o:\0265\dwg\f2-3.dwg 11/11/2020

27-Apr-21

| | | AM PEAK HOUR | | | PM PEAK HOUR | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|--------------|----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|--|
| | | V | OLUMES | [2] | V | OLUMES | [2] | |
| LAND USE | SIZE | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | |
| Proposed Project | | | | | | | | |
| Apartments [3] | 592 DU | 55 | 158 | 213 | 159 | 101 | 260 | |
| Affordable Family Housing [4] | 66 DU | 13 | 21 | 34 | 14 | 11 | 25 | |
| Restaurant [5] | 13,650 GSF | 75 | 61 | 136 | 82 | 51 | 133 | |
| Commercial [6] | 13,650 GLSF | <u>8</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>13</u> | 25 | <u>27</u> | <u>52</u> | |
| Subtotal | | 151 | 245 | 396 | 280 | 190 | 470 | |
| Internal Capture [7] | | (17) | (27) | (44) | (64) | (43) | (107) | |
| Transit Trips (15%) [8] | | (18) | (30) | (48) | (30) | (20) | (50) | |
| Subtotal Project Driveway Trips | | 116 | 188 | 304 | 186 | 127 | 313 | |
| Existing Land Use | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial [5] | (100,781) GLSF | (59) | (36) | (95) | (184) | (200) | (384) | |
| Existing Transit Trips [8] | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial (15%) | | 9 | 5 | 14 | 28 | 30 | 58 | |
| Subtotal Existing Driveway Trips | | (50) | (31) | (81) | (156) | (170) | (326) | |
| NET INCREASE DRIVEWAY TRIPS | | 66 | 157 | 223 | 30 | (43) | (13) | |
| Proposed Pass-By Trips [9] | | | | | | | | |
| Restaurant (20%) | | (11) | (9) | (20) | (11) | (7) | (18) | |
| Commercial (50%) | | (3) | (2) | (5) | (8) | (9) | (17) | |
| Subtotal | | (14) | (11) | (25) | (19) | (16) | (35) | |
| Existing Pass-By Trips (9) | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial (30%) | | 15 | 9 | 24 | 47 | 51 | 98 | |
| NET INCREASE "OFF-SITE" TRIPS | | 67 | 155 | 222 | 58 | (8) | 50 | |

Table 2-1 OPTION A TRIP GENERATION [1]

[1] Sources: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, 2017.

[2] Trips are one-way traffic movements, entering or leaving.

- [2] This are one-way failed internetics, energing of reaving.[3] ITE Land Use Code 221 (Multifamily Housing [Mid-Rise]) trip generation average rates.
- AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.36 trips/dwelling unit; 26% inbound/74% outbound
- PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.44 trips/dwelling unit; 61% inbound/39% outbound
- [4] City of Los Angeles Affordable Housing (Family) trip generation average rates.
- AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.52 trips/dwelling unit; 38% inbound/62% outbound
- PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.38 trips/dwelling unit; 55% inbound/45% outbound
- [5] ITE Land Use Code 932 (High-Turnover [Sit-Down] Restaurant) trip generation average rates.
 AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 9.94 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 55% inbound/45% outbound
 PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 9.77 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 62% inbound/38% outbound
- [6] ITE Land Use Code 820 (Shopping Center) trip generation average rates.
- AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.94 trips/1,000 SF of leasable area; 62% inbound/38% outbound - PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 3.81 trips/1,000 SF of leasable area; 48% inbound/52% outbound
- [7] The internal capture reduction for the residential, restaurant, retail, and office is based on the synergy between all the land uses provided within the Project Site, and determined via NCHRP 684 Internal Capture Estimation Tool (12% for AM Peak Hour and 24% for PM Peak Hour).
- [8] A 15% transit use reduction applied based on the Project Site being located within 1/4 mile of a Big Blue Bus rapid stop. The trip reduction for transit trips has been applied to the proposed Project and existing land uses based on the *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2020 for developments within a 1/4 mile walking distance of a transit station or a Rapid Bus stop.
- [9] Pass-by trips are made as intermediate stops on the way from an origin to a primary trip destination without a route diversion. Pass-by trips are attracted from traffic passing the site on an adjacent street or roadway that offers direct access to the site. The trip reduction for pass-by trips has been applied to the restaurant and commercial components of the Project based on the *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2020 for High Turnover Restaurant, Shopping Center less than 50,000 sf, and Shopping Center 100,000 to less than 300,000 sf.



20-Apr-21

| | | AM | PEAK H | OUR | PM PEAK HOUR | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|-------|--------------|--------------|-------|--|
| | | V | OLUMES | [2] | V | OLUMES | [2] | |
| LAND USE | SIZE | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | |
| Proposed Project | | | | | | | | |
| Apartments [3] | 382 DU | 36 | 102 | 138 | 102 | 66 | 168 | |
| Affordable Family Housing [4] | 43 DU | 8 | 14 | 22 | 9 | 7 | 16 | |
| Restaurant [5] | 20,000 GSF | 109 | 90 | 199 | 121 | 74 | 195 | |
| Commercial [6] | 20,000 GLSF | 12 | 7 | 19 | 36 | 40 | 76 | |
| Office [7] | 90,000 GSF | <u>89</u> | <u>15</u> | 104 | 17 | 87 | 104 | |
| Subtotal | | 254 | 228 | 482 | 285 | 274 | 559 | |
| Internal Capture [8] | | (59) | (51) | (110) | (86) | (83) | (169) | |
| Transit Trips (15%) [9] | | (28) | (24) | (52) | (29) | (28) | (57) | |
| Subtotal Project Driveway Trips | | 167 | 153 | 320 | 170 | 163 | 333 | |
| Existing Land Usa | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial [5] | (100,781) GLSF | (59) | (36) | (95) | (184) | (200) | (384) | |
| Existing Transit Trins [9] | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial (15%) | | 9 | 5 | 14 | 28 | 30 | 58 | |
| Subtotal Existing Driveway Trips | • | (50) | (31) | (81) | (156) | (170) | (326) | |
| NET INCREASE DRIVEWAY TRIPS | | 117 | 122 | 239 | 14 | (7) | 7 | |
| Proposed Dass Py Trins [10] | | | | | | | | |
| Postaurant (20%) | | (14) | (12) | (26) | (14) | (0) | (23) | |
| Commercial (50%) | | (14) | (12) | (20) | (14) | (12) | (23) | |
| Subtotal | | (18) | (14) | (22) | (25) | (12) (21) | (23) | |
| Subtotal | | (18) | (14) | (32) | (23) | (21) | (40) | |
| Existing Pass-By Trips [10] | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial (30%) | | 15 | 9 | 24 | 47 | 51 | 98 | |
| NET INCREASE "OFF-SITE" TRIPS | | 114 | 117 | 231 | 36 | 23 | 59 | |

Table 2-2 OPTION B TRIP GENERATION [1]

[1] Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, 2017.

2] Trips are one-way traffic movements, entering or leaving.

[3] ITE Land Use Code 221 (Multifamily Housing [Mid-Rise]) trip generation average rates. - AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.36 trips/dwelling unit; 26% inbound/74% outbound DM Deak Hour Trip Rate: 0.44 trips/dwelling unit; 61% inbound/20% outbound

- PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.44 trips/dwelling unit; 61% inbound/39% outbound
 [4] City of Los Angeles Affordable Housing (Family) trip generation average rates.
 AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.52 trips/dwelling unit; 38% inbound/62% outbound
- AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.52 trips/dwelling unit; 38% inbound/62% outbound
 PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.38 trips/dwelling unit; 55% inbound/45% outbound
 ITE Land Use Code 932 (High-Turnover [Sit-Down] Restaurant) trip generation avoid
- [5] ITE Land Use Code 932 (High-Turnover [Sit-Down] Restaurant) trip generation average rates.
 AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 9.94 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 55% inbound/45% outbound
 PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 9.77 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 62% inbound/38% outbound
- [6] ITE Land Use Code 820 (Shopping Center) trip generation average rates.
 AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.94 trips/1,000 SF of leasable area; 62% inbound/38% outbound
 PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 3.81 trips/1,000 SF of leasable area; 48% inbound/52% outbound
- [7] ITE Land Use Code 710 (General Office Building) trip generation average rates.
 AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 1.16 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 86% inbound/14% outbound
 PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 1.15 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 16% inbound/84% outbound
- [8] The internal capture reduction for the residential, restaurant, retail, and office is based on the synergy between all the market-rate apartments, restaurant, commercial, and office land uses provided within the Project Site, and determined via NCHRP 684 Internal Capture Estimation Tool (24% for AM Peak Hour and 31% for PM Peak Hour).
- [9] A 15% transit use reduction applied based on the Project Site being located within 1/4 mile of a Big Blue Bus rapid stop. The trip reduction for transit trips has been applied to the proposed Project and existing land uses based on the *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2020 for developments within a 1/4 mile walking distance of a transit station or a Rapid Bus stop. The transit reduction was not applied to the affordable housing component of the Project, per the *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2020.
- [10] Pass-by trips are made as intermediate stops on the way from an origin to a primary trip destination without a route diversion. Pass-by trips are attracted from traffic passing the site on an adjacent street or roadway that offers direct access to the site. The trip reduction for pass-by trips has been applied to the restaurant and commercial components of the Project based on the *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2020 for High Turnover Restaurant, Shopping Center less than 50,000 sf, and Shopping Center 100,000 to less than 300,000 sf.



Project Screening Criteria: Is this project required to conduct a vehicle miles traveled analysis?

Existing Land Use

Project Information



Is the project replacing an existing number of residential units with a smaller number of residential units AND is located within one-half mile of a fixed-rail or fixed-guideway transit station?

O No

O Yes

| Land Use Type | | Value | Unit | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---------|------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Retail General Retail | ▼ | 100.781 | ksf | + | | | | | | |
| Retail General Retail | | 100.781 | ksf | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

Click here to add a single custom land use type (will be included in the above list)

Proposed Project Land Use

| Land Use Type | | Value | Unit | |
|---|----|-----------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Retail General Retail | - | 13.65 | ksf | • |
| Housing Multi-Family Housing Affordable Housing - Family Retail High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurar Retail General Retail | nt | 592 66 13.65 13.65 | DU DU ksf ksf | |

Project Screening Summary

| Existing Land Use | Proposed Project | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|--|
| 3,595 Daily Vehicle Trips | 4,974 Daily Vehicle Trips | | |
| 29,609 Daily VMT | 37,347 Daily VMT | | |
| Tier 1 Scree | ning Criteria | | |
| Project will have less reside to existing residential units mile of a fixed-rail station. Tier 2 Screen | ntial units compa & is within one-h ning Criteria | red alf | |
| The net increase in daily tri | ps < 250 trips | 1,379 Net Daily Trips | |
| The net increase in daily VN | /T ≤ 0 | 7,738 Net Daily VMT | |
| The proposed project consi land uses ≤ 50,000 square fe | sts of only retail eet total. | 27.300 ksf | |
| The proposed project | is required to | perform | |

Click here to add a single custom land use type (will be included in the above list)





Project Screening Criteria: Is this project required to conduct a vehicle miles traveled analysis?

Existing Land Use

Project Information



Is the project replacing an existing number of residential units with a smaller number of residential units AND is located within one-half mile of a fixed-rail or fixed-guideway transit station?

| Land Use Type | | Value | Unit | |
|-------------------------|---|---------|------|--|
| Retail General Retail | - | 100.781 | ksf | |
| Retail General Retail | | 100.781 | ksf | |
| | | | | |

Click here to add a single custom land use type (will be included in the above list)

Proposed Project Land Use

| Land Use Type | | Value | _ | Jnit | |
|--|---|-------|---|------|---|
| Office General Office | - | 90 | | ksf | • |
| Housing Multi-Family | | 382 | | DU | |
| Housing Affordable Housing - Family | | 43 | | DU | |
| Retail High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant | | 20 | | ksf | |
| Retail General Retail | | 20 | | ksf | |
| Office General Office | | 90 | I | ksf | |

Existing Proposed Project Land Use 3,595 5,574 Daily Vehicle Trips Daily Vehicle Trips 29,609 45.178 Daily VMT Daily VMT **Tier 1 Screening Criteria** Project will have less residential units compared to existing residential units & is within one-half mile of a fixed-rail station. **Tier 2 Screening Criteria** 1.979 The net increase in daily trips < 250 trips Net Daily Trips 15,569 The net increase in daily VMT ≤ 0 Net Daily VMT

The proposed project consists of only retail40.000land uses $\leq 50,000$ square feet total.ksf

The proposed project is required to perform VMT analysis.



Project Screening Summary



Project Information



| Proposed Project Land Use Type | Value | Unit |
|--|-------|------|
| Housing Multi-Family | 592 | DU |
| Housing Affordable Housing - Family | 66 | DU |
| Retail High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant | 13.65 | ksf |
| Retail General Retail | 13.65 | ksf |

TDM Strategies

Select each section to show individual strategies Use 🗹 to denote if the TDM strategy is part of the proposed project or is a mitigation strategy



Analysis Results

| Proposed Project | With Mitigation |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 4.974 | 4.974 |
| Daily Vehicle Trips | Daily Vehicle Trips |
| 37,347 | 37,347 |
| Daily VMT | Daily VMT |
| 6.9 | 6.9 |
| Houseshold VMT per Capita | Houseshold VMT per Capita |
| N/A | N/A |
| Work VMT | Work VMT |
| Per | P |
| Significant V | /MT Impact? |
| Household: No | Household: No |
| Threshold = 7.4 | Threshold = 7.4 |
| 15% Below APC | 15% Below APC |
| Work: N/A | Work: N/A |
| Threshold = 11.1 | Threshold = 11.1 |
| 15% Below APC | 15% Below APC |
| | |

Measuring the Miles



Project Information



| Proposed Project Land Use Type | Value | Unit |
|--|-------|------|
| Housing Multi-Family | 382 | DU |
| Housing Affordable Housing - Family | 43 | DU |
| Retail High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant | 20 | ksf |
| Retail General Retail | 20 | ksf |
| Office General Office | 90 | ksf |

TDM Strategies - Max Mitigation Reduction

Select each section to show individual strategies Use I/ to denote if the TDM strategy is part of the proposed project or is a mitigation strategy



With Proposed **Mitigation** Project 5.574 4.459 Daily Vehicle Trips Daily Vehicle Trips 36.142 45.178 Daily VMT Daily VMT 6.8 5.4 Houseshold VMT Houseshold VMT per Capita per Capita 14.5 11.6 Work VMT Work VMT per Employee per Employee **Significant VMT Impact?** Household: No Household: No Threshold = 7.4Threshold = 7.415% Below APC 15% Below APC Work: Yes Work: Yes Threshold = 11.1Threshold = 11.1 15% Below APC 15% Below APC

Analysis Results


| | | TRAFFIC | PEAK | YEA | R 2020 EXI | STING | YEAR 2020 I | XISTING | W/ PROJECT | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | O PROJECT | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE V | / PROJECT | YEAR 2026 F IMF | UTURE W PROVEME | PROJECT + NTS |
|-----|---|---------------|----------|---------------|------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|---------|------------------|----------------|----------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| 1 | Walgrove Avenue / Washington Boulevard (Unsignalized) | SB Left/Right | AM PM | 64.4 155.5 | F F | 215.0 430.0 | 68.2 160.8 | F F | 222.5 435.0 | 138.1 291.2 | F F | 335.0 610.0 | 149.2 300.0 | F F | 347.5 620.0 | | | |
| | (Chargenanices) | EB Left | AM PM | 25.0 18.1 | C C | 112.5 67.5 | 25.6 18.4 | D C | 117.5 70.0 | 33.9 23.0 | D C | 157.5 95.0 | 35.1 23.5 | E C | 162.5 95.0 | | | - |
| 2 | Lincoln Boulevard / Marina Pointe Drive - Maxella Avenue (Signalized) | NB Left | AM PM | 44.6 47.2 | D D | 73.9 122.9 | 44.6 47.2 | D D | 73.9 122.9 | 46.0 47.8 | D D | 78.4 130.4 | 46.0 47.8 | D D | 78.4 130.4 | | | |
| | | NB Through | AM PM | 140.5 76.7 | F F | 1225.2 814.0 | 140.5 76.7 | F F | 1225.2 814.0 | 176.2 123.0 | F F | 1459.9 1111.2 | 176.2 123.0 | F F | 1459.9 1111.2 | | | - |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 22.2 24.0 | C C | 234.3 293.7 | 22.6 24.4 | C C | 245.9 306.5 | 22.9 26.0 | C C | 257.0 355.3 | 23.3 26.5 | C C | 268.8 369.4 | | | |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 33.8 33.6 | C C | 62.7 53.2 | 33.8 33.7 | C C | 65.4 55.8 | 33.9 33.7 | C C | 68.0 59.5 | 33.9 33.8 | C C | 70.8 62.2 | | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 40.2 45.0 | D D | 493.7 598.6 | 40.2 45.0 | D D | 493.7 598.6 | 42.1 51.1 | D D | 540.5 684.3 | 42.1 51.1 | D D | 540.5 684.3 | | | |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 45.3 54.3 | D D | 511.9 627.2 | 45.3 54.3 | D D | 511.9 627.2 | 48.7 64.6 | D E | 564.8 732.8 | 48.7 64.6 | D E | 564.8 732.8 | | | |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 45.6 45.9 | D D | 99.3 113.1 | 45.6 45.9 | D D | 99.3 113.1 | 45.8 46.1 | D D | 106.2 120.0 | 45.8 46.1 | D D | 106.2 120.0 | | | - |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 45.6 45.1 | D D | 104.4 84.0 | 45.6 45.1 | D D | 104.4 84.0 | 45.7 45.2 | D D | 111.3 89.5 | 45.7 45.2 | D D | 111.3 89.5 | - | | |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 7.1 6.5 | A A | 140.9 71.9 | 7.1 6.5 | A A | 140.9 71.9 | 7.2 6.5 | A A | 150.2 76.2 | 7.2 6.5 | A A | 150.2 76.2 | | | |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 52.3 74.1 | D E | 175.0 332.5 | 52.8 73.7 | D E | 187.8 330.8 | 59.6 108.8 | E F | 254.3 457.8 | 61.7 108.1 | E F | 268.1 455.2 | - | | |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 51.1 66.4 | D E | 139.2 302.4 | 51.3 66.3 | D E | 145.1 301.8 | 52.5 79.8 | D E | 182.3 363.3 | 52.7 79.6 | D E | 188.5 362.5 | - | | |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 35.7 37.8 | D D | 141.0 223.3 | 36.1 37.8 | D D | 156.2 222.1 | 36.1 38.4 | D D | 157.5 241.4 | 36.4 38.3 | D D | 172.9 240.3 | | - | - |
| 3 | Del Rey Avenue / Maxella Avenue (Invinentized) | SB Left/Right | AM PM | 11.8 17.0 | B C | 15.0 70.0 | 12.0 17.0 | B C | 17.5 70.0 | 13.4 21.4 | B C | 32.5 100.0 | 13.6 21.5 | B C | 32.5 102.5 | | | |
| | (Onsignan280) | EB Left | AM PM | 8.5 8.9 | A A | 10.0 7.5 | 8.6 8.9 | A A | 12.5 7.5 | 8.7 9.3 | A A | 12.5 10.0 | 8.8 9.3 | A A | 12.5 10.0 | | | - |

| | | TRAFFIC | BEAK | VEAD | 2020 EVIS | TINC | VE A D 2020 E | VISTING | W BRO IFCT | VE A D 2026 E | UTUDE W | OPPOIECT | VEAD 2026 | EUTUDE W/ | PROJECT | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W/ | PROJECT + |
|-----|---|------------|----------|--------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|---------|----------------|---------------|---------|----------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|-------------|----------|-----------|
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| 4 | Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue | NB Left | AM PM | 14.3 20.5 | B C | 10.0 20.0 | 11.0 10.9 | B B | 28.5 23.9 | 16.2 27.2 | C D | 15.0 35.0 | 10.9 11.0 | B B | 31.7 28.3 | - | | |
| | (Unsignalized w/o Project; Signalized w/ Project) | NB Right | AM PM | 9.8 10.4 | A B | 7.5 5.0 | 11.4 10.8 | B B | 34.1 18.3 | 10.1 10.8 | B B | 7.5 7.5 | 11.0 10.9 | B B | 36.8 22.2 | - | | |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | | | | 12.3 13.6 | B B | 78.5 125.1 | | | - | 12.7 14.2 | B B | 91.5 147.4 | - | | |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | | | | 12.4 13.7 | B B | 76.3 119.0 | | | - | 12.8 14.4 | B B | 88.8 139.4 | - | | |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 8.2 8.8 | A A | 2.5 5.0 | 13.8 16.3 | B B | 16.9 27.0 | 8.3 9.1 | A A | 2.5 5.0 | 14.5 18.1 | B B | 19.9 37.5 | - | | |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | | | | 11.5 12.1 | B B | 54.2 77.7 | | | - | 11.7 12.5 | B B | 60.5 94.3 | | | |
| 5 | Maxella Avenue Driveway / Maxella Avenue (Unsignalized) | NB Right | AM PM | 9.4 9.9 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.5 9.9 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.6 10.2 | A B | 0.0 0.0 | 9.8 10.2 | A B | 0.0 0.0 | - | | |
| 6 | Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue | NB Left | AM PM | 17.9 22.4 | B C | 59.4 77.2 | 18.2 22.9 | B C | 60.2 78.2 | 19.3 30.5 | B C | 67.2 116.9 | 19.7 31.7 | B C | 68.1 119.3 | - | | |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 18.6 13.0 | B B | 280.9 151.8 | 20.2 13.0 | C B | 304.6 150.5 | 21.9 13.5 | C B | 327.0 174.9 | 24.7 13.5 | C B | 359.7 173.3 | - | | |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 19.5 25.9 | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 19.5 25.9 | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 20.6 27.4 | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 20.6 27.4 | - | | |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 24.1 16.8 | C B | 44.2 22.7 | 25.3 16.8 | C B | 45.5 22.7 | 26.7 18.0 | C B | 51.1 27.4 | 28.1 17.9 | C B | 53.0 27.3 | - | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 12.5 13.9 | B B | 128.1 189.4 | 12.6 14.1 | B B | 132.9 194.3 | 12.9 15.1 | B B | 145.6 218.0 | 13.0 15.4 | B B | 150.6 224.0 | - | | |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 12.6 14.0 | B B | 122.7 180.2 | 12.6 14.2 | B B | 127.4 186.5 | 12.9 15.2 | B B | 139.3 208.9 | 13.0 15.5 | B B | 144.2 214.8 | - | | |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 13.4 15.4 | B B | 47.9 72.3 | 13.8 15.4 | B B | 57.2 72.0 | 14.0 16.8 | B B | 57.6 90.4 | 14.4 16.8 | B B | 67.3 89.9 | - | | |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 11.3 11.8 | B B | 38.6 57.2 | 11.3 11.7 | B B | 41.1 56.8 | 11.4 12.0 | B B | 45.3 68.3 | 11.5 12.0 | B B | 47.9 67.7 | - | | |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 12.0 12.9 | B B | 55.2 81.0 | 12.2 12.9 | B B | 59.0 81.0 | 12.4 13.2 | B B | 66.9 89.5 | 12.5 13.2 | B B | 70.8 89.5 | - | | |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 12.5 13.9 | B B | 27.5 44.7 | 12.6 13.9 | B B | 27.6 44.5 | 12.9 14.5 | B B | 29.6 48.9 | 13.0 14.5 | B B | 29.9 48.9 | - | | |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 11.1 11.6 | B B | 31.7 52.6 | 11.1 11.6 | B B | 32.9 53.3 | 11.2 11.8 | B B | 35.7 61.0 | 11.2 11.9 | B B | 37.0 61.7 | - | | |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 11.3 11.8 | B B | 32.5 50.1 | 11.3 11.8 | B B | 32.5 50.7 | 11.4 12.0 | B B | 35.4 57.8 | 11.4 12.1 | B B | 35.5 58.6 | - | | |
| 7 | Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Northerly Driveway | NB Left | AM PM | | | | 9.7 10.9 | A B | 2.5 5.0 | | | | 10.0 11.5 | B B | 2.5 5.0 | | | |
| | (Unsignalized) | EB Right | AM PM | | - | | 11.8 12.9 | B B | 7.5 5.0 | | - | | 12.3 13.6 | B B | 7.5 7.5 | | | |

| | | | r – – | | | | | | | | | | | | | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | 13-Apr-21 |
|-----|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|---------|----------------|----------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|----------|-----------------|--------------|---------|----------------|
| | | TRAFFIC | PEAK | YEAF | R 2020 EXIS | STING | YEAR 2020 E | XISTING | W/ PROJECT | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | O PROJECT | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE V | V/ PROJECT | IMF | ROVEME | NTS |
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| 8 | Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Southerly Driveway - Villa | NB Left | AM PM | 9.5 10.9 | A B | 2.5 5.0 | 9.8 10.9 | A B | 2.5 5.0 | 9.9 11.5 | A B | 2.5 7.5 | 10.2 11.5 | B B | 2.5 5.0 | 9.1 11.8 | A B | 8.9 23.0 |
| | (Unsignalized; Signalized w/ Improvements) | NB Through | AM PM | - | | | - | | | | | - | | | - | 6.9 6.2 | A A | 145.5 96.3 |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | | | | | | | | - | - | | | - | 6.9 6.2 | A A | 145.3 95.8 |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 9.4 8.5 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.5 8.6 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.6 8.8 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.7 8.8 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 8.1 7.0 | A A | 1.3 4.2 |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | | | | - | | | | | - | | | - | 7.3 8.1 | A A | 165.6 212.7 |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | | | | - | | | | | - | | | - | 7.3 8.1 | A A | 163.9 209.4 |
| | | EB Left/Right | AM PM | 28.3 118.5 | D F | 10.0 142.5 | 42.3 116.7 | E F | 50.0 137.5 | 35.3 230.9 | E F | 12.5 200.0 | 59.8 227.0 | F F | 67.5 192.5 | 28.8 29.8 | C C | 60.0 95.1 |
| | | WB Left/Right | AM PM | 23.2 21.4 | C C | 7.5 5.0 | 25.8 21.9 | D C | 10.0 5.0 | 27.3 25.5 | D D | 10.0 5.0 | 30.8 26.1 | D D | 12.5 5.0 | 27.9 27.7 | C D | 18.5 10.0 |
| 9 | Mindanao Way/ Glencoe Avenue | NB Left | AM PM | 195.5 54.1 | F D | 892.7 276.3 | 216.5 64.1 | F E | 970.9 309.6 | 283.1 101.4 | F F | 1182.0 397.3 | 306.7 120.5 | F F | 1264.2 453.8 | 22.1 23.3 | C C | 303.4 187.2 |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 20.9 19.1 | C B | 233.0 133.3 | 20.9 19.1 | C B | 233.0 133.3 | 21.4 19.4 | C B | 251.8 152.4 | 21.4 19.4 | C B | 251.8 152.4 | 15.1 17.4 | B B | 211.3 142.5 |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 21.0 19.1 | C B | 225.5 129.9 | 21.0 19.1 | C B | 225.5 129.9 | 21.5 19.4 | C B | 243.0 147.9 | 21.5 19.4 | B B | 243.0 147.9 | 15.2 17.4 | B B | 204.0 138.3 |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 25.9 21.7 | C C | 6.1 7.0 | 25.9 21.7 | C C | 6.1 7.0 | 26.9 22.4 | C C | 7.0 8.6 | 26.9 22.4 | C C | 7.0 8.6 | 29.3 26.6 | C C | 7.4 9.5 |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 19.7 20.6 | B C | 171.2 218.4 | 19.7 20.7 | B C | 173.5 220.3 | 20.0 21.1 | B C | 189.3 240.8 | 20.0 21.2 | C C | 191.2 242.9 | 35.2 34.1 | D C | 249.0 305.0 |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 19.7 20.6 | B C | 161.9 210.0 | 19.8 20.7 | B C | 163.7 211.4 | 20.0 21.2 | C C | 178.3 230.8 | 20.1 21.2 | C C | 180.1 232.5 | 35.5 34.3 | D C | 237.5 291.8 |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 14.3 16.0 | B B | 42.5 86.1 | 14.5 16.1 | B B | 50.1 85.5 | 14.7 16.8 | B B | 51.8 98.6 | 15.0 16.9 | B B | 59.9 98.1 | 21.4 19.1 | C B | 74.3 105.9 |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 12.7 13.6 | B B | 73.6 122.1 | 12.8 13.6 | B B | 78.3 122.1 | 13.0 13.9 | B B | 86.0 135.4 | 13.0 13.9 | B B | 90.8 135.4 | 18.6 15.7 | B B | 113.0 146.7 |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 19.4 28.6 | B C | 295.3 473.9 | 21.4 28.3 | C C | 341.4 469.8 | 20.9 35.3 | C D | 330.7 567.3 | 23.3 35.0 | C D | 381.3 561.7 | 11.2 17.7 | B B | 259.1 398.8 |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 14.1 17.5 | B B | 25.8 83.0 | 14.3 17.5 | B B | 26.0 83.0 | 14.6 18.5 | B B | 29.3 99.3 | 14.7 18.5 | B B | 29.4 99.3 | 20.9 21.1 | C C | 36.5 107.3 |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 12.4 12.6 | B B | 57.0 66.0 | 12.5 12.6 | B B | 58.0 67.1 | 12.5 12.8 | B B | 61.6 74.8 | 12.5 12.8 | B B | 62.4 76.1 | 17.8 14.5 | B B | 77.7 82.2 |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 12.5 12.6 | B B | 56.7 64.9 | 12.5 12.7 | B B | 57.5 66.2 | 12.5 12.8 | B B | 61.0 73.7 | 12.6 12.8 | B B | 62.0 74.8 | 17.8 14.5 | B B | 77.2 81.0 |

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

| | | | | | | | | | | | 13-Apr-21 | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|------------|----------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------------|---------|------------------|----------------|-----------|------------------|----------------|----------|------------------|-------------|---------|-----------|
| | | TRAFFIC | | | | TRIC | VE + D 4040 F | | U BBO IECT | | | | | | DBO IEGT | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | PROJECT + |
| NO | INTERSECTION | IKAFFIC | PEAK | YEAI DELAV [2] | LOS 131 | OUFUE MI | YEAR 2020 E | LOS 131 | OUFUE M | YEAR 2026 F | LOS 131 | OUFUE MI | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE W | OUFUE MI | DELAV [2] | LOS 131 | OUFUE MI |
| 10 | Mindanao Way/ SR-90 Westbound | NB Left | AM PM | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 14.6 | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 14.6 | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 15.4 | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 15.4 | | | |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 14.0 13.4 | B B | 158.0 120.6 | 14.1 13.4 | B B | 159.6 121.7 | 14.3 13.8 | B B | 174.0 136.9 | 14.3 13.8 | B B | 175.2 138.1 | - | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 31.0 51.3 | C D | 257.8 478.2 | 31.8 51.0 | C D | 274.1 476.1 | 32.2 73.0 | C F | 282.9 607.0 | 33.2 72.4 | C F | 300.2 603.5 | - | - | |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 33.7 62.4 | C E | 267.8 520.3 | 34.9 62.0 | C E | 286.2 518.0 | 35.6 84.7 | D F | 295.5 650.1 | 37.0 84.1 | D F | 315.1 646.8 | - | - | |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 26.8 23.1 | C C | 330.0 251.9 | 26.8 23.1 | C C | 330.0 251.9 | 29.4 25.1 | C C | 369.5 297.5 | 29.4 25.1 | C C | 369.5 297.5 | - | - | |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 97.0 31.6 | F C | 969.8 442.1 | 99.7 32.1 | F C | 990.5 449.0 | 130.4 47.2 | F D | 1222.9 594.9 | 133.3 48.9 | F D | 1246.0 609.9 | - | - | |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 160.0 23.8 | F C | 1250.5 243.7 | 166.8 24.3 | F C | 1296.3 252.5 | 200.3 25.6 | F C | 1525.8 277.0 | 207.2 26.2 | F C | 1573.6 286.4 | - | - | |
| 11 | Mindanao Way/ SR-90 Eastbound | NB Through | AM PM | 197.8 144.4 | F F | 760.8 587.7 | 200.6 146.3 | F F | 770.1 594.2 | 241.2 200.4 | F F | 902.7 768.5 | 244.0 202.5 | F F | 912.2 775.4 | | 1 1 | |
| | (Signalized) | NB Right | AM PM | 474.9 394.0 | F F | 1498.1 1261.5 | 474.9 394.0 | F F | 1498.1 1261.5 | 539.1 497.8 | F F | 1683.9 1564.6 | 539.1 497.8 | F F | 1683.9 1564.6 | - | | |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 27.7 33.3 | C C | 197.3 303.4 | 28.4 33.2 | C C | 214.8 302.5 | 28.4 36.8 | C D | 215.8 343.2 | 29.2 36.7 | C D | 233.9 341.7 | - | - | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 17.5 18.7 | B B | 304.5 344.5 | 17.6 18.7 | B B | 307.3 344.5 | 18.4 20.6 | B C | 336.3 403.2 | 18.5 20.6 | B C | 339.2 403.2 | - | - | |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 17.9 17.8 | B B | 17.3 10.3 | 17.9 17.8 | B B | 17.3 10.3 | 18.0 17.8 | B B | 20.9 11.5 | 18.0 17.8 | B B | 20.9 11.5 | - | - | |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 40.1 35.9 | D D | 518.7 474.6 | 40.1 35.9 | D D | 518.7 474.6 | 57.4 46.2 | E D | 668.3 574.1 | 57.4 46.2 | E D | 668.3 574.1 | - | | |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 40.3 35.9 | D D | 517.7 473.0 | 40.3 35.9 | D D | 517.7 473.0 | 57.8 46.3 | D D | 668.1 573.4 | 57.8 46.3 | E D | 668.1 573.4 | - | 1 1 | |

Table 5-2 (Continued) SUMMARY OF DELAYS, LEVELS OF SERVICE, AND VEHICLE QUEUING [1] WEEKDAY AM AND PM PEAK HOURS OPTION A

>

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13-Apr-21 |
|-----|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|--------------|---------|----------------|--------------|----------|----------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| | | TRAFFIC | PEAK | YEAI | R 2020 EXIS | TING | YEAR 2020 E | XISTING V | V/ PROJECT | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | O PROJECT | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE W | // PROJECT | YEAR 2026 F IMF | UTURE W/ ROVEMEN | PROJECT + TS |
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| 12 | Mindanao Way⁄ La Villa Marina | NB Left | AM PM | 9.3 9.5 | AA | 10.6 12.3 | 9.3 9.5 | AA | 10.6 12.3 | 9.4 9.7 | AA | 11.2 13.6 | 9.4 9.7 | A | 11.2 13.6 | | | |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 14.7 13.5 | B B | 302.9 258.9 | 14.7 13.5 | B B | 303.8 260.0 | 15.5 14.5 | B B | 332.4 297.6 | 15.5 14.5 | B B | 333.9 298.8 | | | |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 14.7 13.5 | B B | 299.3 254.6 | 14.7 13.5 | B B | 300.7 255.7 | 15.6 14.6 | B B | 328.7 293.1 | 15.6 14.6 | B B | 330.2 294.3 | - | | |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 6.9 6.6 | A A | 14.1 30.1 | 6.9 6.6 | A A | 14.1 30.1 | 7.6 7.6 | A A | 15.1 32.1 | 7.6 7.6 | A A | 15.1 32.1 | - | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 5.3 5.6 | A A | 139.4 153.7 | 5.4 5.6 | A A | 140.7 153.7 | 5.6 6.0 | A A | 156.3 183.4 | 5.6 6.0 | A A | 158.4 183.4 | - | | |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 5.3 5.6 | A A | 138.1 153.1 | 5.4 5.6 | A A | 139.5 153.1 | 5.6 6.0 | A A | 155.0 182.8 | 5.6 6.0 | A A | 157.1 183.4 | - | | |
| | | EB Left/Through/Right | AM PM | 32.1 32.7 | C C | 24.6 49.3 | 32.1 32.7 | C C | 24.6 49.3 | 32.1 32.8 | C C | 26.4 52.0 | 32.1 32.8 | C C | 26.4 52.0 | | | |
| | | WB Left/Through/Right | AM PM | 45.0 34.4 | D C | 236.9 112.5 | 45.0 34.4 | D C | 236.9 112.5 | 49.2 34.6 | D C | 260.0 119.6 | 49.2 34.6 | D C | 260.0 119.6 | | | |

[1] Pursuant to LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines, July 2020, the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology for signalized and unsignalized intersections was utilized to calculate vehicle queuing.

Control delay reported in seconds per vehicle.
 Signalized Intersection Levels of Service were based or

| ection Levels of Service were based on the follow | ing criteria: | Unsignalized Intersection Levels of Service wer | re based on the following criteria: |
|---|---------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Control Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Control Delay (s/veh) | LOS |
| <= 10 | Α | <= 10 | Α |
| > 10-20 | В | > 10-15 | В |
| > 20-35 | С | > 15-25 | С |
| > 35-55 | D | > 25-35 | D |
| > 55-80 | E | > 35-50 | E |
| > 80 | F | > 50 | F |
| | | | |

[4] The 95th percentile queue is the maximum back of queue with 95th percentile traffic volumes. The HCM 6th Edition methodology worksheets report queues in number of vehicles, however an average vehicle length of 25 feet was assumed for analysis purposes. The reported queues therefore represent the calculated maximum back of queue in feet.

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13-Apr-21 |
|-----|---|---------------|----------|---------------|------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|---------|------------------|----------------|----------|------------------|-------------|---------|------------|
| | | TDAFFIC | DEAL | VEAD | 2 2020 EVB | TINC | VEAD 2020 E | VISTING | V/OPTION P | VE AD 2026 E | UTUDE W | O OPTION P | VE AD 2026 | EUTUDE V | OPTION P | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | OPTION B + |
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | OUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | OUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | OUEUE 141 | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | OUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | OUEUE [4] |
| 1 | Walgrove Avenue / Washington Boulevard | SB Left/Right | AM PM | 64.4 155.5 | F | 215.0 430.0 | 70.7 158.9 | F F | 227.5 432.5 | 138.1 291.2 | F F | 335.0 610.0 | 156.3 296.8 | F | 355.0 615.0 | | | |
| | (Unsignalized) | EB Left | AM PM | 25.0 18.1 | C C | 112.5 67.5 | 26.2 18.3 | D C | 120.0 67.5 | 33.9 23.0 | D C | 157.5 95.0 | 36.1 23.2 | E C | 165.0 95.0 | - | | |
| 2 | Lincoln Boulevard / Marina Pointe Drive - Maxella Avenue | NB Left | AM PM | 44.6 47.2 | D D | 73.9 122.9 | 44.6 47.2 | D D | 73.9 122.9 | 46.0 47.8 | D D | 78.4 130.4 | 46.0 47.8 | D D | 78.4 130.4 | | | - |
| | (Signanzed) | NB Through | AM PM | 140.5 76.7 | F F | 1225.2 814.0 | 140.5 76.7 | F F | 1225.2 814.0 | 176.2 123.0 | F F | 1459.9 1111.2 | 176.2 123.0 | F F | 1459.9 1111.2 | | | |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 22.2 24.0 | C C | 234.3 293.7 | 22.9 24.2 | C C | 256.0 301.1 | 22.9 26.0 | C C | 257.0 355.3 | 23.6 26.3 | C C | 279.5 363.3 | - | | - |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 33.8 33.6 | C C | 62.7 53.2 | 33.9 33.6 | C C | 67.5 54.7 | 33.9 33.7 | C C | 68.0 59.5 | 34.0 33.8 | C C | 72.9 61.1 | - | | - |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 40.2 45.0 | D D | 493.7 598.6 | 40.2 45.0 | D D | 493.7 598.6 | 42.1 51.1 | D D | 540.5 684.3 | 42.1 51.1 | D D | 540.5 684.3 | - | - | - |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 45.3 54.3 | D | 511.9 627.2 | 45.3 54.3 | D | 511.9 627.2 | 48.7 64.6 | D E | 564.8 732.8 | 48.7 64.6 | DE | 564.8 732.8 | - | | - |
| | | EB Lett | AM PM | 45.6 45.9 | D | 99.3 113.1 | 45.6 45.9 | D | 99.3 113.1 | 45.8 | D | 106.2 120.0 | 45.8 46.1 | D | 106.2 120.0 | - | - | - |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 45.6 45.1 | D | 104.4 84.0 | 45.6 45.1 | D | 104.4 84.0 | 45.7 45.2 | D | 111.3 89.5 | 45.7 45.2 | D | 111.3 89.5 | - | - | - |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 7.1 6.5 | A | 140.9 71.9 | 7.1 6.5 | A | 140.9 71.9 | 7.2 6.5 | A | 150.2 76.2 | 7.2 6.5 | A | 150.2 76.2 | - | - | - |
| | | WB Lett | AM PM | 52.3 74.1 | E | 332.5 | 52.6 74.5 | E | 184.5 334.0 | 59.6 108.8 | F | 254.3 457.8 | 61.1 109.6 | F | 264.5 460.2 | - | - | - |
| | | WB Ihrough | AM PM | 51.1 66.4 | E | 302.4 | 51.2 66.6 | E | 303.1 | 52.5 79.8 | E | 182.3 363.3 | 52.6 80.0 | F | 364.2 | - | - | - |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 35.7 37.8 | D | 141.0 223.3 | 36.0 37.9 | D | 152.3 224.4 | 36.1 38.4 | D | 157.5 241.4 | 36.4 38.4 | D | 169.0 242.3 | - | - | - |
| 3 | Del Rey Avenue / Maxella Avenue (Unsionalized) | SB Left/Right | AM PM | 11.8 17.0 | B C | 15.0 70.0 | 12.0 17.1 | B C | 17.5 70.0 | 13.4 21.4 | B C | 32.5 100.0 | 13.6 21.6 | B C | 32.5 102.5 | | | |
| | (enspirated) | EB Left | AM PM | 8.5 8.9 | A A | 10.0 7.5 | 8.6 8.9 | A A | 12.5 7.5 | 8.7 9.3 | A A | 12.5 10.0 | 8.8 9.4 | A A | 12.5 10.0 | - | | |

Table 5-3 SUMMARY OF DELAYS, LEVELS OF SERVICE, AND VEHICLE QUEUING [1] WEEKDAY AM AND PM PEAK HOURS OPTION B

~

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | OPTION B + |
|-----|---|---------------------|--------------|-------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| NO. | INTERSECTION | TRAFFIC MOVEMENT | PEAK HOUR | YEAI DELAY [2] | R 2020 EXIS LOS [3] | STING QUEUE [4] | YEAR 2020 E DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | V/ OPTION B QUEUE [4] | YEAR 2026 F DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | O OPTION B QUEUE [4] | YEAR 2026 1 DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | IMP DELAY [2] | ROVEME LOS [3] | NTS QUEUE [4] |
| 4 | Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue | NB Left | AM PM | 14.3 20.5 | B | 10.0 | 10.9 | B | 26.5 25.9 | 16.2 27.2 | CD | 15.0 35.0 | 10.8 | B | 29.9 30.3 | - | | |
| | (Unsignalized w/o Project; Signalized w/ Project) | NB Right | AM | 9.8 | A | 7.5 | 11.2 | В | 32.0 | 10.1 | В | 7.5 | 11.0 | В | 34.8 | - | | |
| | | EB Through | AM | | | | 12.4 | В | 20.3 82.9 | | | - | 12.8 | в | 24.3 96.2 | - | - | - |
| | | ED Dight | PM | | | | 13.5 | В | 122.6 | | | - | 14.2 | В | 144.7 | - | | |
| | | ED Right | PM | | | | 13.7 | В | 117.0 | | - | - | 14.3 | В | 137.2 | - | | - |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 8.2 8.8 | A A | 2.5 5.0 | 14.0 16.1 | B B | 18.0 26.3 | 8.3 9.1 | A A | 2.5 5.0 | 14.7 17.9 | B B | 21.1 36.7 | - | - | |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | | | | 11.5 12.1 | B B | 54.2 77.7 | | | - | 11.7 12.5 | B B | 60.5 94.3 | - | | |
| 5 | Maxella Avenue Driveway / Maxella Avenue (Unsignalized) | NB Right | AM PM | 9.4 9.9 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.5 9.9 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.6 10.2 | A B | 0.0 0.0 | 9.7 10.2 | A B | 0.0 0.0 | | - | |
| 6 | Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue | NB Left | AM PM | 17.9 22.4 | B C | 59.4 77.2 | 18.5 22.7 | B C | 60.7 77.9 | 19.3 30.5 | B C | 67.2 116.9 | 20.0 31.2 | B C | 68.8 118.3 | | | |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 18.6 13.0 | B B | 280.9 151.8 | 19.8 13.0 | B B | 299.1 154.0 | 21.9 13.5 | C B | 327.0 174.9 | 24.0 13.6 | C B | 352.3 177.5 | - | | |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 19.5 25.9 | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 19.5 25.9 | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 20.6 27.4 | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 20.6 27.4 | | | |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 24.1 16.8 | C B | 44.2 22.7 | 25.1 16.9 | C B | 45.3 22.8 | 26.7 18.0 | C B | 51.1 27.4 | 27.8 18.1 | C B | 52.5 27.5 | | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 12.5 | B | 128.1 | 12.7 | B | 137.1 | 12.9 | B | 145.6 | 13.0 | B | 155.0 | - | - | |
| | | SB Right | AM | 12.6 | В | 122.7 | 12.7 | В | 131.5 | 12.9 | В | 139.3 | 13.1 | В | 148.0 | - | - | |
| | | EB Left | AM | 13.4 | В | 47.9 | 13.7 | В | 55.0 | 14.0 | В | 57.6 | 14.3 | В | 65.2 | - | | |
| | | EB Through | AM | 15.4 | В | 38.6 | 15.5 | В | 40.7 | 16.8 | В | 90.4 45.3 | 17.0 | в | 92.4 47.1 | - | - | - |
| | | FB Right | PM AM | 11.8 | B | 57.2 | 11.8 | B | 57.8 | 12.0 | B | 68.3 66.9 | 12.0 | B | 68.8 69.7 | - | - | - |
| | | 22 Right | PM | 12.9 | В | 81.0 | 12.9 | B | 81.5 | 13.2 | В | 89.5 | 13.2 | B | 89.9 | - | - | |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 12.5 | B | 27.5 44.7 | 12.6 | B | 27.6 44.7 | 12.9 | B | 29.6 48.9 | 12.9 14.6 | B | 29.8 49.0 | - | - | - |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 11.1 11.6 | B B | 31.7 52.6 | 11.2 11.6 | B B | 33.7 53.1 | 11.2 11.8 | B B | 35.7 61.0 | 11.2 11.9 | B B | 37.4 61.5 | - | - | - |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 11.3 11.8 | B B | 32.5 50.1 | 11.3 11.8 | B B | 32.5 50.5 | 11.4 12.0 | B B | 35.4 57.8 | 11.4 12.1 | B B | 35.9 58.4 | - | | - |
| 7 | Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Northerly Driveway | NB Left | AM PM | | | | | | - | | | - | | | - | | | |
| | (Unsignalized) | EB Right | AM PM | | | | | | - | | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13-Apr-21 |
|----|---|---------------|----------|---------------|------------|----------------|---------------|----------|-----------------|----------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|----------|-----------------|--------------|---------|----------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | OPTION B + |
| | | TRAFFIC | PEAK | YEAH | R 2020 EXI | STING | YEAR 2020 1 | EXISTING | W/ OPTION B | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | O OPTION B | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE V | W/ OPTION B | IMI | ROVEME | NTS |
| NC | D. INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| 8 | Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Southerly Driveway - Villa | NB Left | AM PM | 9.5 10.9 | A B | 2.5 5.0 | 10.0 11.2 | A B | 7.5 10.0 | 9.9 11.5 | A B | 2.5 7.5 | 10.4 11.8 | B B | 7.5 10.0 | 14.7 18.9 | B B | 36.1 49.8 |
| | (Unsignalized; Signalized w/ Improvements) | NB Through | AM PM | | | | | | | | | | | | | 9.9 8.8 | A A | 183.0 116.0 |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | | | | - | | | | - | | | | | 9.9 8.8 | A A | 182.8 115.4 |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 9.4 8.5 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.4 8.5 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.6 8.8 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.6 8.7 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 11.6 10.0 | B A | 1.6 5.3 |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | | | | | | | | - | | | | | 10.3 11.6 | B B | 205.8 261.7 |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | | | | | - | | | - | | | | | 10.4 11.7 | B B | 202.0 256.0 |
| | | EB Left/Right | AM PM | 28.3 118.5 | D F | 10.0 142.5 | 35.7 162.8 | E F | 60.0 222.5 | 35.3 230.9 | E F | 12.5 200.0 | 50.7 311.3 | F F | 82.5 300.0 | 24.6 25.9 | C C | 79.8 132.5 |
| | | WB Left/Right | AM PM | 23.2 21.4 | C C | 7.5 5.0 | 29.5 24.2 | D C | 10.0 5.0 | 27.3 25.5 | D D | 10.0 5.0 | 36.0 29.5 | E D | 15.0 7.5 | 23.3 23.2 | C C | 16.7 9.0 |
| 9 | Mindanao Way/ Glencoe Avenue | NB Left | AM PM | 195.5 54.1 | F D | 892.7 276.3 | 234.5 59.2 | F E | 1037.7 293.5 | 283.1 101.4 | F F | 1182.0 397.3 | 326.7 111.5 | F F | 1333.7 427.1 | 22.0 23.4 | C C | 308.2 183.2 |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 20.9 19.1 | C B | 233.0 133.3 | 20.9 19.1 | C B | 233.0 133.3 | 21.4 19.4 | C B | 251.8 152.4 | 21.4 19.4 | C B | 251.8 152.4 | 14.8 17.6 | B B | 209.1 143.7 |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 21.0 19.1 | C B | 225.5 129.9 | 21.0 19.1 | C B | 225.5 129.9 | 21.5 19.4 | C B | 243.0 147.9 | 21.5 19.4 | C B | 243.0 147.9 | 14.8 17.6 | B B | 201.8 139.5 |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 25.9 21.7 | C C | 6.1 7.0 | 25.9 21.7 | C C | 6.1 7.0 | 26.9 22.4 | C C | 7.0 8.6 | 26.9 22.4 | C C | 7.0 8.6 | 29.2 26.7 | C C | 7.4 9.5 |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 19.7 20.6 | B C | 171.2 218.4 | 19.7 20.6 | B C | 175.4 219.4 | 20.0 21.1 | B C | 189.3 240.8 | 20.0 21.1 | C C | 192.7 242.2 | 35.2 34.1 | D C | 250.7 304.2 |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 19.7 20.6 | B C | 161.9 210.0 | 19.8 20.7 | B C | 164.8 211.0 | 20.0 21.2 | C C | 178.3 230.8 | 20.1 21.2 | C C | 181.6 231.6 | 35.4 34.3 | D C | 238.7 290.9 |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 14.3 16.0 | B B | 42.5 86.1 | 14.5 16.1 | B B | 48.2 87.0 | 14.7 16.8 | B B | 51.8 98.6 | 15.0 16.9 | B B | 57.9 99.3 | 21.8 19.0 | C B | 72.7 106.7 |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 12.7 13.6 | B B | 73.6 122.1 | 12.8 13.6 | B B | 77.0 122.7 | 13.0 13.9 | B B | 86.0 135.4 | 13.0 13.9 | B B | 89.5 136.0 | 18.9 15.5 | B B | 112.8 146.0 |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 19.4 28.6 | B C | 295.3 473.9 | 20.9 29.4 | C C | 330.7 485.7 | 20.9 35.3 | C D | 330.7 567.3 | 22.7 36.9 | C D | 369.6 583.1 | 11.1 18.1 | B B | 252.7 409.3 |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 14.1 17.5 | B B | 25.8 83.0 | 14.2 17.5 | B B | 25.9 83.0 | 14.6 18.5 | B B | 29.3 99.3 | 14.7 18.6 | B B | 29.4 99.3 | 21.3 20.8 | C C | 36.9 106.6 |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 12.4 12.6 | B B | 57.0 66.0 | 12.5 12.6 | B B | 58.5 66.5 | 12.5 12.8 | B B | 61.6 74.8 | 12.5 12.8 | B B | 63.1 75.6 | 18.1 14.3 | B B | 79.4 81.0 |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 12.5 12.6 | B B | 56.7 64.9 | 12.5 12.6 | B B | 58.0 65.6 | 12.5 12.8 | B B | 61.0 73.7 | 12.6 12.8 | B B | 62.5 74.2 | 18.2 14.3 | B B | 78.9 79.6 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13-Apr-21 | |
|-----|----------------------------------|------------|----------|----------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|-----------|------------------|----------------|---------|------------------|----------------|----------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| | | TRAFFIC | PEAK | YEAI | R 2020 EXIS | STING | YEAR 2020 E | XISTING V | // OPTION B | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | O OPTION B | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE W | / OPTION B | YEAR 2026 F IMP | UTURE W/ ROVEME | OPTION B + NTS |
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| 10 | Mindanao Way/ SR-90 Westbound | NB Left | AM PM | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 14.6 | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 14.6 | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 15.4 | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 15.4 | | | |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 14.0 13.4 | B B | 158.0 120.6 | 14.1 13.4 | B B | 160.4 121.1 | 14.3 13.8 | B B | 174.0 136.9 | 14.4 13.8 | B B | 176.5 137.5 | - | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 31.0 51.3 | C D | 257.8 478.2 | 31.6 52.3 | C D | 270.7 484.8 | 32.2 73.0 | C F | 282.9 607.0 | 33.0 74.7 | C F | 296.2 616.3 | - | - | - |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 33.7 62.4 | C E | 267.8 520.3 | 34.6 63.5 | C E | 282.1 527.4 | 35.6 84.7 | D F | 295.5 650.1 | 36.7 86.3 | D F | 310.6 659.2 | - | - | |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 26.8 23.1 | C C | 330.0 251.9 | 26.8 23.1 | C C | 330.0 251.9 | 29.4 25.1 | C C | 369.5 297.5 | 29.4 25.1 | C C | 369.5 297.5 | - | | |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 97.0 31.6 | F C | 969.8 442.1 | 102.2 31.9 | F C | 1009.1 446.8 | 130.4 47.2 | F D | 1222.9 594.9 | 135.9 48.2 | F D | 1265.3 603.6 | - | - | |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 160.0 23.8 | F C | 1250.5 243.7 | 172.8 24.1 | F C | 1337.4 248.7 | 200.3 25.6 | F C | 1525.8 277.0 | 213.4 26.0 | F C | 1616.4 282.6 | - | - | |
| 11 | Mindanao Way/ SR-90 Eastbound | NB Through | AM PM | 197.8 144.4 | F F | 760.8 587.7 | 202.7 145.7 | F F | 777.0 592.0 | 241.2 200.4 | F F | 902.7 768.5 | 246.2 201.8 | F F | 919.4 773.1 | | | - |
| | (Signalized) | NB Right | AM PM | 474.9 394.0 | F F | 1498.1 1261.5 | 474.9 394.0 | F F | 1498.1 1261.5 | 539.1 497.8 | F F | 1683.9 1564.6 | 539.1 497.8 | F F | 1683.9 1564.6 | - | | |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 27.7 33.3 | C C | 197.3 303.4 | 28.2 33.6 | C C | 211.2 307.3 | 28.4 36.8 | C D | 215.8 343.2 | 29.0 37.3 | C D | 230.2 348.0 | - | - | - |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 17.5 18.7 | B B | 304.5 344.5 | 17.6 18.7 | B B | 306.8 345.5 | 18.4 20.6 | B C | 336.3 403.2 | 18.5 20.6 | B C | 338.6 404.4 | - | - | |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 17.9 17.8 | B B | 17.3 10.3 | 17.9 17.8 | B B | 17.3 10.3 | 18.0 17.8 | B B | 20.9 11.5 | 18.0 17.8 | B B | 20.9 11.5 | - | - | |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 40.1 35.9 | D D | 518.7 474.6 | 40.1 35.9 | D D | 518.7 474.6 | 57.4 46.2 | E D | 668.3 574.1 | 57.4 46.2 | E D | 668.3 574.1 | - | | |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 40.3 35.9 | D D | 517.7 473.0 | 40.3 35.9 | D D | 517.7 473.0 | 57.8 46.3 | D D | 668.1 573.4 | 57.8 46.3 | E D | 668.1 573.4 | - | | - |

>

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13-Apr-21 |
|-----|-----------------|-----------------------|------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|----------|------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-------------|----------|------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W/ | OPTION B + |
| | | TRAFFIC | PEAK | YEA | R 2020 EXIS | TING | YEAR 2020 E | XISTING W | // OPTION B | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W/ | O OPTION B | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE W | OPTION B | IME | ROVEMEN | TS |
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Mindanao Way/ | NB Left | AM | 9.3 | А | 10.6 | 9.3 | Α | 10.6 | 9.4 | А | 11.2 | 9.4 | Α | 11.2 | | | |
| | La Villa Marina | | PM | 9.5 | А | 12.3 | 9.5 | А | 12.3 | 9.7 | А | 13.6 | 9.7 | А | 13.6 | | | |
| | (Signalized) | | | | | - | | | - | | | | | | | | | |
| | (8) | NB Through | AM | 14.7 | В | 302.9 | 14.7 | В | 305.1 | 15.5 | В | 332.4 | 15.6 | В | 334.7 | | | |
| | | 0 | PM | 13.5 | в | 258.9 | 13.5 | в | 259.3 | 14.5 | В | 297.6 | 14.5 | в | 298.0 | | | |
| | | | | | - | | | - | | | - | | | - | | | | |
| | | NB Right | AM | 14.7 | в | 299.3 | 14.8 | в | 301.5 | 15.6 | В | 328.7 | 15.6 | в | 331.6 | | | |
| | | 0 | PM | 13.5 | в | 254.6 | 13.5 | в | 255.5 | 14.6 | В | 293.1 | 14.6 | в | 294.1 | | | |
| | | | | | - | | | - | | | - | | | - | | | | |
| | | SB Left | AM | 6.9 | А | 14.1 | 6.9 | А | 14.1 | 7.6 | А | 15.1 | 7.6 | А | 15.1 | | | |
| | | | PM | 6.6 | А | 30.1 | 6.6 | А | 30.1 | 7.6 | А | 32.1 | 7.6 | А | 32.1 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | SB Through | AM | 5.3 | А | 139.4 | 5.3 | А | 140.4 | 5.6 | А | 156.3 | 5.6 | А | 158.1 | | | |
| | | 0 | PM | 5.6 | А | 153.7 | 5.6 | А | 154.0 | 6.0 | А | 183.4 | 6.0 | А | 183.7 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | SB Right | AM | 5.3 | А | 138.1 | 5.4 | А | 139.2 | 5.6 | А | 155.0 | 5.6 | А | 156.7 | | | |
| | | 0 | PM | 5.6 | А | 153.1 | 5.6 | А | 153.4 | 6.0 | А | 182.8 | 6.0 | А | 183.1 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | EB Left/Through/Right | AM | 32.1 | С | 24.6 | 32.1 | С | 24.6 | 32.1 | С | 26.4 | 32.1 | С | 26.4 | | | |
| | | 0 0 | PM | 32.7 | С | 49.3 | 32.7 | С | 49.3 | 32.8 | С | 52.0 | 32.8 | С | 52.0 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | WB Left/Through/Right | AM | 45.0 | D | 236.9 | 45.0 | D | 236.9 | 49.2 | D | 260.0 | 49.2 | D | 260.0 | | | |
| | | | PM | 34.4 | c | 112.5 | 34.4 | с | 112.5 | 34.6 | С | 119.6 | 34.6 | Ċ | 119.6 | | | |
| | | | | - | | - | - | | - | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

[1] Pursuant to LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines, July 2020, the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology for signalized and unsignalized intersections was utilized to calculate vehicle queuing.

Control delay reported in seconds per vehicle.
 Signalized Intersection Levels of Service were based on

| ction Levels of Service were based on the followi | ng criteria: | Unsignalized Intersection Levels of Service wer | re based on the following criteria: |
|---|--------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Control Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Control Delay (s/veh) | LOS |
| <= 10 | А | <= 10 | A |
| > 10-20 | В | > 10-15 | В |
| > 20-35 | С | > 15-25 | С |
| > 35-55 | D | > 25-35 | D |
| > 55-80 | E | > 35-50 | E |
| > 80 | F | > 50 | F |

[4] The 95th percentile queue is the maximum back of queue with 95th percentile traffic volumes. The HCM 6th Edition methodology worksheets report queues in number of vehicles, however an average vehicle length of 25 feet was assumed for analysis purposes. The reported queues therefore represent the calculated maximum back of queue in feet.

Appendix J.4

Transportation Assessment

LINSCOTT LAW & GREENSPAN

engineers

TRANSPORTATION ASSESSMENT

PASEO MARINA PROJECT City of Los Angeles, California July 6, 2021

Prepared for:

RAR2-Villa Marina Center CA, LLC 3501 Jamboree Road, Suite 3000 Newport Beach, CA 92660

LLG Ref. 5-16-0265-1



Prepared by:

Jáson A. Shender, AICP Transportation Planner III Under the Supervision of:

David S. Shender, P.E. Principal

Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers

20931 Burbank Boulevard Suite C Woodland Hills, CA 91367

818.835.8648 т 818.835.8649 г

www.llgengineers.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| SECT | ION | | PAGE |
|------|------|---|--|
| 10 | Intr | aduction | 1 |
| 1.0 | 1 1 | Transportation Assessment Overview | •••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• |
| | 1.1 | Study Area | |
| | 1.4 | Study / Hou | |
| 2.0 | Proi | iect Description | |
| | 2.1 | Project Site Location | 4 |
| | 2.2 | Existing Project Site | 4 |
| | 2.3 | Project Description | 4 |
| | 2.4 | Vehicular Project Site Access | 7 |
| | 2.5 | Pedestrian and Bicycle Project Site Access | |
| | 2.6 | Project Parking | |
| | 2.7 | Project Loading | |
| | 2.8 | Project Traffic Generation and Distribution | 10 |
| | | 2.8.1 Project Traffic Generation | 10 |
| | | 2.8.2 Project Traffic Distribution and Assignment | |
| | 2.9 | Project Transportation Demand Management | |
| | , | 2.9.1 Transit Subsidies | |
| | | 2.9.2 Promotions and Marketing | |
| | | 2.9.3 Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommuting | 22 |
| | | 2.9.4 Include Bike Parking per LAMC | |
| | | 2.9.5 Include Secure Bicycle Parking and Showers | |
| | | 2.9.6 Pedestrian Network Improvements | |
| | | 1 | |
| 3.0 | Proj | ject Context | 25 |
| | 3.1 | Non-Vehicle Transport System | |
| | | 3.1.1 Pedestrian Framework | |
| | | 3.1.2 Bicycle Network | |
| | 3.2 | Transit Framework | 32 |
| | 3.3 | Vehicle Network | 32 |
| | | 3.3.1 Regional Highway Access | 32 |
| | | 3.3.2 Local Roadway System | 32 |
| | | 3.3.3 Roadway Descriptions | |
| | | 3.3.4 City of Los Angeles High Injury Network | 40 |
| | 3.4 | Traffic Counts | 41 |
| | 3.5 | Cumulative Development Projects | 47 |
| | | 3.5.1 Related Projects | 47 |
| | | 3.5.2 Ambient Traffic Growth | 47 |
| | | | |
| 4.0 | CEC | QA Analysis of Transportation Impacts | 56 |
| | 4.1 | Consistency with Adopted Plans and Policies (Threshold T-1) | 56 |
| | | 4.1.1 Screening Criteria | 56 |
| | | 4.1.2 Impact Criteria and Methodology | 57 |
| | | 4.1.3 Review of Project Consistency | 58 |
| | | 4.1.4 Review of Cumulative Consistency | 58 |
| | | • | |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

| SECT | ION | | | Page |
|------|-----|---------|---|------|
| | 42 | VMT | Analysis (Threshold T-2 1) | 59 |
| | 1.2 | 421 | Impact Criteria and Methodology | 60 |
| | | 4.2.2 | Summary of Project VMT Analysis | 61 |
| | | 4.2.3 | Summary of Cumulative VMT Analysis | 64 |
| | 4.3 | Geom | etric Design (Threshold T-3) | 65 |
| | | 4.3.1 | Screening Criteria | 65 |
| | | 4.3.2 | Impact Criteria and Methodology | 66 |
| | | 4.3.3 | Qualitative Review of Site Access Points | 67 |
| | 4.4 | Freew | vay Safety Analysis | 68 |
| | 4.5 | CEOA | Transportation Measures | 68 |
| | | 4.5.1 | Transportation Demand Management | 68 |
| | | 4.5.2 | CEQA Transportation Summary | 69 |
| 5.0 | Non | -CEOA | A Analysis | 70 |
| | 5.1 | Pedes | trian, Bicycle, and Transit Access | 70 |
| | | 5.1.1 | Screening Criteria | 70 |
| | | 5.1.2 | Evaluation Criteria | 71 |
| | | 5.1.3 | Results of Qualitative Access Review | 72 |
| | 5.2 | Projec | et Access and Circulation Review | 74 |
| | | 5.2.1 | Screening Criteria | 74 |
| | | 5.2.2 | Evaluation Criteria | 85 |
| | | 5.2.3 | Project Operational and Passenger Loading Evaluation Methodology | 86 |
| | | 5.2.4 | Option B Operational and Passenger Loading Evaluation Methodology | 100 |
| | 5.3 | Projec | et Construction Effect on Nearby Mobility | 102 |
| | | 5.3.1 | Screening Criteria | 102 |
| | | 5.3.2 | Evaluation Criteria and Methodology | 103 |
| | | 5.3.3 | Recommended Project-Specific Action Items | 105 |
| 6.0 | Con | clusion | 8 | 107 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| SECTIO | Section—Figure # | | |
|--------|---|---|--|
| 1–1 | Vicinity Map 2 | ! | |
| 2–1 | Project Site Aerial | , | |
| 2–2 | Project Site Plan – Option A |) | |
| 2–3 | Project Site Plan – Option B | ; | |
| 2–4 | Existing Project Site Trip Distribution | , | |
| 2–5 | Option A Trip Distribution |) | |
| 2–6 | Option B Trip Distribution | / | |

≻

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

| SECTIO | n—Figure # | Page |
|--------|--|------|
| 2–7 | Net New Option A Traffic Volumes – Weekday AM Peak Hour | 18 |
| 2–8 | Net New Option A Traffic Volumes – Weekday PM Peak Hour | 19 |
| 2–9 | Net New Option B Traffic Volumes – Weekday AM Peak Hour | 20 |
| 2–10 | Net New Option B Traffic Volumes – Weekday PM Peak Hour | 21 |
| 3–1 | Pedestrian Attractors Inventory | 26 |
| 3–2 | Facilities Inventory | 27 |
| 3–3 | Pedestrian Enhanced Districts | 29 |
| 3–4 | Neighborhood Enhanced Network | 30 |
| 3–5 | Bicycle Network | 31 |
| 3–6 | Existing Public Transit Routes | 34 |
| 3–7 | Transit Enhanced Network | 35 |
| 3–8 | Existing and Option A Lane Configurations | 37 |
| 3–9 | Existing and Option B Lane Configurations | 38 |
| 3–10 | High Injury Network | 42 |
| 3–11 | Off-Site Trip Distribution – Villa Marina Marketplace/Villa Velletri Townhomes | 46 |
| 3–12 | Existing Traffic Volumes – Weekday AM Peak Hour | 48 |
| 3–13 | Existing Traffic Volumes – Weekday PM Peak Hour | 49 |
| 3–14 | Location of Related Projects | 52 |
| 3–15 | Related Projects Traffic Volumes – Weekday AM Peak Hour | 53 |
| 3–16 | Related Projects Traffic Volumes – Weekday PM Peak Hour | 54 |
| 5–1 | Existing with Option A Traffic Volumes – Weekday AM Peak Hour | 89 |
| 5–2 | Existing with Option A Traffic Volumes – Weekday PM Peak Hour | 90 |
| 5–3 | Existing with Option B Traffic Volumes – Weekday AM Peak Hour | 91 |
| 5–4 | Existing with Option B Traffic Volumes – Weekday PM Peak Hour | 92 |
| 5–5 | Future Cumulative Baseline Traffic Volumes – Weekday AM Peak Hour | 93 |
| 5–6 | Future Cumulative Baseline Traffic Volumes – Weekday PM Peak Hour | 94 |
| 5–7 | Future Cumulative with Option A Traffic Volumes – Weekday AM Peak Hour | 95 |
| 5–8 | Future Cumulative with Option A Traffic Volumes – Weekday PM Peak Hour | 96 |
| 5–9 | Future Cumulative with Option B Traffic Volumes – Weekday AM Peak Hour | 97 |
| 5-10 | Future Cumulative with Option B Traffic Volumes – Weekday PM Peak Hour | 98 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

| SECTION | ION—TABLE# | PAGE |
|---------|--|------|
| 2–1 | Option A Trip Generation | 12 |
| 2–2 | Option B Trip Generation | 13 |
| 3–1 | Existing Public Transit Routes | |
| 3–2 | Villa Marina Marketplace Trip Generation | |
| 3–3 | Villa Velletri Townhomes Trip Generation | 45 |
| 3–4 | Related Projects List and Trip Generation | 50 |
| 4–1 | City of Los Angeles VMT Impact Criteria | 62 |
| 5-1 | Project Evaluation of Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Access | |
| 5–2 | Summary of Delays, Levels of Service, and Vehicle Queuing – Option A | 75 |
| 5–3 | Summary of Delays, Levels of Service, and Vehicle Queuing – Option B | 80 |
| 5–4 | Qualitative Review of Project Construction Activities | 106 |

APPENDICES

| Appe | NDIX |
|------|---|
| A. | Approved Transportation Assessment Memorandum of Understanding |
| B. | Concept Plan – Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue |
| C. | NCHRP Internal Capture Tool Outputs |
| D. | LADOT VMT Calculator Output – Option A |
| E. | LADOT VMT Calculator Output – Option B |
| F. | Manual Traffic Count Data |
| G. | Detailed Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies Review – Option A |
| H. | Detailed Plans, Programs, Ordinances, and Policies Review – Option B |
| I. | Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis for Mixed-Use Projects – LADOT Approved Methodology for Mitigation of VMT Impacts |
| J. | HCM and Levels of Service Explanation Option A HCM Data Worksheets – AM and PM Peak Hours |
| K. | HCM and Levels of Service Explanation Option B HCM Data Worksheets – AM and PM Peak Hours |

TRANSPORTATION ASSESSMENT

PASEO MARINA PROJECT

City of Los Angeles, California July 6, 2021

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Transportation Assessment Overview

This transportation assessment has been conducted to identify and evaluate the potential transportation impacts of the proposed Paseo Marina project (the "Project") on the surrounding street system. The "Project Site" is located at the southwest corner of the Glencoe Avenue and Maxella Avenue intersection in the Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey Community Plan area of the City of Los Angeles (the "City"). Additionally, the Project Site is located within the City's Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan area. The Project Site is currently improved with 100,781 square feet of commercial floor area and surface parking areas, and the site is generally bounded by Maxella Avenue to the north, commercial uses to the south, Glencoe Avenue to the east, and a private driveway to the west. The private driveway is named Ocean Way in this transportation assessment for identification purposes. The Project Site location and general vicinity are shown in *Figure 1–1*.

The transportation analysis follows City's applicable transportation assessment guidelines¹ (TAG). The TAG are focused on transportation metrics that promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal networks and access to diverse land uses, as well as safety, sustainability and smart growth. In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the TAG identify vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as the primary metric for evaluating a project's transportation impacts along with whether the proposed project conflicts or is inconsistent with local plans and policies. In addition, the TAG require evaluation of non-CEQA mobility elements such as pedestrian, bicycle and transit access, project access and circulation, and project construction.

This transportation assessment presents (i) a CEQA assessment of whether the Project conflicts or is inconsistent with local transportation-related plans and policies, (ii) a CEQA assessment of Project-related VMT, (iii) a CEQA assessment of whether the Project increases hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use, (iv) a CEQA freeway safety assessment, (v) a non-CEQA assessment of pedestrian, bicycle and transit access, (vi) a non-CEQA evaluation of Project access, safety and circulation, and (vii) a non-CEQA review of Project construction activities.

¹ Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) Transportation Assessment Guidelines, LADOT, July 2020.



exhibits ₽ 14:08:12 jshender 04/30/2020 o:\0265\dwg\f1-1.dwg

-2-

1.2 Study Area

The CEQA and non-CEQA analysis criteria for this transportation assessment were identified in consultation with City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) staff. The analysis criteria were determined based on the City's TAG, the proposed Project description and location, and the characteristics of the surrounding transportation system. As defined by the City as Lead Agency under CEQA, LADOT confirmed the appropriateness of the analysis criteria when it entered into a transportation assessment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the Project on March 12, 2020. The approved MOU is contained in *Appendix A*. In addition to the Project, this transportation assessment evaluates an alternative Project ("Option B"). LADOT confirmed the appropriateness of the analysis criteria for Option B when it entered into a transportation assessment evaluates an alternative Project ("Option B").

2.0 **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

2.1 **Project Site Location**

The Project Site is located at the southwest corner of Glencoe Avenue and Maxella Avenue in the Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey Community Plan area of the City. Additionally, the Project Site is located within the City's Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan area. The Project Site is generally bounded by Maxella Avenue to the north, commercial uses to the south, Glencoe Avenue to the east, and Ocean Way to the west. The Project Site location and general vicinity are shown in *Figure 1–1*.

The Project Site is located within a Transit Priority Area as determined by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and is currently served by many local lines and regional/commuter lines via stops located within convenient walking distance along Maxella Avenue, Glencoe Avenue, Lincoln Boulevard, and Mindanao Way. The bus lines with stops in the Project study area include: Metro Local Line 108/358, LADOT Commuter Express 437A, Culver City Bus (CCB) Line 1, CCB Line 2, CCB Line 7, City of Santa Monica Big Blue Bus (BBB) Line 3, BBB Rapid Line 3, and BBB Line 16.

2.2 Existing Project Site

The Project Site includes approximately 6.06 acres of land and is currently improved with 100,781 square feet of commercial floor area. Vehicular access to the existing Project Site is provided by two access points along the east side of Ocean Way, one driveway along the south side of Maxella Avenue, and three driveways along the west side of Glencoe Avenue. Parking for the existing commercial space is provided in onsite surface parking lots. The Project Site is highlighted in an aerial photograph presented in *Figure 2–1*.

2.3 Project Description

The Applicant proposes to remove the existing improvements on the Project Site and construct a mixed-use development under one of two development options. Option A would include 592 market-rate residential apartment dwelling units, 66 affordable housing dwelling units, 13,650 square feet of restaurant floor area, and 13,650 square feet of commercial retail floor area. Parking for Option A would be provided in two subterranean levels and two above-grade levels of parking within each of the three buildings. Option A proposes to provide a total of 1,217 parking spaces. Construction and occupancy of Option A is proposed to be completed by the year 2026. The site plan for Option A is shown in *Figure 2–2*.

Option B would include 382 market-rate residential apartment dwelling units, 43 affordable housing dwelling units, 20,000 square feet of restaurant floor area, 20,000 square feet of commercial retail floor area, and 90,000 square feet of office floor area. Option B proposes to provide 1,287 parking spaces within an onsite parking garage with an at-grade level and three subterranean levels. The at-grade level of the parking garage will provide parking for the restaurant and commercial retail components of Option B, as well as for the leasing office associated with the residential component. The first subterranean level of the parking garage



Ϋ́



color.ctb exhibits ₽ 09:32:54 jshender 12/11/2020 o:\0265\dwg\f2-2.dwg

6

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

(Level B1) will provide parking for all components of Option B (i.e., residential, restaurant, commercial retail, and office). Level B2 will provide parking for the residential and office components of Option B. Level B3 will provide parking for the residential component of Option B. Construction and occupancy of Option B is proposed to be completed by the year 2026. The site plan for Option B is shown in *Figure 2–3*.

The following analysis accounts for both development options, and the term "Project" is used to describe both options unless stated otherwise.

2.4 Vehicular Project Site Access

Vehicular access to the Project Site will generally be provided by access points along Ocean Way, and driveways along Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue. Proposed site access to Option A and Option B differs slightly and is described in detail in the following paragraphs.

Vehicular access to Option A will be provided via two access points along the east side of Ocean Way, one driveway along the south side of Maxella Avenue, one driveway along the west side of Glencoe Avenue, and one entry/exit driveway located along the southern boundary of the Project Site. As shown in *Figure 2–2*, the parking areas within each of the residential buildings will be provided with two vehicular access points. The Ocean Way access points are proposed to accommodate full vehicular access (i.e., left-turn and right-turn ingress and egress turning movements). The Maxella Avenue driveway is proposed to accommodate right-turn vehicular ingress and egress only (i.e., left-turn ingress and egress traffic movements are not permitted). The northerly Glencoe Avenue driveway is proposed to accommodate full vehicular ingress and egress traffic movements are not permitted). The southerly Glencoe Avenue driveway is proposed to accommodate full vehicular ingress and egress traffic movements are not permitted). The southerly Glencoe Avenue driveway serving the Pavilions parking area and is proposed to continue to accommodate full vehicular access (i.e., left-turn and right-turn ingress and egress turning movements).

Vehicular access to Option B will be provided via three access points along the east side of Ocean Way, one driveway along the south side of Maxella Avenue, and one driveway along the west side of Glencoe Avenue, along the southern boundary of the Project Site. As shown in Figure 2-3, the southerly Ocean Way access point will provide access to the subterranean parking areas designated for the residential component of Option B. The central Ocean Way access point will provide access to the subterranean parking area designated for the office component of Option B. The northerly Ocean Way access point will provide access to the atgrade level of the onsite parking garage designated for the restaurant and commercial components of Option B. The three Ocean Way access points are proposed to accommodate full vehicular access (i.e., left-turn and right-turn ingress and egress turning movements). The Maxella Avenue driveway will provide access to the at-grade level of the onsite parking garage designated for the restaurant and commercial components of the onsite parking garage and is proposed to accommodate right-turn vehicular ingress and egress only (i.e., left-turn ingress and egress traffic movements are not permitted). The Glencoe Avenue driveway is the existing driveway serving the Pavilions parking area and is proposed to provide access to two vehicular access points along the south side of Option B. The westerly access point will provide access the



LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

<u>-</u>8-

PASEO MARINA PROJECT

subterranean parking area within the onsite parking garage designated for the residential component of Option B, while the easterly access point will provide access to the at-grade level of the onsite parking garage designated for the restaurant and commercial components of Option B. The Glencoe Avenue driveway is proposed to continue to accommodate full vehicular access (i.e., left-turn and right-turn ingress and egress turning movements).

As part of the Project, the Applicant, in conjunction with LADOT, will design and implement roadway striping changes along Maxella Avenue at the Ocean Way intersection. Specifically, the existing signalized crosswalk located approximately 100 feet west of the east leg of the intersection will be removed, and crosswalks will be installed at the Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue intersection. Additionally, the Applicant, in conjunction with LADOT, will install a traffic signal at the intersection with controlled crossing devices (e.g., signalized crosswalks). A concept plan for these improvements was previously submitted to the LADOT Western District Office for initial review and approval and is attached in *Appendix B*.

2.5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Project Site Access

Proposed pedestrian access to the Project will be provided via Ocean Way, Maxella Avenue, and Glencoe Avenue. The Project will provide access locations to ensure pedestrian safety in compliance with City standards (e.g., provide sidewalks and crosswalks, and other pedestrian traffic controls). Separate pedestrian entrances would provide access from the nearby public transit stops, as well as other amenities along the major corridors.

Proposed bicycle access to the Project will be provided via Ocean Way, Maxella Avenue, and Glencoe Avenue. The Project will provide bicycle parking onsite for residents, visitors, and employees of the Project. Bicycle parking spaces will be installed in compliance with the Los Angeles Municipal Code.

2.6 Project Parking

Option A will provide a total of 1,217 parking spaces within two subterranean levels and two above-grade levels of the onsite parking garage. Parking for Option B will be provided within one at-grade level and three subterranean levels of the onsite parking garage and will provide a total of 1,287 parking spaces.

2.7 Project Loading

Loading activities associated with service and delivery operations, trash collection and Waste Management for Option A will occur along the south side of the westerly residential building and the south side of the southerly residential building (i.e., at the westerly and southeasterly portions of the Project Site). Service and delivery vehicles will utilize the northerly and southerly Glencoe Avenue driveways to access the Project's service areas. Additionally, a passenger loading area is provided within the westerly residential building's parking garage. Therefore, all loading activities will occur off-street and internal to the Project Site.

Loading activities associated with service and delivery operations, trash collection and Waste Management for Option B will occur along at the northwest and south-central portions of the Project Site. Service and delivery vehicles will utilize the northerly Ocean Way access points, Maxella Avenue driveway, and Glencoe Avenue driveway to access the loading zones and trash/recycling areas located within the at-grade level of the onsite parking garage. Additionally, a passenger drop-off/pick-up area is provided along east side of Ocean Way, internal to the Project Site. Therefore, all loading activities will occur off-street and internal to the Project Site.

2.8 **Project Traffic Generation and Distribution**

2.8.1 Project Traffic Generation

Traffic generation is expressed in vehicle trip ends, defined as one-way vehicular movements, either entering or exiting the generating land use. Traffic volumes expected to be generated by the proposed Project during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, as well as on a daily basis, were estimated using rates provided in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual*² and the affordable housing trip rates published in Table 3.3-2 of the TAG. The following trip generation rates were used to forecast the traffic volumes expected to be generated by the Project:

- Apartments: ITE Land Use Code 221 (Multifamily Housing [Mid-Rise]) trip generation average rates were used to forecast the traffic volumes expected to be generated by the residential components of Option A and Option B.
- Affordable Housing: LADOT Affordable Housing (Family) trip generation average rates were used to forecast the traffic volumes expected to be generated by the affordable housing components of Option A and Option B.
- Restaurant: ITE Land Use Code 932 (High-Turnover [Sit-Down] Restaurant) trip generation average rates were used to forecast the traffic volumes expected to be generated by the restaurant components of Option A and Option B.
- Commercial: ITE Land Use Code 820 (Shopping Center) trip generation average rates were used to forecast the traffic volumes expected to be generated by the commercial retail components of Option A and Option B.
- Office: ITE Land Use Code 710 (General Office Building) trip generation average rates were used to forecast the traffic volumes expected to be generated by the office component of Option B.

In addition to the trip generation forecasts for Option A and Option B (which are essentially an estimate of the number of vehicles that could be expected to enter and exit the Project Site access points), an internal capture adjustment has been applied for Option A and Option B to account for the synergistic effects of the planned land use mix. Internal capture trips are those trips made

² Institute of Transportation Engineers, *Trip Generation Manual*, 10th Edition, Washington, D.C., 2017.

internal to the site between land uses in a mixed or multi-use development. When combined within a mixed or multi-use development, land uses tend to interact, and thus attract a portion of each other's trip generation. LLG utilized the Internal Capture Tool published by the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) which estimates internal capture trips within a single development site. The NCHRP Internal Capture Tool generates an internal capture adjustment for Option A of 12 percent (12%) and 24% for the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. For Option B, the NCHRP Internal Capture Tool generates an internal capture adjustment of 24% and 31% for the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. The outputs of the NCHRP Internal Capture Tool for Option A and Option B are provided in *Appendix C*.

An adjustment was made to the trip generation forecast based on the Project Site's existing land use. The existing land use includes 100,781 square feet of commercial floor area and the trips associated with that existing use will be subtracted from the projected Project trips to account for the existing environmental condition. ITE Land Use Code 820 (Shopping Center) trip generation average rates were used to estimate the trip reduction related to the existing commercial floor area.

Furthermore, a forecast was also made of the transit trips that will be generated by the Project in lieu of trips by the private automobile. The Project Site is within a Transit Priority Area as determined by SCAG and is currently served by many local lines and regional/commuter lines via stops located within convenient walking distance along Maxella Avenue, Glencoe Avenue, Lincoln Boulevard, and Mindanao Way. The bus lines with stops in the Project study area include: Metro Local Line 108/358, LADOT Commuter Express 437A, Culver City Bus (CCB) Line 1, CCB Line 2, CCB Line 7, City of Santa Monica Big Blue Bus (BBB) Line 3, BBB Rapid Line 3, and BBB Line 16. Further discussion of the transit framework is provided in Section 3.2 herein. As the Project Site is within one-quarter mile of a Rapid Bus stop, a transit adjustment of 15% has been utilized, consistent with guidance provided in the TAG.

Lastly, a forecast was made of likely pass-by trips. Pass-by trips are made as intermediate stops on the way from an origin to a primary destination without a route diversion. Pass-by trips are attracted from traffic passing the site on an adjacent street or roadway that offers direct access to the site. In this instance, the adjacent roadways to the Project Site include Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue. In accordance with the pass-by trip rates provided in Attachment H of the TAG, a 20% pass-by reduction adjustment was applied to the restaurant land use components of Option A and Option B, a 50% pass-by reduction adjustment for Shopping Center less than 50,000 square feet was applied to the commercial land use components of Option A and Option B, and a 30% pass-by reduction adjustment for Shopping Center 100,000 to less than 300,000 square feet was applied to the existing commercial floor area.

The trip generation forecasts for Option A and Option B were submitted for review and approval by LADOT staff. As presented in *Table 2–1*, Option A is expected to generate 222 net new vehicle trips (67 inbound trips and 155 outbound trips) during the AM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, Option A is expected to generate 50 net new vehicle trips (58 inbound trips and -8 outbound trips). As presented in *Table 2–2*, Option B is expected to generate 231 net new

Table 2-1 OPTION A TRIP GENERATION [1]

| 27-Apr-21 | | | | | | | 27-Apr-21 |
|----------------------------------|----------------|--------------|------|-------------|--------------|-------|-----------|
| | | AM PEAK HOUR | | | PM PEAK HOUR | | |
| | | VOLUMES [2] | | VOLUMES [2] | | [2] | |
| LAND USE | SIZE | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL |
| Proposed Project | | | | | | | |
| Apartments [3] | 592 DU | 55 | 158 | 213 | 159 | 101 | 260 |
| Affordable Family Housing [4] | 66 DU | 13 | 21 | 34 | 14 | 11 | 25 |
| Restaurant [5] | 13,650 GSF | 75 | 61 | 136 | 82 | 51 | 133 |
| Commercial [6] | 13,650 GLSF | <u>8</u> | 5 | <u>13</u> | 25 | 27 | <u>52</u> |
| Subtotal | | 151 | 245 | 396 | 280 | 190 | 470 |
| Internal Capture [7] | | (17) | (27) | (44) | (64) | (43) | (107) |
| Transit Trips (15%) [8] | | (18) | (30) | (48) | (30) | (20) | (50) |
| Subtotal Project Driveway Trips | • | 116 | 188 | 304 | 186 | 127 | 313 |
| Fristing Land Has | | | | | | | |
| Commencial [5] | (100 781) CLEE | (50) | (26) | (05) | (194) | (200) | (294) |
| Commercial [5] | (100,781) GLSF | (39) | (30) | (93) | (104) | (200) | (384) |
| Existing Transit Trips [8] | | | | | | | |
| Commercial (15%) | | 9 | 5 | 14 | 28 | 30 | 58 |
| Subtotal Existing Driveway Trips | | (50) | (31) | (81) | (156) | (170) | (326) |
| NET INCREASE DRIVEWAY TRIPS | | 66 | 157 | 223 | 30 | (43) | (13) |
| Pronosed Pass-Ry Trins [9] | | | | | | | |
| Restaurant (20%) | | (11) | (9) | (20) | (11) | (7) | (18) |
| Commercial (50%) | | (11) | (2) | (20) | (8) | (9) | (17) |
| Subtotal | | (14) | (11) | (25) | (19) | (16) | (35) |
| ~ | | (1.) | () | (20) | (1) | (10) | (55) |
| Existing Pass-By Trips [9] | | | | | | | |
| Commercial (30%) | | 15 | 9 | 24 | 47 | 51 | 98 |
| NET INCREASE "OFF-SITE" TRIPS | - | 67 | 155 | 222 | 58 | (8) | 50 |

[1] Sources: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, 2017.

[2] Trips are one-way traffic movements, entering or leaving.

[3] ITE Land Use Code 221 (Multifamily Housing [Mid-Rise]) trip generation average rates.
 AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.36 trips/dwelling unit; 26% inbound/74% outbound

- PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.44 trips/dwelling unit; 61% inbound/39% outbound
- [4] City of Los Angeles Affordable Housing (Family) trip generation average rates.
- AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.52 trips/dwelling unit; 38% inbound/62% outbound
- PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.38 trips/dwelling unit; 55% inbound/45% outbound [5] ITE Land Use Code 932 (High-Turnover [Sit-Down] Restaurant) trip generation average rates.
- AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 9.94 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 55% inbound/45% outbound
 PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 9.77 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 62% inbound/38% outbound
- [6] ITE Land Use Code 820 (Shopping Center) trip generation average rates.
- AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.94 trips/1,000 SF of leasable area; 62% inbound/38% outbound
 PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 3.81 trips/1,000 SF of leasable area; 48% inbound/52% outbound
- [7] The internal capture reduction for the residential, restaurant, retail, and office is based on the synergy between all the land uses provided within the Project Site, and determined via NCHRP 684 Internal Capture Estimation Tool (12% for AM Peak Hour and 24% for PM Peak Hour).
- [8] A 15% transit use reduction applied based on the Project Site being located within 1/4 mile of a Big Blue Bus rapid stop. The trip reduction for transit trips has been applied to the proposed Project and existing land uses based on the *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2020 for developments within a 1/4 mile walking distance of a transit station or a Rapid Bus stop.
- [9] Pass-by trips are made as intermediate stops on the way from an origin to a primary trip destination without a route diversion. Pass-by trips are attracted from traffic passing the site on an adjacent street or roadway that offers direct access to the site. The trip reduction for pass-by trips has been applied to the restaurant and commercial components of the Project based on the *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2020 for High Turnover Restaurant, Shopping Center less than 50,000 sf, and Shopping Center 100,000 to less than 300,000 sf.

Table 2-2 OPTION B TRIP GENERATION [1]

| | 20-Apr-21 | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|--------------|-----------|-------|--------------|-------|------------|
| | | AM PEAK HOUR | | | PM PEAK HOUR | | |
| | | VOLUMES [2] | | | VOLUMES [2] | | |
| LAND USE | SIZE | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL |
| Proposed Project | | | | | | | |
| Apartments [3] | 382 DU | 36 | 102 | 138 | 102 | 66 | 168 |
| Affordable Family Housing [4] | 43 DU | 8 | 14 | 22 | 9 | 7 | 16 |
| Restaurant [5] | 20,000 GSF | 109 | 90 | 199 | 121 | 74 | 195 |
| Commercial [6] | 20,000 GLSF | 12 | 7 | 19 | 36 | 40 | 76 |
| Office [7] | 90,000 GSF | 89 | <u>15</u> | 104 | 17 | 87 | <u>104</u> |
| Subtotal | | 254 | 228 | 482 | 285 | 274 | 559 |
| Internal Capture [8] | | (59) | (51) | (110) | (86) | (83) | (169) |
| Transit Trips (15%) [9] | | (28) | (24) | (52) | (29) | (28) | (57) |
| Subtotal Project Driveway Trips | | 167 | 153 | 320 | 170 | 163 | 333 |
| Existing Land Use | | | | | | | |
| Commercial [5] | (100,781) GLSF | (59) | (36) | (95) | (184) | (200) | (384) |
| Existing Transit Trips [9] | | | | | | | |
| Commercial (15%) | | 9 | 5 | 14 | 28 | 30 | 58 |
| Subtotal Existing Driveway Trips | | (50) | (31) | (81) | (156) | (170) | (326) |
| NET INCREASE DRIVEWAY TRIPS | | 117 | 122 | 239 | 14 | (7) | 7 |
| Proposed Pass-By Trips [10] | | | | | | | |
| Restaurant (20%) | | (14) | (12) | (26) | (14) | (9) | (23) |
| Commercial (50%) | | (4) | (2) | (6) | (11) | (12) | (23) |
| Subtotal | | (18) | (14) | (32) | (25) | (21) | (46) |
| Existing Pass-By Trips [10] | | | | | | | |
| Commercial (30%) | | 15 | 9 | 24 | 47 | 51 | 98 |
| NET INCREASE "OFF-SITE" TRIPS | • | 114 | 117 | 231 | 36 | 23 | 59 |

[1] Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, 2017.

[2] Trips are one-way traffic movements, entering or leaving.

[3] ITE Land Use Code 221 (Multifamily Housing [Mid-Rise]) trip generation average rates.
 - AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.36 trips/dwelling unit; 26% inbound/74% outbound
 - PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.44 trips/dwelling unit; 61% inbound/39% outbound

- FM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.44 (rips/dwelling unit; 01% indound/59% outbound
 City of Los Angeles Affordable Housing (Family) trip generation average rates.
 AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.52 trips/dwelling unit; 38% inbound/62% outbound
- AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.52 trips/dwelling unit; 38% inbound/62% outbound
 PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.38 trips/dwelling unit; 55% inbound/45% outbound
 ITE Land Use Code 932 (High-Turnover [Sit-Down] Restaurant) trip generation avoid
- [5] ITE Land Use Code 932 (High-Turnover [Sit-Down] Restaurant) trip generation average rates.
 AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 9.94 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 55% inbound/45% outbound
 PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 9.77 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 62% inbound/38% outbound
- [6] ITE Land Use Code 820 (Shopping Center) trip generation average rates.
 AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.94 trips/1,000 SF of leasable area; 62% inbound/38% outbound
 PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 3.81 trips/1,000 SF of leasable area; 48% inbound/52% outbound
- [7] ITE Land Use Code 710 (General Office Building) trip generation average rates.
 AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 1.16 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 86% inbound/14% outbound
 PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 1.15 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 16% inbound/84% outbound
- [8] The internal capture reduction for the residential, restaurant, retail, and office is based on the synergy between all the market-rate apartments, restaurant, commercial, and office land uses provided within the Project Site, and determined via NCHRP 684 Internal Capture Estimation Tool (24% for AM Peak Hour and 31% for PM Peak Hour).
- [9] A 15% transit use reduction applied based on the Project Site being located within 1/4 mile of a Big Blue Bus rapid stop. The trip reduction for transit trips has been applied to the proposed Project and existing land uses based on the *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2020 for developments within a 1/4 mile walking distance of a transit station or a Rapid Bus stop. The transit reduction was not applied to the affordable housing component of the Project, per the *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2020.
- [10] Pass-by trips are made as intermediate stops on the way from an origin to a primary trip destination without a route diversion. Pass-by trips are attracted from traffic passing the site on an adjacent street or roadway that offers direct access to the site. The trip reduction for pass-by trips has been applied to the restaurant and commercial components of the Project based on the *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2020 for High Turnover Restaurant, Shopping Center less than 50,000 sf, and Shopping Center 100,000 to less than 300,000 sf.

vehicle trips (114 inbound trips and 117 outbound trips) during the AM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, Option B is expected to generate 59 net new vehicle trips (36 inbound trips and 23 outbound trips).

The daily vehicle trips expected to be generated by Option A and Option B were estimated using Version 1.3 of the City's VMT Calculator. Copies of the detailed VMT Calculator worksheets for Option A and Option B are contained in *Appendix D* and *Appendix E*. As indicated in the summary VMT Calculator worksheets, Option A is forecast to generate 1,379 net new daily vehicle trips, and Option B is forecast to generate 1,979 net new daily vehicle trips. It is noted that Option B will incorporate transportation demand management (TDM) strategies. Further discussion of the TDM strategies is provided in Section 2.9.

2.8.2 Project Traffic Distribution and Assignment

Project traffic volumes both entering and exiting the Project Site have been distributed and assigned to the adjacent street system based on the following considerations:

- The Project Site's proximity to major traffic corridors (e.g., Washington Boulevard, Lincoln Boulevard, SR-90);
- Expected localized traffic flow patterns based on adjacent roadway channelization and presence of traffic signals;
- Existing intersection traffic volumes;
- Ingress/egress availability at the Project Site assuming the site access and circulation scheme described in Section 2.4;
- The location of proposed parking areas;
- Nearby population and employment; and
- Input from LADOT staff.

The general, directional traffic distribution patterns for the existing commercial floor area on the Project Site is presented in *Figure 2–4*. The general, directional traffic distribution patterns for Option A related trips bound to the Project Site is presented in *Figure 2–5*. The general, directional traffic distribution patterns for Option B related trips bound to the Project Site is presented in *Figure 2–6*. The forecast net new weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes at the study intersections associated with Option A are presented in *Figures 2–7* and *2–8*, respectively. The forecast net new weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes at the study intersections associated with Option B are presented in *Figures 2–9* and *2–10*, respectively. The Option A traffic volume assignments presented in *Figures 2–7* and *2–8* reflect the traffic distribution characteristics shown in *Figures 2–4* and *2–5*, and the Option A traffic generation forecast presented in *Table 2–1*. The Option B traffic volume assignments presented in *Figures 1–9* and *2–8* reflect the traffic distribution characteristics shown in *Figures 2–4* and *2–5*, and the Option A traffic generation forecast presented in *Table 2–1*. The Option B traffic volume assignments presented in *Figures 1–9* and *2–8* reflect the traffic distribution characteristics shown in *Figures 2–4* and *2–5*, and the Option A traffic generation forecast presented in *Figures 1–9* and *2–10*.














2-9 and 2-10 reflect the traffic distribution characteristics shown in *Figures 2–4* and 2–6, and the Option B traffic generation forecast presented in *Table 2–2*.

2.9 **Project Transportation Demand Management**

The Applicant will comply with the City's existing transportation demand management (TDM) Ordinance in Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 12.26.J. Beyond the requirements in the TDM ordinance, Option B includes six TDM strategies to be implemented as mitigation measures.³ The TDM strategies are listed in Table 2.2-2 of the TAG. Further discussion of these TDM strategies is provided in the sections below.

2.9.1 Transit Subsides

This TDM strategy involves the subsidization of transit fare for residents and employees of Option B. The subsidy will be proactively offered to each resident and employee at least once annually for a minimum of five years. At the time of initial opening, Option B will offer a daily transit subsidy to all (i.e., 100%) residents and employees of \$2.98 per day.

2.9.2 **Promotions and Marketing**

Option B will utilize promotional and marketing tools to educate and inform residents and employees about alternative transportation options and the effects of their travel choices. Rather than two-way communication tools or tools that would encourage an individual to consider a different mode of travel at the time the trip is taken (i.e., smartphone application, daily email, etc.), this TDM strategy includes passive educational and promotional materials, such as posters, information boards, or a website with information that residents and employees can choose to read at their own leisure.

2.9.3 Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommuting Program

The strategy encourages employees to work alternative schedules or telecommute, including staggered start times, flexible schedules, or compressed work weeks. At the time of initial opening of the development, Option B will offer 1.5 days per week of telecommuting to at least 5% of all employees.

2.9.4 Include Bike Parking per Los Angeles Municipal Code

Table 12.21A.16(a)(1)(i) of the LAMC provides the required short-term and long-term bicycle parking spaces for the residential component of Option B (425 units). The short-term bicycle parking ratios are as follows:

| • | Dwelling Units 1-25: | 1 space per 10 units (3 spaces); |
|---|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| • | Dwelling Units 26-100: | 1 space per 15 units (5 spaces); |

• Dwelling Units 101-200: 1 space per 20 units (5 spaces); and

³ As discussed in Section 4.2, Option A as proposed results in a less than significant VMT impact. Therefore, no additional TDM measures are proposed in conjunction with Option A as proposed since mitigation is not required.

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

• Dwelling Units 201-425: 1 space per 40 units (6 spaces).

The long-term bicycle parking ratios are as follows:

| • | Dwelling Units 1-25: | 1 space per unit (25 spaces); |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| • | Dwelling Units 26-100: | 1 space per 1.5 units (50 spaces); |
| • | Dwelling Units 101-200: | 1 space per 2 units (50 spaces); and |
| • | Dwelling Units 201-425: | 1 space per 4 units (56 spaces). |

Table 12.21.A.16(a)(2) in the LAMC provides the required short-term and long-term bicycle parking spaces for the restaurant, commercial, and office components of Option B. The short-term bicycle parking ratios are as follows:

| • | Retail (20,000 s.f.): | 1 space per 2,000 s.f. (10 spaces); |
|---|---------------------------|---|
| • | Restaurant (20,000 s.f.): | 1 space per 2,000 s.f. (10 spaces); and |
| • | Office (90,000 s.f.): | 1 space per 10,000 s.f. (9 spaces). |

The long-term bicycle parking ratios are as follows:

| • | Retail (20,000 s.f.): | 1 space per 2,000 s.f. (10 spaces); |
|---|---------------------------|---|
| • | Restaurant (20,000 s.f.): | 1 space per 2,000 s.f. (10 spaces); and |
| • | Office (90,000 s.f.): | 1 space per 5,000 s.f. (18 spaces). |

Based on the above, Option B is required to provide 19 short-term and 181 long-term bicycle parking spaces for the residential component. For the restaurant, commercial, and office components, Option B is required to provide 29 short-term spaces and 38 long-term spaces. Option B will provide the LAMC-required number of short-term and long-term bicycle parking spaces.

2.9.5 Include Secure Bicycle Parking and Showers

This strategy involves implementation of additional end-of-trip bicycle facilities to support safe and comfortable bicycle travel by providing amenities at destinations. This strategy applies to projects that include bicycle parking onsite per LAMC. Projects providing long-term bicycle parking secured from the general public in accordance with LAMC Section 12.21A.16(d)(2) and showers in accordance with LAMC Section 91.6307 qualify for this measure.

Option B will provide short-term and long-term bicycle parking in accordance with LAMC Section 12.21A.16(d)(2). In addition, Option B will provide showers in accordance with LAMC Section 91.6307.

2.9.6 Pedestrian Network Improvements

This strategy involves implementation of pedestrian network improvements throughout and around the Project Site that encourage people to walk. This includes internally linking all uses within the Project Site with pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks and connecting the Project Site to the surrounding pedestrian network.

Option B includes pedestrian access points directly to sidewalks on the adjacent streets, including Maxella Avenue, and Glencoe Avenue. Additionally, Option B will improve existing sidewalks or construct new sidewalks on the above-mentioned streets adjacent to the Project Site. Furthermore, Option B will add street trees and landscaping, including a park along the Project Site's easterly frontage, to enhance the pedestrian network and improve exterior lighting along the sidewalks to improve safety.

3.0 PROJECT CONTEXT

3.1 Non-Vehicle Transport System

3.1.1 *Pedestrian Framework*

Public sidewalks and pedestrian facilities are provided on all streets within the Project Site vicinity. Public sidewalks ranging in width from nine feet to 11 feet are provided along the Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue property frontages. Potential pedestrian destinations located within an approximately one-quarter mile radius (i.e., 1,320 feet) from the Project Site are noted in *Figure 3–1*, per Section 3.2.4 of the TAG. *Figure 3–2* shows the existing and planned pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities within an approximately one-quarter mile radius (i.e., 1,320 feet) from the Project Site. As presented in *Figure 3–2*, the following pedestrian facilities currently are provided in the direct vicinity of the Project Site:

- American With Disabilities Act (ADA) access ramps, including some with the yellow truncated domes, are provided at the following intersections and midblock crossings located along Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site:
 - Lincoln Boulevard / Marina Pointe Drive Maxella Avenue
 - Del Rey Avenue / Maxella Avenue
 - Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue
 - Maxella Avenue Signalized Midblock Crossing⁴
 - Glencoe Avene / Maxella Avenue
 - Glencoe Avenue Signalized Midblock Crossing
 - Mindanao Way / Glencoe Avenue
- Traditional parallel bar or continental style pedestrian crosswalks with varying widths of between approximately 12 feet and 20 feet are provided at the following intersections and midblock crossings located near the Project Site:
 - Lincoln Boulevard / Marina Pointe Drive Maxella Avenue
 - Del Rey Avenue / Maxella Avenue
 - Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue

⁴ The existing Maxella Avenue midblock crossing will be removed as part of both Option A and Option B. The existing crosswalk will be shifted to the Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue intersection, which will be signalized with controlled crossing devices in conjunction with Option A and Option B.

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers



-26-

:\0265\dwg\t3-1.dwg 10/15/2020 15:13:43 jshender IIg exhibits c



-27-

o:\0265\dwg\f3-2.dwg 10/15/2020 15:34:15 jshender ∥g exhibits c

- Maxella Avenue Signalized Midblock Crossing
- Glencoe Avene / Maxella Avenue
- Glencoe Avenue Signalized Midblock Crossing
- Mindanao Way / Glencoe Avenue
- Pedestrian crossing signals and push buttons are presently included as part of the traffic signal controls at the nearby signalized intersections that are noted in *Figure 3–2*.

Option A and Option B have been designed to encourage pedestrian activity and walking as a transportation mode. Walkways are planned within Option A and Option B that will connect to the sidewalks along Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue in a manner that promotes walkability.

The City's Mobility Plan 2035^5 identifies a collection of arterial streets, known as Pedestrian Enhanced Districts (PEDs), where pedestrian improvements could be prioritized to provide enhanced walking connections to and from the major destinations within communities. The arterials in close proximity to the Project Site that have been identified as PEDs are presented in *Figure 3–3*. Mobility Plan 2035 also identifies a collection of streets, known as the Neighborhood Enhanced Network (NEN), that provide comfortable and safe routes for nonmotorized modes of travel such as walking. Roadways within the NEN in close proximity to the Project Site are presented in *Figure 3–4*.

3.1.2 Bicycle Network

Bicycle access to the Project Site is facilitated by the City's bicycle roadway network. Existing bicycle facilities (e.g., Class I Bicycle Path, Class II Bicycle Lanes, Class III Bicycle Routes, Bicycle Friendly Streets, etc.) identified in the City's 2010 Bicycle Plan are located within an approximately one-half mile radius from the Project Site.⁶ Within the immediate Project Site vicinity, Lincoln Boulevard has been designated for Class II Bicycle Lanes as part of the City's Bicycle Lane Network. The 2010 Bicycle Plan goals and policies have been folded into the Mobility Plan 2035 to reflect a commitment to a balanced, multi-modal viewpoint. Roadways within the City's Bicycle Network in close proximity to the Project Site and in the surrounding area are shown in *Figure 3–5*. Additionally, as shown in *Figure 3–4*, Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue have been designated within the NEN, a selection of streets that provide safe routes for non-motorized modes of travel such as bicycling.

⁵ Mobility Plan 2035, Los Angeles Department of City Planning, December 2015.

⁶ Source: 2010 Bicycle Plan, Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Adopted March 1, 2011. As noted in the Mobility Plan 2035, the 2010 Bicycle Plan and policies have been folded into the Mobility Plan to reflect a commitment to a balanced, multi-modal viewpoint.



-29-





3.2 Transit Framework

The Project Site is located within a Transit Priority Area and is currently served by many local lines and regional/commuter lines via stops located within convenient walking distance along Maxella Avenue, Glencoe Avenue, Lincoln Boulevard, and Mindanao Way. Public bus transit service in the Project Site area is currently provided by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority (Metro), LADOT, City of Culver City (CCB), and City of Santa Monica Big Blue Bus (BBB). A summary of the existing transit service, including the transit route, destinations and peak hour headways is presented in *Table 3–1*. The existing public transit routes in the Project Site vicinity are illustrated in *Figure 3–6*.

Mobility Plan 2035 identifies a collection of streets, known as the Transit Enhanced Network (TEN), where improvements, in collaboration with transit operators, aim to provide reliable and frequent service that is convenient and safe, increase transit ridership, reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips and integrate transit infrastructure improvements with the identity of the surrounding street. Potential enhancements range from streetscape improvements, installation of transit shelters, or installation of dedicated transit lanes. Roadways within the TEN in close proximity to the Project Site and in the surrounding area are shown in *Figure 3–7*. In addition, the location of bus stops and amenities (e.g., bus benches, shelters, etc.) in the Project study area is displayed in *Figure 3–3*.

3.3 Vehicle Network

3.3.1 Regional Highway Access

Regional vehicular access to the Project Site is primarily provided by State Route 90 (SR-90). A brief description of SR-90 is provided in the following paragraph.

SR-90 is an east-west State Highway that locally extends from Culver City to Marina del Rey to Culver City. In the immediate vicinity of the Project Site, SR-90 is known as the Marina Expressway, and provides at-grade intersections. East of Culver Boulevard, SR-90 is known as the Marina Freeway. In the Project study area, two to three travel lanes are provided in each direction on SR-90. In the immediate vicinity of the Project Site, SR-90 intersects Mindanao Way and Lincoln Boulevard in both the eastbound and westbound direction. The SR-90 intersections at Mindanao Way and Lincoln Boulevard are located approximately one-quarter mile (0.25-mile) southeast and southwest of the Project Site, respectively.

3.3.2 Local Roadway System

The following intersections were selected in consultation with LADOT staff for analysis of potential traffic operations deficiencies due to the proposed Project:

- 1. Walgrove Avenue / Washington Boulevard⁷
- 2. Lincoln Boulevard / Marina Pointe Drive Maxella Avenue

⁷ Intersection located within the jurisdiction of the City of Culver City.

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

| Table 3-1 | |
|----------------------------------|----|
| EXISTING PUBLIC TRANSIT ROUTES [| 1] |

| | | | | | 28-Apr-20 |
|-----------------------|--|----------------------------------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| | | | Ν | NO. OF BUSE | S |
| DOUTE | DECTINATIONS | ROADWAY(S) | DUR | ING PEAK H | IOUR |
| ROUTE | DESTINATIONS | NEAR SITE | DIR | AM | PM |
| Metro 108 / 358 | Pico Rivera to Marina del Rev | Mindanao Way | EB | 3 | 2 |
| | (via Slauson Avenue) | | WB | 3 | 3 |
| | | | | | |
| Commuter Express 437A | Downtown Los Angeles to Culver City/Marina Del Pey/Venice | Mindanao Way | FB | 2 | 0 |
| Commuter Express 457A | (via Culver Boulevard, Grand Avenue, and Olive Street) | Windanao way | WB | 0 | 2 |
| | | | | | |
| CODI: 1 | | | FD | | |
| CCB Line I | West LA Transit Center to Venice Beach | Washington Boulevard | EB | 4 | 4 |
| | (via washington Boulevard) | | WD | - | - |
| | | | | | |
| CCB Line 2 | Culver City Transit Center to Venice High School | Washington Boulevard | EB | 1 | 1 |
| | (via inglewood Boulevard) | | wВ | 1 | 1 |
| CCD Line 7 | Department Colour Cites to Marine del Davi | Madama Were Chance Darkered | ED | 2 | |
| CCB Line / | Downtown Culver City to Marina del Rey (via Culver Boulevard) | Mindanao Way, Glencoe Boulevard, | EB | 2 | 2 |
| | | Waxena Avenac, Eliconi Boulevard | WB | 2 | 2 |
| DDD 2 | Doumtourn Sonto Monico to Aviotion Station | Lincoln Doulovard | ND | 4 | 4 |
| 5 000 | (via Lincoln Boulevard) | Lincoli Bouevard | SB | 4 | 4 |
| | | | | | |
| BBB Papid 3 | Downtown Santa Monica to Aviation Station | Lincoln Boulevard | NB | 5 | 6 |
| сари з | (via Lincoln Boulevard) | Enconi Boulevaru | SB | 3 | 6 |
| | (| | | - | |
| DDD 14 | West Les Angeles te Marine Del Deu | Washington Devlayand | ND | 2 | 2 |
| 10 10 | west Los Angeles to Marina Del Key (via Wilshire Boulevard and Bundy Drive) | w assungton Boulevard | NB SB | 5 1 | 2 |
| | (bout bout and buildy birro) | | 55 | | - |
| | | | Total | 42 | 45 |

[1] Sources: Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) website, 2020.
 Los Angeles Department of Transportation (Commuter Express) website, 2020.
 Culver CityBus (CCB) website, 2020.
 City of Santa Monica Big Blue Bus (BBB) website, 2020.





o:/0265/dwg/f3-7.dwg 09/23/2020 13:47:00 jshender IIg exhibits color.ctb

- 3. Del Rey Avenue / Maxella Avenue
- 4. Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue
- 5. Maxella Avenue Driveway / Maxella Avenue
- 6. Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue
- 7. Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Northerly Driveway⁸
- 8. Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Southerly Driveway Villa Velletri Driveway
- 9. Mindanao Way / Glencoe Avenue
- 10. Mindanao Way / SR-90 (Marina Expressway) Westbound
- 11. Mindanao Way / SR-90 (Marina Expressway) Eastbound
- 12. Mindanao Way / La Villa Marina

Six of the 12 intersections are presently controlled by traffic signals. The Walgrove Avenue / Washington Boulevard, Del Rey Avenue / Maxella Avenue, and Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue, intersections are two-way stop-controlled intersections. A traffic signal will be installed at the Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue intersection in conjunction with both Option A and Option B.

The existing southerly driveway along Glencoe Avenue (Study Int. No. 8) is a two-way stopcontrolled intersection (i.e., a stop sign faces the outbound driveway approach) and will remain in conjunction with both Option A and Option B. The existing Maxella Avenue Driveway will be shifted approximately 101 feet to the east under Option A and two feet to the west under Option B and will be a two-way stop-controlled intersection (i.e., a stop sign will face the outbound driveway approach). The Glencoe Avenue Northerly Driveway is proposed in conjunction with Option A and will be a two-way stop-controlled intersection (i.e., a stop sign will face the outbound driveway approach).

The existing and Project lane configurations at the 12 study intersections for Option A and Option B are displayed in *Figures 3–8* and *3–9*, respectively.

3.3.3 Roadway Descriptions

Immediate access to the Project Site is provided by Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue. A brief description of the roadways in the Project study area is provided in the following paragraphs.

Walgrove Avenue is a north-south oriented roadway located northwest of the Project Site. Within the Project study area, Walgrove Avenue is designated as a Collector by the City and the

⁸ Option B does not propose a northerly driveway along Glencoe Avenue. However, for consistency purposes, the intersection is included as a study intersection for both Option A and Option B.

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers





llg exhibits jshender 14:45:59 04/13/2021 o:\0265\dwg\f3-9.dwg City of Culver City. One through travel lane is provided in each direction on Walgrove Avenue within the Project study area. Walgrove Avenue is posted for a speed limit of 25 miles per hour within the Project study area.

Lincoln Boulevard is a north-south oriented roadway located west of the Project Site. Within the Project study area, Lincoln Boulevard is designated as a Boulevard I by the City. Three through travel lanes are provided in each direction on Lincoln Boulevard within the Project study area. Separate exclusive left-turn lanes are provided in each direction on Lincoln Boulevard at the Marina Pointe Drive – Maxella Avenue intersection. A separate exclusive right-turn lane is provided in the northbound direction on Lincoln Boulevard at the Marina Pointe Drive – Maxella Avenue intersection. Lincoln Boulevard at the Marina Pointe Drive – Maxella Avenue intersection. Lincoln Boulevard at the Project study area.

Del Rey Avenue is a north-south oriented roadway located west of the Project Site. Within the Project study area, Del Rey Avenue is designated as a Local Street – Standard by the City. One through travel lane is provided in each direction on Del Rey Avenue within the Project study area. Del Rey Avenue is posted for a speed limit of 25 miles per hour within the Project study area.

Glencoe Avenue is a northwest-southeast oriented roadway that borders the Project Site to the east. Within the Project study area, Glencoe Avenue is designated as an Avenue II Modified north of Maxella Avenue, and as a Collector south of Maxella Avenue by the City. One through travel lane is provided in each direction on Glencoe Avenue north of Maxella Avenue and east of Mindanao Way. Two two through travel lanes are provided in each direction on Glencoe Avenue between Maxella Avenue and Mindanao Way. Separate exclusive left-turn lanes are provided in each direction on Glencoe Avenue at the Maxella Avenue and Mindanao Way intersections. A separate exclusive right-turn lane is provided in the northbound direction on Glencoe Avenue intersection, and in the eastbound direction at the Mindanao Way intersection. Glencoe Avenue is posted for a speed limit of 25 miles per hour within the Project study area.

Mindanao Way is a north-south oriented roadway located east of the Project Site. Within the Project study area, Mindanao Way is designated as an Avenue II north of Glencoe Avenue and as an Avenue I south of Glencoe Avenue by the City. Two through travel lanes are provided in each direction on Mindanao Way within the Project study area. Separate exclusive left-turn lanes are provided in each direction on Mindanao Way at the Glencoe Avenue, SR-90 Westbound, SR-90 Eastbound, and La Villa Marina intersections. A separate exclusive right-turn lane is provided in the northbound direction on Mindanao Way at the SR-90 Eastbound intersection. Mindanao Way is posted for a speed limit of 30 miles per hour within the Project study area.

Washington Boulevard is an east-west oriented roadway located north of the Project Site. Within the Project study area, Washington Boulevard is designated as a Boulevard II by the City and as a Primary Arterial by the City of Culver City. Two through travel lanes are provided in each direction on Washington Boulevard within the Project study area. A separate exclusive left-turn

lane is provided on Washington Boulevard in the eastbound direction at the Walgrove Avenue intersection. Washington Boulevard is posted for a speed limit of 35 miles per hour within the Project study area.

Marina Pointe Drive is an east-west oriented roadway located southwest of the Project Site. Within the Project study area, Marina Pointe Drive is designated as a Private Street by the City. One through travel lane is provided in each direction on Marina Pointe Drive within the Project study area. A separate exclusive left- and right-turn lane is provided on Marina Pointe Drive intersection in the eastbound direction at the Lincoln Boulevard intersection. There is no speed limit posted on Marina Pointe Drive within the Project study area, thus a prima facie speed limit of 25 miles per hour is assumed, consistent with California Vehicle Code Section 22352(b)(1).

Maxella Avenue is an east-west oriented roadway located that borders the Project Site to the north. Within the Project study area, Maxella Avenue is designated as an Avenue III west of Glencoe Avenue and as a Collector east of Glencoe Avenue by the City. Two through travel lanes are provided in each direction on Maxella Avenue west of Glencoe Avenue. One through travel lane is provided in each direction east of Glencoe Avenue. Separate exclusive left-turn lanes are provided in each direction on Maxella Avenue at the Glencoe Avenue intersection, in the westbound direction at the Lincoln Boulevard intersection, and the eastbound direction at the Del Rey Avenue intersection. A separate exclusive right-turn lane is provided on Maxella Avenue in the westbound direction at the Lincoln Boulevard intersection and the eastbound direction at the Glencoe Avenue intersection. Maxella Avenue is posted for a speed limit of 25 miles per hour within the Project study area.

La Villa Marina is an east-west oriented roadway located southeast of the Project Site. Within the Project study area, La Villa Marina is designated as a Local Street – Standard by the City. One through travel lane is provided in each direction on La Villa Marina within the Project study area. La Villa Marina is posted for a speed limit of 25 miles per hour within the Project study area.

3.3.4 City of Los Angeles High Injury Network

Vision Zero⁹ is a citywide initiative which prioritizes the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists on public streets, with the understanding that roads which are safe for vulnerable users will be safer for all users, in an effort to eliminate traffic fatalities. Key elements of the policy, such as reducing traffic speeds, are founded on the principles of engineering, education, enforcement, evaluation, and equity. Originating in Sweden, the policy has been adopted in numerous other North American cities, including California cities such as San Francisco and San Diego.

Mayor Eric Garcetti issued Executive Directive No. 10 in August 2015, formally launching the Vision Zero initiative in Los Angeles. Vision Zero is also a stated safety objective in the Mobility Plan 2035, which sets the goal of zero traffic deaths by 2035. Jointly directed by LADOT and the Police Department, Vision Zero takes a multi-disciplinary approach to identifying safety risk factors and implementing solutions on a citywide scale. Using a

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

methodology originally developed by the San Francisco Public Health Department, the Vision Zero Task Force has identified streets where investments in safety will have the most impact in reducing severe injuries and traffic fatalities in the City. These roads are collectively known as the High Injury Network (HIN). The HIN will be reviewed by the LADOT's Vision Zero group for potential engineering re-design as well as educational and enforcement campaigns. As shown in *Figure 3–10*, Lincoln Boulevard has been identified on the HIN.

If a proposed project results in significant transportation impacts, LADOT's Vision Zero group will review those specific locations and immediate vicinity for potential safety enhancements that are consistent with the City's Vision Zero initiative.

3.4 Traffic Counts

In April 2020, LADOT issued guidance¹⁰ to transportation consultants related to traffic count data to be used in transportation assessments prepared in accordance with the City's TAG. Because traffic count data could not be collected at the study intersections due to the COVID-19 pandemic, LADOT has directed transportation consultants to use historical data, with appropriate modifications to represent current (pre-pandemic) traffic volume conditions. For this transportation assessment, the following techniques were used to estimate current year (2020) peak hour turning movement traffic volumes at the study intersections:

- <u>Walgrove Avenue / Washington Boulevard:</u> Peak hour traffic volume data collected at this intersection in 2017 were increased by a 1.0% annual traffic growth rate through the year 2020 to estimate current year traffic volumes. Further discussion of the annual traffic growth rate is provided in Section 3.5.2.
- <u>Lincoln Boulevard / Marina Pointe Drive Maxella Avenue:</u> Peak hour traffic volume data collected at this intersection in 2016 were increased by a 1.0% annual traffic growth rate through the year 2020 to estimate current year traffic volumes.
- <u>Del Rey Avenue / Maxella Avenue:</u> Peak hour traffic volume data collected at this intersection in 2016 were increased by a 1.0% annual traffic growth rate through the year 2020 to estimate current year traffic volumes.
- <u>Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue</u>: Peak hour traffic volume data collected at this intersection in 2016 were increased by a 1.0% annual traffic growth rate through the year 2020 to estimate current year traffic volumes.
- <u>Maxella Avenue Driveway / Maxella Avenue</u>: The traffic count data and subsequent adjustments to year 2020 conditions at the Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue intersection were used to derive the westbound and eastbound through volumes. Turning movements at the intersection were derived based on application of trip generation rates to the commercial floor area within the existing Project Site. The existing Project Site

⁹ Vision Zero Los Angeles 2015-2025, August 2015.

¹⁰ Pandemic-related updates to LADOT's Transportation Assessment Requirements, LADOT, April 17, 2020.



0

-s 1:50:37

09/23/2020

-42-

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

PASEO MARINA PROJECT

trips were assigned to the existing Project Site driveways, including the intersection. *Tables 2–1* and 2–2 present the trip generation forecast for the commercial floor area within the existing Project Site. The general, directional traffic distribution patterns for the existing Project Site are presented in *Figure 2–4*.

- <u>Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue:</u> Peak hour traffic volume data collected at this intersection in 2016 were increased by a 1.0% annual traffic growth rate through the year 2020 to estimate current year traffic volumes.
- <u>Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Northerly Driveway:</u> The traffic count data and subsequent adjustments approaching and departing the Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue intersection were used to derive the northbound and southbound through volumes.
- Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Southerly Driveway Villa Velletri Driveway: The traffic count data and subsequent adjustments approaching and departing the Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue intersection were used to derive the northbound and southbound through volumes. Turning movements at the intersection were derived based on application of trip generation rates to the size of the land uses within the existing Project Site, the existing Villa Marina Marketplace bordering the Project Site to the south, and the Villa Velletri townhomes utilizing the driveway located across Glencoe Avenue from the Project Site. The existing Project Site trips, Villa Marina Marketplace Trips, and Villa Velletri townhomes trips were assigned to the existing driveways serving the respective sites, including the intersection. Tables 2-1 and 2-2 present the trip generation forecast for the commercial floor area within the existing Project Site. Tables 3-2 and 3-3 present the trip generation forecasts for the land uses within the existing Villa Marina Marketplace and Villa Velletri townhomes, respectively. The general, directional traffic distribution patterns for the existing Project Site are presented in Figure 2-4. The general, directional traffic distribution patterns for the existing Villa Marina Marketplace and Villa Velletri townhomes are presented in *Figure 3–11*.
- <u>Mindanao Way / Glencoe Avenue:</u> Peak hour traffic volume data collected at this intersection in 2016 were increased by a 1.0% annual traffic growth rate through the year 2020 to estimate current year traffic volumes.
- <u>Mindanao Way / SR-90 Westbound:</u> Peak hour traffic volume data collected at this intersection in 2016 were increased by a 1.0% annual traffic growth rate through the year 2020 to estimate current year traffic volumes.
- <u>Mindanao Way / SR-90 Eastbound:</u> Peak hour traffic volume data collected at this intersection in 2016 were increased by a 1.0% annual traffic growth rate through the year 2020 to estimate current year traffic volumes.

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

Table 3-2VILLA MARINA MARKETPLACE TRIP GENERATION [1]SOUTH OF PROJECT SITE

| 23-Sep-20 | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------------------|-----|-------|--------------|------|--------|--|--|
| | | AM PEAK HOUR | | | PM PEAK HOUR | | | | |
| | | VOLUMES [2] VOLUMES [2 | | | | | ES [2] | | |
| LAND USE | SIZE | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | | |
| <i>Existing Site</i> Commercial [3] | 113,599 GLSF | 66 | 41 | 107 | 208 | 225 | 433 | | |
| <i>Transit Trips [4]</i> Commercial (15%) | | (10) | (6) | (16) | (31) | (34) | (65) | | |
| NET EXISTING DRIVEWAY TR | RIPS | 56 | 35 | 91 | 177 | 191 | 368 | | |

[1] Sources: ITE *Trip Generation Manual*, 10th Edition, 2017.

[2] Trips are one-way traffic movements, entering or leaving.

[3] ITE Land Use Code 820 (Shopping Center) trip generation average rates.

- AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.94 trips/1,000 SF of leasable area; 62% inbound/38% outbound - PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 3.81 trips/1,000 SF of leasable area; 48% inbound/52% outbound

[4] A 15% transit use reduction applied based on the site being located within 1/4 mile of a

Big Blue Bus rapid stop. The trip reduction for transit trips has been applied to the existing site based on the *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2020 for developments within a 1/4 mile walking distance of a transit station or a Rapid Bus stop.

Table 3-3 VILLA VELLETRI TOWNHOMES TRIP GENERATION [1]

| 23-Sep-20 |
|-----------|
|-----------|

| | | AM PEAK HOUR VOLUMES [2] | | | PM PEAK HOUR VOLUMES [2] | | | |
|--|-------|-----------------------------|-----|-------|-----------------------------|-----|-------|--|
| LAND USE | SIZE | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | |
| <i>Existing Site</i> Townhomes [3] | 54 DU | 6 | 19 | 25 | 19 | 11 | 30 | |
| NET EXISTING VILLA VELLETRI DRIVEWAY TRIPS | | | 19 | 25 | 19 | 11 | 30 | |

[1] Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, 2017.

[2] Trips are one-way traffic movements, entering or leaving.

[3] ITE Land Use Code 220 (Multifamily Housing [Low-Rise]) trip generation average rates.

- AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.46 trips/dwelling unit; 23% inbound/77% outbound

- PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.56 trips/dwelling unit; 63% inbound/37% outbound



• <u>Mindanao Way / La Villa Marina:</u> Peak hour traffic volume data collected at this intersection in 2017 were increased by a 1.0% annual traffic growth rate through the year 2020 to estimate current year traffic volumes.

The existing traffic volumes at the study intersections during the weekday AM and PM peak hours are shown in *Figures 3–12* and *3–13*, respectively. Summary data worksheets of the manual traffic counts at the study intersections are contained in *Appendix F*.

3.5 Cumulative Development Projects

3.5.1 Related Projects

A forecast of on-street traffic conditions prior to occupancy of Option A and Option B was prepared by incorporating the potential trips associated with other known development projects (related projects) in the area. With this information, the potential impact of the Project can be evaluated within the context of the cumulative impact of all ongoing development. The related projects research was based on information on file at LADOT, City of Culver City Planning Department, and County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning within a 0.75-mile radius (one-quarter mile past the farthest outlying study intersection) of the Project Site. The list of related projects in the Project Site area is presented in *Table 3–4*. The location of the related projects is shown in *Figure 3–14*.

Traffic volumes expected to be generated by the related projects were calculated using rates provided in the ITE *Trip Generation Manual*. The related projects' respective traffic generation for the weekday AM and PM peak hours, as well as on a daily basis for a typical weekday, is summarized in *Table 3–4*. The distribution of the related projects traffic volumes to the study intersections during the weekday AM and PM peak hours are displayed in *Figures 3–15* and 3-16, respectively.

As noted in Section 3.4, peak hour traffic volume data was collected at the study intersections in 2016 and 2017. Many of the related projects listed in *Table 3–4* have been completed. However, as noted in Section 3.4, peak hour traffic volume data was collected at the study intersections in 2016 and 2017, and these projects had yet to be completed. The completed projects have been included in the cumulative baseline to provide a complete forecast of onstreet traffic conditions prior to occupancy of Option A and Option B. Furthermore, two of the related projects are expected to generate a net reduction in traffic volumes during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. These projects were removed from the cumulative baseline to provide a conservative forecast of on-street traffic conditions prior to occupancy of Option A and Option B.

3.5.2 Ambient Traffic Growth

In order to account for unknown related projects not included in this analysis, the existing traffic volumes were increased at an annual rate of 1.0% per year to and including the year 2026 (i.e., the anticipated year of Project buildout). The ambient growth factor was based on general traffic growth factors provided in the 2010 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County





| | | | | | | | DAILY | AN | 1 PEAK H | DUR | PM PEAK HOUR | | | |
|-----|---|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--|
| MAP | PROJECT NAME/ | PROJECT | ADDRESS/ | LAND USE | DATA | DATA | TRIP ENDS [2] | N N | OLUMES | [2] TOTAL | IN . | VOLUMES | [2] | |
| NO. | PROJECT NUMBER | SIATUS | LOCATION | LAND USE City of I | os Angeles | SOURCE | VOLUMES | IN | 001 | IUIAL | IN | 001 | IUIAL | |
| | | 1 | | | os Angeles | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| LA1 | X67 Lofts | Completed | 4140 S. Glencoe Avenue | Apartments Office | 67 DU 3,211 GSF | | 481 | 11 | 28 | 39 | 33 | 23 | 56 | |
| LA2 | C1 by CLG | Completed | 4210 S. Del Rey Avenue | Condominiums Office | 136 DU 14,929 GSF | | 627 | 24 | 47 | 71 | 48 | 37 | 85 | |
| LA3 | R3 by CLG | Completed | 4091 S. Redwood Avenue | Condominiums Office | 67 DU 7,525 GSF | | 391 | 4 | 21 | 25 | 29 | 22 | 51 | |
| LA4 | G8 by CLG | Completed | 4040 S. Del Rey Avenue | Apartments Office | 230 DU 18,800 GSF | [3] | 831 | (28) | 72 | 44 | 74 | (14) | 60 | |
| LA5 | INclave | Completed | 4065-71 Glencoe Avenue | Creative Office Specialty Retail | 35,206 GSF 1,500 GSF 49 DU | [4] | (96) | 31 | 18 | 49 | 1 | 47 | 48 | |
| LA6 | Warehouse to Office | Completed | 4721 S. Alla Road | Office | 118,352 GSF | | 267 | 38 | 5 | 43 | 9 | 48 | 57 | |
| LA7 | Stella Phase 2 | Completed | 13488 W. Maxella Avenue | Apartments | 65 DU | | 362 | 6 | 23 | 29 | 26 | 14 | 40 | |
| LA8 | Thatcher Yard | Approved | 3233 S. Thatcher Avenue | Affordable Senior Housing Affordable Family Housing | 68 DU 30 DU | [5] | 239 | 9 | 14 | 23 | 11 | 9 | 20 | |
| LA9 | Cedars-Sinai Marina del Rey Replacement Hospital | Approved | 4650 Lincoln Boulevard | Hospital Hospital Medical Office | 160 Beds (133) Beds (50,500) GSF | [6] | (1,155) | (73) | (18) | (91) | (34) | (90) | (124) | |
| | | | | City of C | Culver City | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| CC1 | Costco Expansion | Under Construction | 13463 Washington Boulevard | Discount Club Fueling Station Supermarket | 31,023 GSF 2 FP (63,213) GSF | [7] [8] [9] | 1,297 344 (6,750) | 11 11 (145) | 4 10 (96) | 15 21 (241) | 65 14 (298) | 65 14 (286) | 130 28 (584) | |
| CC2 | Baldwin Site | Under Construction | 12803 Washington Boulevard | Apartments Retail | 37 DU 7,206 GSF | [10] [11] | 271 272 | 4 4 | 13 3 | 17 7 | 6 13 | 15 14 | 21 27 | |
| CC3 | Kayvon Mixed-Use | Completed | 12712-12718 Washington Boulevard | Residential Retail Retail | 5 DU 3,414 GSF (2,340) GSF | [10] [11] [11] | 37 129 (88) | 0 2 (1) | 2 1 (1) | 2 3 (2) | 1 6 (4) | 2 7 (5) | 3 13 (9) | |
| CC4 | Townhome Development | Proposed | 4118 Wade Street | Townhomes | 4 DU | [10] | 29 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | |

Table 3-4 RELATED PROJECTS LIST AND TRIP GENERATION [1]

Table 3-4 (Continued) RELATED PROJECTS LIST AND TRIP GENERATION [1]

| | | | | | | PROJECT | DAILY | AM PEAK HOUR | | | PM PEAK HOUR | | |
|------|---|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|
| MAP | PROJECT NAME/ | PROJECT | ADDRESS/ | LAND USE | DATA | DATA | TRIP ENDS [2] | · · · · | OLUMES | [2] | | VOLUMES | [2] |
| NO. | PROJECT NUMBER | STATUS | LOCATION | LAND-USE | SIZE | SOURCE | VOLUMES | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL |
| | County of Los Angeles | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LC1 | Pier 44/Pacific Marina Venture (Lease Parcel 44) | Under Construction | 4637 Admiralty Way | Commercial Marina | 91,760 GSF 141 Berths | [11] [12] | 3,464 326 | 53 3 | 33 7 | 86 10 | 168 18 | 182 12 | 350 30 |
| TOTA | L | | | | | | 1,278 | (36) | 188 | 152 | 187 | 117 | 304 |

[1] Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation Related Projects List, City of Culver City Active Projects Map, and County of Los Angeles Related Projects List.

[2] Trips are one-way traffic movements, entering or leaving.

[3] Source: Memorandum for the 4040 Del Rey Avenue Apartment Project, prepared by Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., Revised March 30, 2016.

[4] Source: Traffic Impact Study for the Inclave Mixed-Use Project, prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers, November 4, 2016.

[5] Source: Technical Memorandum for the Thatcher Yard Residential Project, prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers, February 19, 2019.

[6] Source: Transportation Assessment for the Cedars-Sinai Marina del Rey Replacement Hospital Project, prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers, March 12, 2020.

[7] ITE Land Use Code 857 (Discount Club) trip generation average rates.

[8] ITE Land Use Code 944 (Gasoline/Service Station) trip generation average rates.

[9] ITE Land Use Code 850 (Supermarket) trip generation average rates.

[10] ITE Land Use Code 220 (Multifamily Housing [Low-Rise]) trip generation average rates.

[11] ITE Land Use Code 820 (Shopping Center) trip generation average rates.

[12] ITE Land Use Code 420 (Marina) trip generation average rates.

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers



-52-



-53-

10/01/2020



-54-

exhibits ₽ jshender 16:44:16 10/05/2020 o:\0265\dwg\f3-16.dwg ("CMP manual") and determined in consultation with LADOT staff. It is noted that based on review of the general traffic growth factors provided in the CMP manual for the Project Site area (i.e., Regional Statistical Area [RSA] 16, Santa Monica, which includes the Project Site), it is anticipated that the existing traffic volumes are expected to increase at an annual rate of approximately 0.23% per year between the years 2015 and 2026. Thus, application of an annual growth factor of 1.0% annual growth results in a highly conservative forecast of future traffic volumes in the area as it substantially exceeds the annual traffic growth rate published in the CMP manual. Furthermore, the CMP manual's traffic growth rate is intended to anticipate future traffic generated by development projects in the Project Site vicinity. Thus, the inclusion in this traffic analysis of a forecast of traffic generated by known related projects plus the use of an ambient growth traffic factor based on CMP traffic model data results in an even more conservative estimate of future traffic volumes at the study intersections.

4.0 CEQA ANALYSIS OF TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS

4.1 Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies (Threshold T-1)

The City aims to achieve an accessible and sustainable transportation system that meets the needs of all users. The City's adopted transportation-related plans and policies affirm that streets should be safe and convenient for all users of the transportation system, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, public transit riders, disabled persons, senior citizens, children, and movers of commercial goods. Therefore, the transportation requirements for proposed developments should be generally consistent with the City's transportation-related plans and policies.

As stated in Section 2.1.1 of the TAG, proposed projects shall be analyzed to identify potential conflicts with adopted City plans and policies and, if there is a conflict, improvements that prioritize access for and improve the comfort of people walking, bicycling, and riding transit in order to provide safe and convenient streets for all users should be identified. Projects designed to encourage sustainable travel help to reduce vehicle miles traveled. This section provides a review of the screening criteria and a summary of the consistency of the Project with the City's adopted plans and policies.

4.1.1 Screening Criteria

Per Section 2.1.2 of the TAG, if the project requires a discretionary action, and the answer is yes to any of the following questions, further analysis is required to assess whether the Project would conflict with adopted City plans, programs, ordinances, or policies that establish the transportation planning framework for all travel modes:

- Does the project require a discretionary action that requires the decision maker to find that the decision substantially conforms to the purpose, intent, and provisions of the General Plan?
 - Yes, both Option A and Option B will require a discretionary action.
- Is the project known to directly conflict with a transportation plan, policy, or program adopted to support multimodal transportation options or public safety?
 - No, neither Option A nor Option B are known to directly conflict with a transportation plan, policy, or program adopted to support multimodal transportation options or public safety.
- Is the project proposing to, or required to make any voluntary or required modifications to the public right-of-way (i.e., street dedications, reconfigurations of curb line, etc.)?
 - Yes, a three-foot street dedication is required for Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue along the Project Site.
As the answer is "yes" to two of the three screening criteria questions in the TAG, further analysis is required to assess whether Option A or Option B would conflict with adopted City plans, programs, ordinances, or policies.

4.1.2 Impact Criteria and Methodology

The impact criteria set forth in Appendix G to the State CEQA Guidelines, as well as Section 2.1.3 of the City's TAG, regarding conflicts with plans, programs, ordinances, or policies (referred to as Threshold T-1 in the TAG) are as follows:

• Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?

The threshold test is to assess whether a project would conflict with an adopted program, policy, plan, or ordinance that is adopted to protect the environment. In general, transportation policies or standards adopted to protect the environment are those that support multimodal transportation options and a reduction in VMT. Conversely, a project would not always have a significant impact merely based on whether or not it would implement a particular transportation-related program, plan, policy, or ordinance. Many of these programs must be implemented by the City itself over time, and over a broad area, and it is the intention of this threshold test to ensure that proposed development projects and plans do not preclude the City from implementing adopted programs, plans and policies.

The methodology for determining a project's transportation impact associated with conflicts with plans, programs, ordinances, or policies is describe in the TAG as follows:

- A project that generally conforms with and does not obstruct the City's development policies and standards will generally be considered to be consistent. The Applicant should review the documents and ordinances identified in the TAG (refer to Table 2.1-1 on Page 2-3) for City plans, policies, programs, ordinances and standards relevant to determining project consistency. TAG Attachment D: Plan Consistency Worksheet provides questions that must be answered in order to help guide whether the project conflicts with City circulation system policies. A "yes" or "no" answer to these questions does not determine a conflict. Rather, as indicated in TAG Attachment D, the Applicant must provide substantiating information to help determine whether the proposed project precludes the City's implementation of any adopted policy and/or program that was adopted to protect the environment. A mere conflict with adopted transportation related policies, or standards that require administrative relief or legislative change does not in itself constitute an impact.
- If vacation of a public right-of-way, or relief from a required street dedication is sought as part of a proposed project, an assessment should be made as to whether the right-of-way in question is necessary to serve a long-term mobility need, as defined in Mobility Plan 2035, transportation specific plan, or other planned improvement in the future.

Per Section 2.1.4 of the TAG, the analysis of cumulative impacts may be quantitative or qualitative. Each of the plans, ordinances, and policies reviewed to assess potential conflicts with proposed projects should be reviewed to assess cumulative impacts that may result from the proposed project in combination with other development projects in the study area. In addition, the cumulative analysis should also consider planned transportation system improvements within the study area as identified in consultation with LADOT.

Related projects to be considered in the cumulative analysis are known development projects located within a one-half mile radius of the Project Site. Please refer to the list of related projects identified in *Table 3–4* and *Figure 3–14* for the location of the related projects in relation to the Project Site.

4.1.3 Review of Project Consistency

This section provides a summary of the consistency review that compares the characteristics of the Project and site design features (i.e., including the site access and circulation scheme) with the City's relevant plans and policies. *Appendix G* provides the Plans, Policies, and Programs Worksheet from the TAG, and provide additional detail regarding the plans, programs, ordinances, and policies review for Option A. As confirmed in *Appendix G*, Option A has been found to be generally consistent with the relevant City plans, policies and programs and does not include any features that would preclude the City from completing and complying with these guiding documents and policy objectives. Therefore, Option A does not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, and the impact would therefore be "less than significant".

Appendix H provides the Plans, Policies, and Programs Worksheet from the TAG, and provide additional detail regarding the plans, programs, ordinances, and policies review for Option B. As confirmed in *Appendix H*, Option B been found to be generally consistent with the relevant City plans, policies and programs and does not include any features that would preclude the City from completing and complying with these guiding documents and policy objectives. Therefore, Option B does not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, and the impact would therefore be "less than significant".

Furthermore, the Applicant will comply with existing applicable City ordinances (e.g., the City's existing TDM Ordinance, referred to in the LAMC Section 12.26.J) and the other requirements per the City's Municipal Code, as well as the TDM requirements of the Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan.

4.1.4 Review of Cumulative Consistency

Per Section 2.1.4 of the TAG, the analysis of cumulative consistency requires consultation and confirmation with City of Los Angeles Department of Planning and Transportation (i.e., with LADCP and LADOT).

As with Option A and Option B, the related projects would include adequate bicycle facilities and include high density urban uses in proximity to the nearby multimodal transportation facilities. Furthermore, the Stella Phase 2 project, located adjacent to the Project Site at 13488 Maxella Avenue, has been completed. The related projects, as with Option A and Option B, would not conflict with adjacent street designations and classifications. No street widenings would be necessary for these projects. Accordingly, there would be no significant cumulative impacts to which Option A and Option B, as well as other nearby related projects contribute to regarding transportation policies or standards adopted to protect the environment and support multimodal transportation options and a reduction in VMT.

Based on the discussion and conclusion in the preceding Section 4.1.3, the guiding language contained in the City's TAG, and review of related projects in the Project vicinity, this documentation is sufficient to demonstrate that there is also no cumulative inconsistency with the City's plans, policies, ordinances and programs, and therefore, the cumulative impacts of Option A and Option B would be less than significant. In addition, since neither Option A nor Option B include any features that would preclude the City from completing and complying with these guiding documents and policy objectives, there is no cumulative inconsistency that can be determined.

4.2 VMT Analysis (Threshold T-2.1)

The California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) issued proposed updates to the State CEQA Guidelines in November 2017 and an accompanying technical advisory guidance in April 2018 (*OPR Technical Advisory*) that amended one of the Appendix G significance thresholds for transportation impacts to delete reference to vehicle delay and level of service and instead refer to Section 15064.3 (b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines to ask if the project would result in a substantial increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Section 15064.3(b)(1) states as follows:

• Land Use Projects. Vehicle miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. Generally, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high-quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. Projects that decrease vehicle miles traveled in the project area compared to existing conditions should be considered to have a less than significant transportation impact.

The California Natural Resources Agency adopted this change to the CEQA Guidelines in December 2018, and it is now in effect. Accordingly, the City has adopted a significance criterion for transportation impacts based on VMT for land use projects and plans that closely tracks the amended Appendix G question:

• Threshold T-2.1: For a land use project, would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1)?

The City has developed the following screening and impact criteria to address this question. The criteria below are based on the OPR technical advisory but reflects local considerations.

Per Section 2.2.2 of the TAG, if the project requires discretionary action, and the answer is no to either T-2.1-1 or T-2.1-2, further analysis will not be required for CEQA Threshold T-2.1, and a "no impact" determination can be made:

• T-2.1-1: Would the land use project generate a net increase of 250 or more daily vehicle trips?

For purposes of screening the daily vehicle trips, a proposed project's daily vehicle trips should be estimated using the City's VMT Calculator tool or the most recent edition of the ITE *Trip Generation Manual*. TDM strategies should not be considered for the purposes of screening. If existing land uses are present on the project site or there were previously terminated land uses that meet the criteria for trip credits described in the trip generation methodology discussion (refer to Subsection 3.3.4.1 of the TAG), the daily vehicle trips generated by the existing or qualified terminated land uses can be estimated using the VMT Calculator tool and subtracted from the proposed project's daily vehicle trips to determine the net increase in daily vehicle trips.

• T-2.1-2: Would the project generate a net increase in daily VMT?

For the purpose of screening the VMT, a project's daily VMT should be estimated using the City's VMT Calculator tool or the City's Travel Demand Forecasting (TDF) model. TDM strategies should not be considered for the purpose of screening. If existing land uses are present on the project site or there were previously terminated land uses that meet the criteria for trip credits description in the trip generation methodology discussion (refer to Subsection 3.3.4.1 of the TAG), the daily VMT generated by the existing or qualified terminated land uses can be estimated using the City VMT Calculator tool and subtracted from the project's daily VMT to determine the net increase in daily VMT.

In addition to the above screening criteria, the portion of, or the entirety of a project that contains small-scale or local serving retail uses¹¹ are assumed to have less than significant VMT impacts. If the answer to the following question is no, then that portion of the project meets the screening criteria, and a no impact determination can be made for the portion of the project that contains retail uses. However, if the retail project is part of a larger mixed-use project, then the remaining portion of the project may be subject to further analysis in accordance with the above screening criteria. Projects that include retail uses in excess of the screening criteria would need to evaluate the entirety of the project's VMT, as specified in Subsection 2.2.4 of the TAG.

• If the project includes retail uses, does the portion of the project that contain retail uses exceed a net 50,000 square feet?

4.2.1 Impact Criteria and Methodology

A development project will have a potential VMT impact if the project meets the following criteria stated in Section 2.2.3 of the TAG:

¹¹ As noted in the TAG, the definition of retail for this purpose includes restaurant.

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

- For residential projects, the project would generate household VMT per capita exceeding 15% below the existing average household VMT per capita for the Area Planning Commission (APC) area in which the project is located.
- For office projects, the project would generate work VMT per employee exceeding 15% below the existing average work VMT per employee for the APC in which the project is located.
- For regional serving retail projects, the project would result in a net increase in VMT.
- For other land use types, measure VMT impacts for the work trip element using the criteria for office projects above.

The City's TAG establishes different VMT significance thresholds for each of the seven Area Planning Commission (APC) areas as the characteristics of each are distinct in terms of land use, density, transit availability, employment, etc. The City's significance thresholds (i.e., based on a Daily Household VMT per Capita basis and a Daily Work VMT per Employee) for each of the APC areas are presented in *Table 4–1*. As the Project Site is located within the area governed by the West Los Angeles APC, the VMT significant impact criterion (i.e., 15% below the APC average) applicable to the Project is 7.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita and 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee.

The impact methodology set forth in the TAG for a mixed-use project is as follows:

• Mixed-Use Projects. The project VMT impact should be considered significant, if, after taking credit for internal capture, the project exceeds the impact criteria for any one (or all) of a particular project's land use(s). In such cases, mitigation options that reduce the VMT generated by any or all of the land uses could be considered.

It is important to note that since the restaurant and retail components of both Option A and Option B are local-serving and are below 50,000 square feet (i.e., the proposed restaurant and retail space for Option A and Option B totals 27,300 square feet and 40,000 square feet, respectively), the restaurant and retail components are assumed to have a less than significant VMT impact based on the screening criteria contained in the City's TAG.

4.2.2 Summary of Project VMT Analysis

The daily vehicle trips and VMT expected to be generated by the Project were forecast using Version 1.3 of the City's VMT Calculator tool. Copies of the detailed City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator worksheets for Option A and Option B are contained in *Appendix D* and *Appendix E*, respectively. As indicated in the summary VMT Calculator worksheet, the Project is forecast to generate the following:

• Option A is estimated to generate a total of 4,974 daily vehicle trips and 1,379 net new daily vehicle trips.

Table 4-1 CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT IMPACT CRITERIA [1]

| | 15% BELOW AP | C CRITERIA [2] |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| AREA PLANNING COMMISSION | DAILY HOUSEHOLD VMT PER CAPITA | DAILY WORK VMT PER EMPLOYEE |
| Central | 6.0 | 7.6 |
| East Los Angeles | 7.2 | 12.7 |
| Harbor | 9.2 | 12.3 |
| North Valley | 9.2 | 15.0 |
| South Los Angeles | 6.0 | 11.6 |
| South Valley | 9.4 | 11.6 |
| West Los Angeles | <u>7.4</u> | <u>11.1</u> |

[1] Source: LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines, July 2020.

[2] The development project will have a potential impact if the project meets the following:

- For residential projects, the project would generate household VMT per capita exceeding 15% below the existing average household VMT per capita for the APC area in which the project (refer to above [source: Table 2.2-1 of the TAG]).

- For office projects, the project would generate work VMT per employee exceeding 15% below the existing average work VMT per employee for the APC in which the project is located (refer to above [source: Table 2.2-1 of the TAG]).

- For retail projects, the project would result in a net increase in VMT.

- For other land use types, measure VMT impacts for the work trip element using the criteria for office project above (source: Table 2.2-1 of the TAG).

- The estimated Daily Household VMT per Capita for Option A is 6.9 Daily Household VMT per Capita, which is less than the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 7.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita.
- Option B, prior to the consideration of the TDM measures described in Section 2.9, is estimated to generate a total of 5,574 daily vehicle trips and 1,979 net new daily vehicle trips.
- Prior to the consideration of the TDM measures described in Section 2.9, the estimated Daily Household VMT per Capita for Option B is 6.8, which is less than the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 7.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita.
- Prior to the consideration of the TDM measures described in Section 2.9, the estimated Daily Work VMT per Employee for Option B is 14.5, which is greater than the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee.
- Taking the TDM measures described in Section 2.9 into consideration, the estimated Daily Household VMT per Capita for Option B is reduced to 5.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita, which further below the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 7.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita. The estimated Daily Work VMT per Employee for Option B is reduced to 11.6 Daily Work VMT per Employee, which is greater than the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee.

While the Option B Daily Work VMT per Employee is greater than the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee, LLG has identified that the total VMT related to the residential and commercial components would fall below the total VMT that would be calculated using the applicable thresholds of significance for Option B based on the data provided in LADOT's VMT Calculator. A memorandum detailing the methodology for determining the less than significant impact was submitted to LADOT staff and was approved by LADOT on April 1, 2021.¹² The approved memorandum is attached in *Appendix I*.

As stated above, the Daily Household VMT per Capita for the residential component of Option B is calculated to be 5.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, which is well below the threshold for the West Los Angeles APC of 7.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita. For the office component of Option B, the Daily Work VMT per Employee value is calculated to be reduced from 14.5 to 11.6 with consideration of TDM measures. While the Daily Work VMT per Employee value after application of TDM measures is greater than the threshold of 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee, a finding of a less than significant impact is made related to the Daily Work VMT per Employee for Option B in consideration of the "excess" mitigation provided by the TDM measures recommended for Option B. For example, as shown in VMT Calculator output provided in *Appendix E*, prior to consideration of TDM measures, the Daily Household VMT per Capita associated with the residential component of Option B is 6.8 VMT, which is below the threshold of significance of

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

7.4 VMT. Implementation of the following TDM measures previously described in Section 2.9, while not required, will further reduce the Option B Daily Household VMT per Capita: Transit Subsidies for Project residents; Promotions and Marketing; Bike Parking per the LAMC; Secure Bicycle Parking and Showers; and Pedestrian Network Improvements. The resulting Daily Household VMT per Capita for the residential component is with implementation of the non-required TDM measures is calculated to be reduced to 5.4 VMT, which is substantially less than the threshold of significance for the West Los Angeles APC (7.4 VMT) and therefore is deemed to offset the unmitigated portion of the Daily Work VMT per Employee related to the office component. This is demonstrated through the calculation of total VMT, as further described in the memorandum provided in *Appendix I*.

4.2.3 Summary of Cumulative VMT Analysis

As stated in the City's TAG (refer to Section 2.2.4 thereof), analyses should consider both shortterm and long-term project effects on VMT. Short-term effects are evaluated in the detailed Project-level VMT analysis summarized above. Long-term, or cumulative, effects are determined through a consistency check with the SCAG RTP/SCS. The RTP/SCS is the regional plan that demonstrates compliance with air quality conformity requirements and GHG reduction targets. As such, projects that are consistent with this plan in terms of development, location, density, and intensity, are part of the regional solution for meeting air pollution and GHG goals. Projects that are deemed to be consistent would have a less than significant cumulative impact on VMT. Development in a location where the RTP/SCS does not specify any development may indicate a significant impact on transportation. However, as discussed in the TAG, for projects that do not demonstrate a significant impact based on an efficiency-based significance threshold (i.e., VMT per Capita or VMT per Employee), the determination that the project would individually have a less-than-significant VMT impact is sufficient to demonstrate there would be no cumulatively significant VMT impact associated with the project and the relevant related projects. This is because projects that fall under the City's efficiency-based impact thresholds are already shown to align with the long-term VMT and GHG reduction goals of SCAG's RTP/SCS.

Based on the Option A VMT analysis and conclusion in Section 4.2.2, above (i.e., which conclude that Option A falls under the City's efficiency-based significant impact thresholds and thus are already shown to align with the long-term VMT and GHG reduction goals of SCAG's RTP/SCS), no cumulative VMT impact is anticipated. Therefore, the Option A cumulative VMT impact would be less than significant.

Based on the Option B VMT analysis and conclusion in Section 4.2.2, above (i.e., which conclude that the excess TDM mitigation provided for the residential component of Option B will offset the unmitigated Daily Work VMT per Employee impact of the office component), no cumulative VMT impact is anticipated. Therefore, the Option B cumulative VMT impact would be less than significant.

¹² Per email with Eddie Guerrero, LADOT Senior Transportation Engineer on April 1, 2021.

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

4.3 Geometric Design (Threshold T-3)

As stated in the City's TAG (refer to Section 2.4.1 thereof), impacts regarding the potential increase of hazards due to a geometric design feature generally relate to the design of access points to and from the project site, and may include safety, operational, or capacity impacts. Impacts can be related to vehicle/vehicle, vehicle/bicycle, or vehicle/pedestrian conflicts as well as to operational delays caused by vehicles slowing and/or queuing to access a project site. These conflicts may be created by the driveway configuration or through the placement of project driveway(s) in areas of inadequate visibility, adjacent to bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or too close to busy or congested intersections. Evaluation of access impacts require details relative to project land use, size, design, location of access points, etc. These impacts are typically evaluated for permanent conditions after project completion but can also be evaluated for temporary conditions during project construction. Project access can be analyzed in qualitative and/or quantitative terms, and in conjunction with the review of internal site circulation and access to parking areas. All proposed site access points should be evaluated.

4.3.1 Screening Criteria

Per Section 2.4.2 of the TAG, if the project requires a discretionary action, and the answer is "yes" to either of the following questions, further analysis will be required to assess whether the project would result in impacts due to geometric design hazards or incompatible uses:

- Is the project proposing new driveways, or introducing new vehicle access to the property from the public right-of-way?
 - Yes, Option A proposes to shift the existing driveway along the Project Site's Maxella Avenue frontage approximately 101 feet east of the existing driveway. Additionally, Option A proposes a new driveway along the Project Site's Glencoe Avenue frontage, approximately 113 feet south of the existing driveway. Option B proposes to shift the existing driveway along the Project Site's Maxella Avenue frontage approximately two feet west of the existing driveway.
- Is the project proposing to, or required to make any voluntary or required modifications to the public right-of-way (i.e., street dedications, reconfigurations of curb line, etc.)?

As stated in the City's TAG (refer to Section 2.4.2 thereof), for the purpose of the screening for projects that include physical changes to the public right-of-way, the street designation and improvement standard for any project frontage along streets classified as an Avenue or Boulevard (as designated in the City's General Plan) must first be determined using Mobility Plan 2035 or NavigateLA. If any street fronting the project site is an Avenue or Boulevard and it is determined that additional dedication, or physical modifications to the public right-of-way are proposed or required, the answer to this question is yes. For projects not subject to dedication and improvement requirements under the LAMC, but the project nonetheless includes dedications or physical modifications to the public right-of-way, the answer to this question is yes. Based on a review of the proposed project, the following answer is provided:

• Yes, a three-foot street dedication is required for Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue along the Project Site.

As the answer is "yes" to all of the screening criteria questions, further analysis is required to assess whether the Project would result in impacts due to geometric design hazards or incompatible uses.

4.3.2 Impact Criteria and Methodology

The significance threshold set forth in Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, as well as the City's TAG, for substantially increasing hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use (referred to a Threshold T-3), is as follows:

- Threshold T-3: Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
 - No, neither Option A nor Option B would substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature.

As set forth in Section 2.4.3 of the TAG, in making this determination, preliminary project access plans are to be reviewed in light of commonly accepted traffic engineering design standards to ascertain whether any deficiencies are apparent in the site access plans which would be considered significant. The determination of significance shall be on a case-by-case basis, considering the following factors:

- The relative amount of pedestrian activity at project access points.
- Design features/physical configurations that affect the visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists to drivers entering and exiting the site, and the visibility of cars to pedestrians and bicyclists.
- The type of bicycle facilities the project driveway(s) crosses and the relative level of utilization.
- The physical conditions of the site and surrounding area, such as curves, slopes, walks, landscaping or other barriers, that could result in vehicle/pedestrian, vehicle/bicycle, or vehicle/vehicle impacts.
- The project location, or project-related changes to the public right-of-way, relative to proximity to the High Injury Network or a Safe Routes to School program area.
- Any other conditions, including the approximate location of incompatible uses that would substantially increase a transportation hazard.

With respect to vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian safety impacts, the TAG (refer to Section 2.4.4 thereof) indicates that a review of all project access points, internal circulation, and parking access from an operational and safety perspective (for example, turning radii, driveway queuing, line of sight for turns into and out of project driveway[s]) should be conducted. Where project driveways would cross pedestrian facilities or bicycle facilities (bike lanes or bike paths), operational and safety issues related to the potential for vehicle/pedestrian and vehicle/bicycle conflicts and the severity of consequences that could result should be considered. In areas with moderate to high levels of pedestrian or bicycle activity, the collection of pedestrian or bicycle count data may be required.

4.3.3 Qualitative Review of Site Access Points

As discussed in Section 3.3.3 herein, the Project Site has frontage along Maxella Avenue, an Avenue III with a posted speed limit of 25 miles per hour, and Glencoe Avenue, a Collector with a posted speed limit of 25 miles per hour. Option A and Option B will enhance the pedestrian experience along these corridors, including at the Project Site access points, which will enhance connections to and from the numerous pedestrian destinations in the direct vicinity of the Project Site. As previously noted, Option A and Option B will be required to provide a 3-foot dedication along the Project Site, thereby providing opportunities for wider sidewalks and/or parkway areas on Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue and also reduces the potential for vehicle/pedestrian conflicts at driveways. Excellent line of sight is provided for all modes of travel (motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists) at the Project Site driveways under Option A and Option B. Sidewalks are provided along both the Project Site's Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue frontages, and signalized crossings within convenient walking distance to the Project Site. Neither Option A nor Option B will add site access points along the Project Site's Maxella Avenue frontage. Option A will remove one site vehicular site access point along the Project Site's Glencoe Avenue frontage and shift the existing northerly driveway along Glencoe Avenue 113 feet south, increasing the distance between the driveway and the Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue intersection. Option B will reduce the number of curb cuts along the Project Site's Glencoe Avenue frontage from three to one, with the southerly Glencoe Avenue Driveway to remain. The Project Site and surrounding area are in good physical condition and located on flat terrain. The physical condition of the Project Site and proposed entry/exit points would be improved by both Option A and Option B, therefore, the potential for vehicle/pedestrian, vehicle/bicycle, or vehicle/vehicle impacts would be reduced. Neither Maxella Avenue nor Glencoe Avenue are noted in the City's HIN. Given the existing physical conditions of the Project Site and planned reduction of curb cuts along Glencoe Avenue, no safety concerns related to geometric design are noted. The driveways would be designed to comply with LADOT standards. The driveways would not require the removal or relocation of existing passenger transit stops and would be designed and configured to avoid or minimize potential conflicts with transit services and pedestrian traffic. No security gates or other parking control features are proposed along the Project Site driveways in close proximity to the public right-ofway under Option A or Option B. As discussed in a following section, no excessive vehicle queuing is anticipated at the Project Site driveways under Option A or Option B. Project Site driveways will be designed and constructed to City standards to ensure adequate maneuvering by

vehicles entering and exiting the Project Site. Therefore, it can be determined that neither Option A nor Option B would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use, and a less than significant impact determination can be reached.

4.4 Freeway Safety Analysis

It is noted that the City issued an interim guidance on the preparation of a freeway safety analysis for land use projects.¹³ If the answer is yes to the following question, a freeway safety analysis will be required to assess whether the project would lengthen a forecasted off-ramp queue and create speed differentials between vehicles exiting freeway off-ramps and vehicles operation on the freeway mainline:

- Does the land use project add 25 or more trips to any nearby freeway off-ramp serving the project site in either the morning or afternoon peak-hour?
 - No, the Project does not add 25 or more trips to any nearby freeway off-ramp serving the Project Site in either the morning or afternoon peak hour. SR-90 is an at-grade roadway in the immediate Project Site vicinity. As SR-90 is an at-grade roadway, the Mindanao Way / SR-90 Westbound and Mindanao Way / SR-90 Eastbound intersections are not considered to be freeway off-ramps. As there are no freeway off-ramps located in the immediate Project Site area, neither Option A nor Option B will add 25 or more trips to any nearby freeway off-ramps.

As the answer is "no" to the screening criteria question (i.e., Option A and Option B will not add 25 or more trips to nearby freeway off-ramps serving the Project Site during either the AM of PM peak hour), a freeway safety analysis is not required, and both Option A and Option B would cause a less than significant freeway safety impact.

4.5 CEQA Transportation Measures

4.5.1 Transportation Demand Management

The Applicant will comply with existing applicable City ordinances (e.g., the City's existing TDM Ordinance, referred to in the LAMC Section 12.26.J) and the other requirements per the City's Municipal Code, as well as the TDM requirements of the Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan. Beyond the requirements in the TDM ordinance and Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan, Option B includes six TDM strategies to be implemented as mitigation measures and are described in detail in Section 2.9 above. The TDM strategies include:

- Transit Subsidies;
- Promotions and Marketing;
- Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommuting;

¹³ LADOT Transportation Assessments – Interim Guidance for Freeway Safety Analysis, City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation, May 2020.

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

- Include Bicycle Parking per LAMC;
- Include Secure Bicycle Parking and Showers; and
- Pedestrian Network Improvements.

4.5.2 CEQA Transportation Summary

Based on the analysis and findings above, Option A would not conflict with City plans, policies, ordinances and programs, would not result in a significant VMT impact, would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, and would not result in a freeway safety impact. Therefore, for CEQA purposes, the transportation impacts of Option A would be less than significant.

Based on the analysis and findings above, Option B would not conflict with City plans, policies, ordinances and programs, would not result in a significant VMT impact, would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, and would not result in a freeway safety impact. Therefore, for CEQA purposes, the transportation impacts of Option B would be less than significant.

5.0 NON-CEQA ANALYSIS

The authority for requiring non-CEQA transportation analysis and potentially requiring improvements to address identified deficiencies lies in the City of Los Angeles' Site Plan Review authority as established in LAMC Section 16.05. As provided in Section 16.05:

"The purposes of site plan review are to promote orderly development, evaluate and mitigate significant environmental impacts, and promote public safety and the general welfare by ensuring that development projects are properly related to their sites, surrounding properties, traffic circulation, sewers, other infrastructure and environmental setting; and to control or mitigate the development of projects which are likely to have a significant adverse effect on the environment as identified in the City's environmental review process, or on surrounding properties by reason of inadequate site planning or improvements."

Additional authority is found in other City ordinances, such as certain transportation specific plans. The impacts, also referred to as deficiencies, discussed in the City's TAG are not intended to be interpreted as thresholds of significance, or significance criteria for purposes of CEQA review unless otherwise specifically identified (refer to Section 4.0).

5.1 Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Access

The assessment of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities is intended to determine a project's potential effect on pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities in the vicinity of the project. A potential deficiency could be physical (through removal, modification, or degradation of facilities) or demand-based (by adding pedestrian or bicycle demand to inadequate facilities).

5.1.1 Screening Criteria

Per Section 3.2.2 of the TAG, if the answer is yes to all of the following questions, further analysis is required to assess whether the Project would negatively affect existing pedestrian, bicycle, or transit facilities:

- Does the land use project involve a discretionary action that would be under review by the Department of City Planning?
 - Yes, Option A and Option B involve a discretionary action that would be under review by the Department of City Planning.
- Does the land use project include the construction, or addition of 50 dwelling units or guest rooms or combination thereof, or 50,000 square feet of non-residential space?
 - Yes, Option A proposes the construction of 592 market-rate residential apartment dwelling units and 66 affordable housing dwelling units. Additionally, Option A proposes the construction of 27,300 square feet of non-residential space, including 13,650 square feet of restaurant floor area and 13,650 square feet of commercial floor area. Option B proposes the construction of 382 market-rate residential apartment

dwelling units, 43 affordable housing dwelling units, and 130,000 square feet of nonresidential space, including 20,000 square feet of restaurant floor area, 20,000 square feet of commercial floor area, and 90,000 square feet of office floor area.

- Would the project generate a net increase of 1,000 daily vehicle trips, or is the project's frontage along a street classified as an Avenue or Boulevard (as designated in the City General Plan), 250 linear feet or more, or is the project's building frontage encompassing an entire block along a street classified as an Avenue or Boulevard by the City's General Plan?
 - Yes, both Option A and Option B will generate a net increase of 1,000 daily vehicle trips. As indicated on the Screening Tab of the City's VMT Calculator (Page 1 of *Appendix D*), Option A would generate a net increase of 1,379 daily vehicle trips. As indicated on the Screening Tab of the City's VMT Calculator (Page 1 of *Appendix E*), Option B would generate net increase of 1,979 daily vehicle trips. The Project Site's frontage along Maxella Avenue, which is designated as an Avenue III, is approximately 505 linear feet. The Project Site's frontage along Glencoe Avenue, which is designated as a Collector, is approximately 555 linear feet. The Project Site's frontage along Maxella Avenue or the Glencoe Avenue does not include an entire block.

As the answer is "yes" to all of the screening criteria, further analysis is required to assess whether the Project would negatively affect existing pedestrian, bicycle, or transit facilities.

5.1.2 Evaluation Criteria

Per Section 3.2.2 of the TAG, factors to consider when assessing a project's potential effect on pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities, include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Would a project directly or indirectly result in a permanent removal or modification that would lead to the degradation of pedestrian, bicycle, or transit facilities, such as:
 - Removal or degradation of existing sidewalks, crosswalks, pedestrian refuge islands, and/or curb extensions/bulbouts.
 - Removal or degradation of existing bikeways and/or supporting facilities (e.g., bikeshare stations, on-street bike racks/parking, bike corrals, etc.).
 - Removal or degradation of existing transit and/or local circulator facilities including stop, bench, shelter, concrete pad, bus lane, or other amenities.
 - Removal of other existing transportation system elements supporting sustainable mobility.
 - Increase street crossing distance for pedestrians; increase in number of travel/turning lanes; increase in turning radius or turning speeds.

- Removal, degradation, or narrowing of an existing sidewalk, path, crossing, or pedestrian access way.
- Removal or narrowing of existing sidewalk-street buffering elements (e.g., curb extension, parkway, planting strip, street trees, etc.).
- Would a project intensify use of existing pedestrian, bicycle, or transit facilities, such as:
 - Increase in pedestrian or vehicle volume, and thereby increase the need or attraction to cross a street at unmarked pedestrian crossings or unsignalized or uncontrolled intersections where a crossing is not available without significant rerouting. Refer to the Guidelines for Marked Crosswalks Across Uncontrolled Locations, in LADOT's Manual of Policies and Procedures (MPP) Section 344, or Guidelines for Traffic Signals in MPP Section 353 to determine approval and warrant criteria for an additional crossing.
 - Result in new pedestrian demand between project site entries/exits and major destinations or transit stops expected to serve the development where there are missing pedestrian facilities (e.g., gaps in the sidewalk network) or substandard pedestrian facilities (e.g., narrow or uneven sidewalks, no crosswalks at intersections or mid-block, no marked crossing, or push button crossing rather than actuated, etc.).
 - Increase transit demand at bus stops that lack marked crossings, with insufficient sidewalks, or are in isolated, or unlit areas.

The locations and descriptions of pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities in the Project vicinity that could be affected by Project-related traffic or by users traveling between the Project Site and nearby destinations is presented in Section 3.0 (Project Context) herein. Potential pedestrian destinations located within an approximately one-quarter mile (i.e., 1,320 feet) from the Project Site (as stated in Section 3.2.4 of the TAG) are noted in *Figure 3–1*. Pedestrian facilities currently located near the Project Site also are provided in *Figure 3–2*. The location of the City's Bicycle Network within the immediate Project Site vicinity and in the surrounding area is shown in *Figure 3–5*.

5.1.3 Results of Qualitative Access Review

Table 5–1 summarizes the City's criteria associated with the two guiding questions regarding the pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access assessment and the determination of potential Project-related effect on the subject facilities in the Project vicinity. The determination is based on whether the Project would create deficiencies that could be physical (through removal, modification, or degradation of facilities) or demand-based (by adding pedestrian or bicycle demand to inadequate facilities). As indicated in *Table 5–1*, the Project does not include any features that would permanently remove, adversely modify, or degrade pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities in the Project vicinity. As also noted in *Table 5–1*, it is possible that the Project may nominally intensify use of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities in the Project vicinity. As

Table 5-1 PROJECT EVALUATION OF PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE, AND TRANSIT ACCESS

| | | 14-Dec-20 |
|---|---|--|
| CRITERIA | PROJECT RESPONSE | FURTHER QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT? |
| PERMANENT REMOVAL OR MOL | DIFICATION OF FACILITIES | |
| Removal or degradation of existing sidewalks, crosswalks, pedestrian refuge islands, and/or curb extensions/bulbouts. | No | No |
| Removal or degradation of existing bikeways and/or supporting facilities (e.g., bikeshare stations, on-street bike racks/parking, bike corrals, etc.). | No | No |
| Removal or degradation of existing transit and/or local circulator facilities including stop, bench, shelter, concrete pad, bus lane, or other amenities. | No | No |
| Removal of other existing transportation system elements supporting sustainable mobility. | No | No |
| Increase street crossing distance for pedestrians; increase in number of travel/turning lanes; increase in turning radius or turning speeds. | No | No |
| Removal, degradation, or narrowing of an existing sidewalk, path, crossing, or pedestrian access way. | No | No |
| Removal or narrowing of existing sidewalk-street buffering elements (e.g., curb extension, parkway, planting strip, street trees, etc.). | No | No |
| INTENSIFY USE O | F FACILITIES | |
| Increase in pedestrian or vehicle volume, and thereby increase the need or attraction to cross a street at unmarked pedestrian crossings or unsignalized or uncontrolled intersections where a crossing is not available without significant rerouting. Refer to the Guidelines for Marked Crosswalks Across Uncontrolled Locations, in LADOT's Manual of Policies and Procedures (MPP) Section 344, or Guidelines for Traffic Signals in MPP Section 353 to determine approval and warrant criteria for an additional crossing. | The Project may nominally increase pedestrians attempting to cross Maxella Avenue and/or Glencoe Avenue. Existing signalized crossings are available along the Project Site's frontage midblock at Maxella Avenue and at the Glencoe Avenue Maxella Avenue intersection. Futher, the Project proposes to shift the existing midblock crossing on Maxella Avenue 100 feet to the west and provide signalized crossings in conjunction with the signalized crossings in to dy Maxella Avenue intersection. Therefore, the need for a marked crosswalk is not warranted per LADOT MPP Section 344. | No |
| Result in new pedestrian demand between project site entries/exits and major destinations or transit stops expected to serve the development where there are missing pedestrian facilities (e.g., gaps in the sidewalk network) or substandard pedestrian facilities (e.g., narrow or uneven sidewalks, no crosswalks at intersections or mid-block, no marked crossing, or push button crossing rather than actuated, etc.). | The Project may nominally increase pedestrians walking to local destinations and/or transit stops. The intersections along Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue provides crosswalks and pedestrian phasing. | No |
| Increase transit demand at bus stops that lack marked crossings, with insufficient sidewalks, or are in isolated, unshaded, or unlit areas. | The Project may nominally increase pedestrians walking to local transit stops. Transit stops for BBB Rapid 3, BBB Route 16, and CCB Route 7 are provided at the Lincoln Boulevard / Marina Pointe Drive - Maxella Avenue intersection. Transit stops for BBB Route 16 are provided at the Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue intersection. These intersections are signalized and provide crosswalks with pedestrian phasing. | No |

also shown in *Table 5–1*, the Project has the potential to nominally increase pedestrian activity to an existing unmarked crossing (e.g., across Maxella Avenue and/or Glencoe Avenue), but this is not expected to result in a deficient condition.

It is noted that the Project Site is located in close proximity to roadways (e.g., Lincoln Boulevard) included on the HIN. As such, it is understood that LADOT staff may coordinate internal review with the Vision Zero Programs Bureau to determine if safety-related measures are needed to support safe access to and/or from the development site for vulnerable road users (i.e., pedestrians and bicyclists).

Based on this analysis, no specific actions or improvements are recommended relating to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access for both Option A and Option B.

5.2 **Project Access and Circulation Review**

Project access and circulation constraints relate to the provision of access to and from the project site, and may include safety, operational, or capacity constraints. Constraints can be related to vehicular/vehicular, vehicular/bicycle, or vehicular/pedestrian constraints as well as to operational delays. These conflicts may be created by the driveway configuration or through the placement of Project driveway(s) in areas of inadequate visibility, adjacent to bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or too close to an intersection or crosswalk. The Project access and circulation has been evaluated for permanent conditions after Project completion. *Tables* 5-2 and 5-3 summarize the vehicle queuing analysis prepared for each of the study locations for the representative intersection traffic movements for the weekday AM and PM peak hours, for Option A and Option B, respectively. *Appendix J* and *Appendix K* contain the analysis data worksheets for the study intersections for Option A and Option B, respectively.

5.2.1 Screening Criteria

For land use projects, if the answer is yes to all of the following questions (refer to Section 3.3.2 of the TAG), further analysis will be required to assess whether the project would negatively affect project access and circulation:

- Does the land use project involve a discretionary action that would be under review by the Department of City Planning?
 - Yes, the Project will require a discretionary action that would be under review by the Department of City Planning.
- Would the land use project generate a net increase of 250 or more daily vehicle trips?
 - Yes, both Option A and Option B will generate a net increase of 250 or more daily vehicle trips. As indicated on the Screening Tab of the City's VMT Calculator (Page 1 of *Appendix D*), Option A would generate a net increase of 1,379 daily vehicle trips. As indicated on the Screening Tab of the City's VMT Calculator (Page 1 of *Appendix E*), Option B would generate net increase of 1,979 daily vehicle trips.

| | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | VEAD 2026 F | UTUDE W | 13-Apr-21 |
|-----|--|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|----------|------------------|----------------|----------|------------------|--------------|---------|-----------|
| | | TRAFFIC | PEAK | YEA | R 2020 EXIS | STING | YEAR 2020 I | XISTING | W/ PROJECT | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W/ | O PROJECT | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE W | PROJECT | I LAK 2020 F | ROVEME | NTS |
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| 1 | Walgrove Avenue / Washington Boulevard (Incignalized) | SB Left/Right | AM PM | 64.4 155.5 | F F | 215.0 430.0 | 68.2 160.8 | F F | 222.5 435.0 | 138.1 291.2 | F F | 335.0 610.0 | 149.2 300.0 | F F | 347.5 620.0 | - | | |
| | (Chaighanized) | EB Left | AM PM | 25.0 18.1 | C C | 112.5 67.5 | 25.6 18.4 | D C | 117.5 70.0 | 33.9 23.0 | D C | 157.5 95.0 | 35.1 23.5 | E C | 162.5 95.0 | - | | |
| 2 | Lincoln Boulevard / Marina Pointe Drive - Maxella Avenue (Signalizzed) | NB Left | AM PM | 44.6 47.2 | D D | 73.9 122.9 | 44.6 47.2 | D D | 73.9 122.9 | 46.0 47.8 | D D | 78.4 130.4 | 46.0 47.8 | D D | 78.4 130.4 | | | |
| | (Signanzer) | NB Through | AM PM | 140.5 76.7 | F F | 1225.2 814.0 | 140.5 76.7 | F F | 1225.2 814.0 | 176.2 123.0 | F F | 1459.9 1111.2 | 176.2 123.0 | F F | 1459.9 1111.2 | - | | |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 22.2 24.0 | C C | 234.3 293.7 | 22.6 24.4 | C C | 245.9 306.5 | 22.9 26.0 | C C | 257.0 355.3 | 23.3 26.5 | C C | 268.8 369.4 | - | | |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 33.8 33.6 | C C | 62.7 53.2 | 33.8 33.7 | C C | 65.4 55.8 | 33.9 33.7 | C C | 68.0 59.5 | 33.9 33.8 | C C | 70.8 62.2 | - | - | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 40.2 45.0 | D D | 493.7 598.6 | 40.2 45.0 | D D | 493.7 598.6 | 42.1 51.1 | D D | 540.5 684.3 | 42.1 51.1 | D D | 540.5 684.3 | - | - | |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 45.3 54.3 | D D | 511.9 627.2 | 45.3 54.3 | D D | 511.9 627.2 | 48.7 64.6 | D E | 564.8 732.8 | 48.7 64.6 | D E | 564.8 732.8 | - | - | |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 45.6 45.9 | D D | 99.3 113.1 | 45.6 45.9 | D D | 99.3 113.1 | 45.8 46.1 | D D | 106.2 120.0 | 45.8 46.1 | D D | 106.2 120.0 | - | - | |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 45.6 45.1 | D D | 104.4 84.0 | 45.6 45.1 | D D | 104.4 84.0 | 45.7 45.2 | D D | 111.3 89.5 | 45.7 45.2 | D D | 111.3 89.5 | - | - | |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 7.1 6.5 | A A | 140.9 71.9 | 7.1 6.5 | A A | 140.9 71.9 | 7.2 6.5 | A A | 150.2 76.2 | 7.2 6.5 | A A | 150.2 76.2 | - | - | |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 52.3 74.1 | D E | 175.0 332.5 | 52.8 73.7 | D E | 187.8 330.8 | 59.6 108.8 | E F | 254.3 457.8 | 61.7 108.1 | E F | 268.1 455.2 | - | - | |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 51.1 66.4 | D E | 139.2 302.4 | 51.3 66.3 | D E | 145.1 301.8 | 52.5 79.8 | D E | 182.3 363.3 | 52.7 79.6 | D E | 188.5 362.5 | - | - | |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 35.7 37.8 | D D | 141.0 223.3 | 36.1 37.8 | D D | 156.2 222.1 | 36.1 38.4 | D D | 157.5 241.4 | 36.4 38.3 | D D | 172.9 240.3 | - | - | |
| 3 | Del Rey Avenue / Maxella Avenue (Invinentized) | SB Left/Right | AM PM | 11.8 17.0 | B C | 15.0 70.0 | 12.0 17.0 | B C | 17.5 70.0 | 13.4 21.4 | B C | 32.5 100.0 | 13.6 21.5 | B C | 32.5 102.5 | | | |
| | (Onsignanzeu) | EB Left | AM PM | 8.5 8.9 | A A | 10.0 7.5 | 8.6 8.9 | A A | 12.5 7.5 | 8.7 9.3 | A A | 12.5 10.0 | 8.8 9.3 | A A | 12.5 10.0 | - | - | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W/ | 13-Apr-21 PROJECT + |
|----|---|---------------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|----------|----------------|------------------|----------|------------------------|
| NO | INTERSECTION | TRAFFIC MOVEMENT | PEAK HOUR | YEAF DELAV [2] | 2020 EXIS | OUFUE 141 | YEAR 2020 E | XISTING V | V/ PROJECT | YEAR 2026 I DELAV [2] | FUTURE W/ | O PROJECT | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE W | / PROJECT | IMP DELAV [2] | ROVEMEN | VTS OUFUE 141 |
| | | | nook | | - | QULUE [4] | DEE.11 [2] | | QULUE [4] | DEE.11 [2] | 100 [0] | QULUE [1] | | 200[0] | QULUE [4] | DEL.[1] | 100 [0] | Quint [4] |
| 4 | Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue | NB Lett | AM PM | 14.3 20.5 | В С | 10.0 20.0 | 11.0 10.9 | B | 28.5 23.9 | 16.2 27.2 | C D | 15.0 35.0 | 10.9 | B | 31.7 28.3 | | | |
| | (Unsignalized w/o Project; Signalized w/ Project) | ND Di-Le | | 0.8 | | 7.6 | 11.4 | р | 24.1 | 10.1 | р | 7.6 | 11.0 | р | 26.9 | | | |
| | | NB Right | PM | 9.8 | B | 5.0 | 10.8 | В | 18.3 | 10.1 | В | 7.5 | 10.9 | В | 22.2 | - | | |
| | | FB Through | AM | | | | 12.3 | в | 78.5 | | | | 12.7 | в | 91.5 | | | |
| | | | PM | | | | 13.6 | В | 125.1 | | | | 14.2 | В | 147.4 | | | |
| | | EB Right | AM | | | | 12.4 | в | 76.3 | | | | 12.8 | в | 88.8 | | | |
| | | | PM | | | | 13.7 | В | 119.0 | | | | 14.4 | в | 139.4 | | | |
| | | WB Left | AM | 8.2 | А | 2.5 | 13.8 | в | 16.9 | 8.3 | А | 2.5 | 14.5 | в | 19.9 | | | |
| | | | PM | 8.8 | Α | 5.0 | 16.3 | В | 27.0 | 9.1 | А | 5.0 | 18.1 | в | 37.5 | | | |
| | | WB Through | AM | | | | 11.5 | В | 54.2 | | | | 11.7 | B | 60.5 | | | |
| | | | Pivi | | | | 12.1 | Б | 11.1 | | | | 12.5 | Б | 94.5 | - | | |
| 5 | Maxella Avenue Driveway/ | NB Right | AM | 9.4 | А | 0.0 | 9.5 | А | 0.0 | 9.6 | А | 0.0 | 9.8 | А | 0.0 | | | |
| | Maxella Avenue | - | PM | 9.9 | А | 0.0 | 9.9 | Α | 0.0 | 10.2 | В | 0.0 | 10.2 | В | 0.0 | | | |
| | (Unsignalized) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Glencoe Avenue / | NB Left | AM | 17.9 | в | 59.4 | 18.2 | в | 60.2 | 19.3 | в | 67.2 | 19.7 | в | 68.1 | | | |
| | Maxella Avenue | | PM | 22.4 | С | 77.2 | 22.9 | С | 78.2 | 30.5 | С | 116.9 | 31.7 | С | 119.3 | | | |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM | 18.6 | в | 280.9 | 20.2 | С | 304.6 | 21.9 | С | 327.0 | 24.7 | С | 359.7 | | | |
| | | | PM | 13.0 | В | 151.8 | 13.0 | В | 150.5 | 13.5 | В | 174.9 | 13.5 | В | 173.3 | - | | |
| | | NB Right | AM | 10.7 | В | 19.5 | 10.7 | В | 19.5 | 10.7 | B | 20.6 | 10.7 | B | 20.6 | | | |
| | | | Pivi | 10.8 | Б | 25.9 | 10.8 | Б | 23.9 | 10.8 | Б | 27.4 | 10.8 | Б | 27.4 | | | |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 24.1 16.8 | C B | 44.2 22.7 | 25.3 16.8 | C B | 45.5 22.7 | 26.7 18.0 | C B | 51.1 27.4 | 28.1 17.9 | C B | 53.0 27.3 | | - | |
| | | 0D 77 1 | | | - | | 10.0 | | | 10.0 | | | | | | | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 12.5 | В | 128.1 189.4 | 12.6 | В | 132.9 194.3 | 12.9 | B | 218.0 | 13.0 | B | 150.6 224.0 | | - | |
| | | SB Right | AM | 12.6 | в | 122.7 | 12.6 | в | 127.4 | 12.9 | в | 1393 | 13.0 | в | 144.2 | | | |
| | | ob rigin | PM | 14.0 | В | 180.2 | 14.2 | В | 186.5 | 15.2 | В | 208.9 | 15.5 | В | 214.8 | | | |
| | | EB Left | AM | 13.4 | в | 47.9 | 13.8 | в | 57.2 | 14.0 | в | 57.6 | 14.4 | в | 67.3 | | | |
| | | | PM | 15.4 | В | 72.3 | 15.4 | В | 72.0 | 16.8 | в | 90.4 | 16.8 | в | 89.9 | | | |
| | | EB Through | AM | 11.3 | В | 38.6 | 11.3 | В | 41.1 | 11.4 | В | 45.3 | 11.5 | В | 47.9 | | | |
| | | | РМ | 11.8 | в | 57.2 | 11.7 | в | 56.8 | 12.0 | в | 68.3 | 12.0 | в | 67.7 | | | |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 12.0 | B | 55.2 81.0 | 12.2 | B | 59.0 81.0 | 12.4 | B | 66.9 89.5 | 12.5 | B | 70.8 89.5 | - | | |
| | | | | | - | | | - | 01.0 | | 5 | | | 5 | 0,15 | | | |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 12.5 | B | 27.5 44.7 | 12.6 13.9 | B | 27.6 44.5 | 12.9 14.5 | B | 29.6 48.9 | 13.0 14.5 | B | 29.9 48.9 | | - | |
| | | WB Through | AM | 11.1 | R | 31.7 | 11.1 | в | 32.0 | 11.2 | в | 35.7 | 11.2 | в | 37.0 | - | _ | |
| | | WD Infough | PM | 11.6 | В | 52.6 | 11.6 | В | 53.3 | 11.8 | B | 61.0 | 11.9 | В | 61.7 | | - | - |
| | | WB Right | AM | 11.3 | в | 32.5 | 11.3 | в | 32.5 | 11.4 | в | 35.4 | 11.4 | в | 35.5 | | | |
| | | 5 | PM | 11.8 | В | 50.1 | 11.8 | В | 50.7 | 12.0 | В | 57.8 | 12.1 | В | 58.6 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Northerly Driveway | NB Left | AM PM | | | | 9.7 10.9 | A B | 2.5 5.0 | | - | | 10.0 11.5 | B B | 2.5 5.0 | | - | |
| | (Unsignalized) | ED Di-La | 434 | | | | 11.9 | Р | 75 | | | | 12.2 | P | 75 | | | |
| | | EB Kight | PM PM | | | | 11.8 12.9 | В | 7.5 5.0 | | | | 12.5 | В | 7.5 7.5 | | _ | |
| | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | VEAD 2024 P | CEUDENS | 13-Apr-21 |
|-----|--|---------------|----------|---------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|---------|----------------|----------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|---------|-----------------|--------------|----------|----------------|
| | | TRAFFIC | PEAK | YEAR | 2020 EXIS | STING | YEAR 2020 F | XISTING | W/ PROJECT | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | O PROJECT | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE | V/PROJECT | Y EAR 2026 F | UTURE W/ | FROJECT + |
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| 8 | Glencoe Avenue / | NB Left | AM | 9.5 | A | 2.5 | 9.8 | A | 2.5 | 9.9 | A | 2.5 | 10.2 | В | 2.5 | 9.1 | A | 8.9 |
| | Glencoe Avenue Southerly Driveway - Villa Velletri Driveway (Unsignalized; Signalized w/ Improvements) | NB Through | AM | | | 5.0 | | | 5.0 | | | - | - | | 5.0 | 6.9 | A | 23.0 145.5 |
| | | | PM | | | | | | | | | - | | | | 6.2 | А | 96.3 |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | | | - | - | | | | - | - | | | - | 6.9 6.2 | A A | 145.3 95.8 |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 9.4 8.5 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.5 8.6 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.6 8.8 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.7 8.8 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 8.1 7.0 | A A | 1.3 4.2 |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | | | | | | | | | - | | | - | 7.3 8.1 | A A | 165.6 212.7 |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | | | - | - | | | | | - | | | - | 7.3 8.1 | A A | 163.9 209.4 |
| | | EB Left/Right | AM PM | 28.3 118.5 | D F | 10.0 142.5 | 42.3 116.7 | E F | 50.0 137.5 | 35.3 230.9 | E F | 12.5 200.0 | 59.8 227.0 | F F | 67.5 192.5 | 28.8 29.8 | C C | 60.0 95.1 |
| | | WB Left/Right | AM PM | 23.2 21.4 | C C | 7.5 5.0 | 25.8 21.9 | D C | 10.0 5.0 | 27.3 25.5 | D D | 10.0 5.0 | 30.8 26.1 | D D | 12.5 5.0 | 27.9 27.7 | C D | 18.5 10.0 |
| 9 | Mindanao Way/ Glencoe Avenue | NB Left | AM PM | 195.5 54.1 | F D | 892.7 276.3 | 216.5 64.1 | F E | 970.9 309.6 | 283.1 101.4 | F F | 1182.0 397.3 | 306.7 120.5 | F F | 1264.2 453.8 | 22.1 23.3 | C C | 303.4 187.2 |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 20.9 19.1 | C B | 233.0 133.3 | 20.9 19.1 | C B | 233.0 133.3 | 21.4 19.4 | C B | 251.8 152.4 | 21.4 19.4 | C B | 251.8 152.4 | 15.1 17.4 | B B | 211.3 142.5 |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 21.0 19.1 | C B | 225.5 129.9 | 21.0 19.1 | C B | 225.5 129.9 | 21.5 19.4 | C B | 243.0 147.9 | 21.5 19.4 | B B | 243.0 147.9 | 15.2 17.4 | B B | 204.0 138.3 |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 25.9 21.7 | C C | 6.1 7.0 | 25.9 21.7 | C C | 6.1 7.0 | 26.9 22.4 | C C | 7.0 8.6 | 26.9 22.4 | C C | 7.0 8.6 | 29.3 26.6 | C C | 7.4 9.5 |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 19.7 20.6 | B C | 171.2 218.4 | 19.7 20.7 | B C | 173.5 220.3 | 20.0 21.1 | B C | 189.3 240.8 | 20.0 21.2 | C C | 191.2 242.9 | 35.2 34.1 | D C | 249.0 305.0 |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 19.7 20.6 | B C | 161.9 210.0 | 19.8 20.7 | B C | 163.7 211.4 | 20.0 21.2 | C C | 178.3 230.8 | 20.1 21.2 | C C | 180.1 232.5 | 35.5 34.3 | D C | 237.5 291.8 |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 14.3 16.0 | B B | 42.5 86.1 | 14.5 16.1 | B B | 50.1 85.5 | 14.7 16.8 | B B | 51.8 98.6 | 15.0 16.9 | B B | 59.9 98.1 | 21.4 19.1 | C B | 74.3 105.9 |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 12.7 13.6 | B B | 73.6 122.1 | 12.8 13.6 | B B | 78.3 122.1 | 13.0 13.9 | B B | 86.0 135.4 | 13.0 13.9 | B B | 90.8 135.4 | 18.6 15.7 | B B | 113.0 146.7 |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 19.4 28.6 | B C | 295.3 473.9 | 21.4 28.3 | C C | 341.4 469.8 | 20.9 35.3 | C D | 330.7 567.3 | 23.3 35.0 | C D | 381.3 561.7 | 11.2 17.7 | B B | 259.1 398.8 |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 14.1 17.5 | B B | 25.8 83.0 | 14.3 17.5 | B B | 26.0 83.0 | 14.6 18.5 | B B | 29.3 99.3 | 14.7 18.5 | B B | 29.4 99.3 | 20.9 21.1 | C C | 36.5 107.3 |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 12.4 12.6 | B B | 57.0 66.0 | 12.5 12.6 | B B | 58.0 67.1 | 12.5 12.8 | B B | 61.6 74.8 | 12.5 12.8 | B B | 62.4 76.1 | 17.8 14.5 | B B | 77.7 82.2 |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 12.5 12.6 | B B | 56.7 64.9 | 12.5 12.7 | B B | 57.5 66.2 | 12.5 12.8 | B B | 61.0 73.7 | 12.6 12.8 | B B | 62.0 74.8 | 17.8 14.5 | B B | 77.2 81.0 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13-Apr-21 |
|-----|----------------------------------|------------|----------|----------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|-----------|------------------|----------------|---------|------------------|----------------|----------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| | | TRAFFIC | PEAK | YEAF | R 2020 EXIS | STING | YEAR 2020 E | XISTING V | V/ PROJECT | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | O PROJECT | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE W | // PROJECT | YEAR 2026 F IMP | UTURE W/ ROVEME! | PROJECT + NTS |
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| 10 | Mindanao Way/ SR-90 Westbound | NB Left | AM PM | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 14.6 | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 14.6 | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 15.4 | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 15.4 | | | |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 14.0 13.4 | B B | 158.0 120.6 | 14.1 13.4 | B B | 159.6 121.7 | 14.3 13.8 | B B | 174.0 136.9 | 14.3 13.8 | B B | 175.2 138.1 | | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 31.0 51.3 | C D | 257.8 478.2 | 31.8 51.0 | C D | 274.1 476.1 | 32.2 73.0 | C F | 282.9 607.0 | 33.2 72.4 | C F | 300.2 603.5 | | | |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 33.7 62.4 | C E | 267.8 520.3 | 34.9 62.0 | C E | 286.2 518.0 | 35.6 84.7 | D F | 295.5 650.1 | 37.0 84.1 | D F | 315.1 646.8 | | | |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 26.8 23.1 | C C | 330.0 251.9 | 26.8 23.1 | C C | 330.0 251.9 | 29.4 25.1 | C C | 369.5 297.5 | 29.4 25.1 | C C | 369.5 297.5 | | | |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 97.0 31.6 | F C | 969.8 442.1 | 99.7 32.1 | F C | 990.5 449.0 | 130.4 47.2 | F D | 1222.9 594.9 | 133.3 48.9 | F D | 1246.0 609.9 | | | |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 160.0 23.8 | F C | 1250.5 243.7 | 166.8 24.3 | F C | 1296.3 252.5 | 200.3 25.6 | F C | 1525.8 277.0 | 207.2 26.2 | F C | 1573.6 286.4 | - | | |
| 11 | Mindanao Way/ SR-90 Eastbound | NB Through | AM PM | 197.8 144.4 | F F | 760.8 587.7 | 200.6 146.3 | F F | 770.1 594.2 | 241.2 200.4 | F F | 902.7 768.5 | 244.0 202.5 | F F | 912.2 775.4 | | | |
| | (Signalized) | NB Right | AM PM | 474.9 394.0 | F F | 1498.1 1261.5 | 474.9 394.0 | F F | 1498.1 1261.5 | 539.1 497.8 | F F | 1683.9 1564.6 | 539.1 497.8 | F F | 1683.9 1564.6 | | | |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 27.7 33.3 | C C | 197.3 303.4 | 28.4 33.2 | C C | 214.8 302.5 | 28.4 36.8 | C D | 215.8 343.2 | 29.2 36.7 | C D | 233.9 341.7 | | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 17.5 18.7 | B B | 304.5 344.5 | 17.6 18.7 | B B | 307.3 344.5 | 18.4 20.6 | B C | 336.3 403.2 | 18.5 20.6 | B C | 339.2 403.2 | | | |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 17.9 17.8 | B B | 17.3 10.3 | 17.9 17.8 | B B | 17.3 10.3 | 18.0 17.8 | B B | 20.9 11.5 | 18.0 17.8 | B B | 20.9 11.5 | | | |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 40.1 35.9 | D D | 518.7 474.6 | 40.1 35.9 | D D | 518.7 474.6 | 57.4 46.2 | E D | 668.3 574.1 | 57.4 46.2 | E D | 668.3 574.1 | | | |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 40.3 35.9 | D D | 517.7 473.0 | 40.3 35.9 | D D | 517.7 473.0 | 57.8 46.3 | D D | 668.1 573.4 | 57.8 46.3 | E D | 668.1 573.4 | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13-Apr-21 |
|----|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|--------------|---------|----------------|------------------|----------|----------------|-------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| | | TRAFFIC | PFAK | VEA | R 2020 EXIS | TING | VEAR 2020 F | XISTING V | V PROJECT | VEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | OPROJECT | VEAR 2026 | FUTURE W | PROJECT | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W/ PROVEMEN | PROJECT + TS |
| NO | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAV [2] | LOS 131 | OUFUE MI | DEL AV [2] | LOSIB | OUFUE MI | DEL AV 121 | LOSIN | OUFUE IAI | DEL AV [2] | LOS BI | OUFUE MI | DELAV [2] | LOS BL | OUFUE MI |
| | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | noek | DELAI [2] | 103 [5] | QUEUE [4] | DELAI [2] | 103 [5] | QUEUE [4] | DELAT [2] | 103[5] | QUEUE [4] | DELAI [2] | 103 [5] | QUEUE [4] | DELAI [2] | 105 [5] | QUEUE [4] |
| 12 | Mindanao Way/ La Villa Marina | NB Left | AM PM | 9.3 9.5 | A A | 10.6 12.3 | 9.3 9.5 | A A | 10.6 12.3 | 9.4 9.7 | A A | 11.2 13.6 | 9.4 9.7 | A A | 11.2 13.6 | | | |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 14.7 13.5 | B B | 302.9 258.9 | 14.7 13.5 | B B | 303.8 260.0 | 15.5 14.5 | B B | 332.4 297.6 | 15.5 14.5 | B B | 333.9 298.8 | - | | |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 14.7 13.5 | B B | 299.3 254.6 | 14.7 13.5 | B B | 300.7 255.7 | 15.6 14.6 | B B | 328.7 293.1 | 15.6 14.6 | B B | 330.2 294.3 | - | | |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 6.9 6.6 | A A | 14.1 30.1 | 6.9 6.6 | A A | 14.1 30.1 | 7.6 7.6 | A A | 15.1 32.1 | 7.6 7.6 | A A | 15.1 32.1 | - | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 5.3 5.6 | A A | 139.4 153.7 | 5.4 5.6 | A A | 140.7 153.7 | 5.6 6.0 | A A | 156.3 183.4 | 5.6 6.0 | A A | 158.4 183.4 | | | |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 5.3 5.6 | A A | 138.1 153.1 | 5.4 5.6 | A A | 139.5 153.1 | 5.6 6.0 | A A | 155.0 182.8 | 5.6 6.0 | A A | 157.1 183.4 | - | | |
| | | EB Left/Through/Right | AM PM | 32.1 32.7 | C C | 24.6 49.3 | 32.1 32.7 | с с | 24.6 49.3 | 32.1 32.8 | C C | 26.4 52.0 | 32.1 32.8 | C C | 26.4 52.0 | | | |
| | | WB Left/Through/Right | AM PM | 45.0 34.4 | D C | 236.9 112.5 | 45.0 34.4 | D C | 236.9 112.5 | 49.2 34.6 | D C | 260.0 119.6 | 49.2 34.6 | D C | 260.0 119.6 | - | | |

| [1] [2] | Pursuant to LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines, July 20 Control delay reported in seconds per vehicle. | 20, the Highway Capacity Manua | l (HCM) methodology for signalized and unsignalized in | tersections was utilized to calculate vehicle queuing |
|------------|---|--------------------------------|--|---|
| [5] | Signalized intersection Levels of Service were based on the following | criteria. | Unsignalized intersection Levels of Bervice wer | e based on the following criteria. |
| | Control Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Control Delay (s/veh) | LOS |
| | <= 10 | A | <= 10 | A |
| | > 10-20 | В | > 10-15 | В |
| | > 20-35 | С | > 15-25 | С |
| | > 35-55 | D | > 25-35 | D |
| | > 55-80 | E | > 35-50 | E |
| | > 80 | F | > 50 | F |

[4] The 95th percentile queue is the maximum back of queue with 95th percentile traffic volumes. The HCM 6th Edition methodology worksheets report queues in number of vehicles, however an average vehicle length of 25 feet was assumed for analysis purposes. The reported queues therefore represent the calculated maximum back of queue in feet.

>

| | | TRAFFIC | PEAK | YEAI | R 2020 EXIS | STING | YEAR 2020 E | XISTING | V/ OPTION B | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | O OPTION B | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE W | OPTION B | YEAR 2026 F IMF | UTURE W/ | 13-Apr-21 OPTION B + NTS |
|-----|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|---------|------------------|----------------|----------|------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------------------------|
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| 1 | Walgrove Avenue / Washington Boulevard (Unsignalized) | SB Left/Right | AM PM | 64.4 155.5 | F | 215.0 430.0 | 70.7 158.9 | F | 227.5 432.5 | 138.1 291.2 | F | 335.0 610.0 | 156.3 296.8 | F F | 355.0 615.0 | - | - | |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 25.0 18.1 | C C | 112.5 67.5 | 26.2 18.3 | C | 120.0 67.5 | 33.9 23.0 | C | 157.5 95.0 | 36.1 23.2 | E C | 165.0 95.0 | - | | |
| 2 | Lincoln Boulevard / Marina Pointe Drive - Maxella Avenue (Signalized) | NB Left | AM PM | 44.6 47.2 | D D | 73.9 122.9 | 44.6 47.2 | D D | 73.9 122.9 | 46.0 47.8 | D D | 78.4 130.4 | 46.0 47.8 | D D | 78.4 130.4 | - | | |
| | (Spinned) | NB Through | AM PM | 140.5 76.7 | F F | 1225.2 814.0 | 140.5 76.7 | F F | 1225.2 814.0 | 176.2 123.0 | F F | 1459.9 1111.2 | 176.2 123.0 | F F | 1459.9 1111.2 | - | | |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 22.2 24.0 | C C | 234.3 293.7 | 22.9 24.2 | C C | 256.0 301.1 | 22.9 26.0 | C C | 257.0 355.3 | 23.6 26.3 | с с | 279.5 363.3 | - | | |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 33.8 33.6 | C C | 62.7 53.2 | 33.9 33.6 | C C | 67.5 54.7 | 33.9 33.7 | C C | 68.0 59.5 | 34.0 33.8 | с с | 72.9 61.1 | - | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 40.2 45.0 | D D | 493.7 598.6 | 40.2 45.0 | D D | 493.7 598.6 | 42.1 51.1 | D D | 540.5 684.3 | 42.1 51.1 | D D | 540.5 684.3 | - | - | |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 45.3 54.3 | D D | 511.9 627.2 | 45.3 54.3 | D D | 511.9 627.2 | 48.7 64.6 | D E | 564.8 732.8 | 48.7 64.6 | D E | 564.8 732.8 | - | | |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 45.6 45.9 | D D | 99.3 113.1 | 45.6 45.9 | D D | 99.3 113.1 | 45.8 46.1 | D D | 106.2 120.0 | 45.8 46.1 | D D | 106.2 120.0 | - | | |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 45.6 45.1 | D D | 104.4 84.0 | 45.6 45.1 | D D | 104.4 84.0 | 45.7 45.2 | D D | 111.3 89.5 | 45.7 45.2 | D D | 111.3 89.5 | - | | |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 7.1 6.5 | A A | 140.9 71.9 | 7.1 6.5 | A A | 140.9 71.9 | 7.2 6.5 | A A | 150.2 76.2 | 7.2 6.5 | A A | 150.2 76.2 | - | | |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 52.3 74.1 | D E | 175.0 332.5 | 52.6 74.5 | D E | 184.5 334.0 | 59.6 108.8 | E F | 254.3 457.8 | 61.1 109.6 | E F | 264.5 460.2 | - | | |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 51.1 66.4 | D E | 139.2 302.4 | 51.2 66.6 | D E | 143.7 303.1 | 52.5 79.8 | D E | 182.3 363.3 | 52.6 80.0 | E F | 187.0 364.2 | - | | |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 35.7 37.8 | D D | 141.0 223.3 | 36.0 37.9 | D D | 152.3 224.4 | 36.1 38.4 | D D | 157.5 241.4 | 36.4 38.4 | D D | 169.0 242.3 | - | | |
| 3 | Del Rey Avenue / Maxella Avenue (Incinentized) | SB Left/Right | AM PM | 11.8 17.0 | B C | 15.0 70.0 | 12.0 17.1 | B C | 17.5 70.0 | 13.4 21.4 | B C | 32.5 100.0 | 13.6 21.6 | B C | 32.5 102.5 | | | |
| | (Onsignalized) | EB Left | AM PM | 8.5 8.9 | A A | 10.0 7.5 | 8.6 8.9 | A A | 12.5 7.5 | 8.7 9.3 | A A | 12.5 10.0 | 8.8 9.4 | A A | 12.5 10.0 | - | - | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W/ | 13-Apr-21 OPTION B + | |
|-----|---|---------------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| NO. | INTERSECTION | TRAFFIC MOVEMENT | PEAK HOUR | YEAI DELAY [2] | 2020 EXIS LOS [3] | TING QUEUE [4] | YEAR 2020 E DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | V/ OPTION B QUEUE [4] | YEAR 2026 F DELAY [2] | UTURE W/ LOS [3] | O OPTION B QUEUE [4] | YEAR 2026 DELAY [2] | FUTURE W LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | IMF DELAY [2] | ROVEMEN LOS [3] | VTS QUEUE [4] |
| 4 | Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue | NB Left | AM PM | 14.3 20.5 | B C | 10.0 20.0 | 10.9 10.9 | B B | 26.5 25.9 | 16.2 27.2 | C D | 15.0 35.0 | 10.8 11.1 | B B | 29.9 30.3 | - | | |
| | (Unsignalized w/o Project; Signalized w/ Project) | NB Right | AM PM | 9.8 10.4 | A B | 7.5 5.0 | 11.2 10.9 | B B | 32.0 20.3 | 10.1 10.8 | B B | 7.5 7.5 | 11.0 11.0 | B B | 34.8 24.3 | - | | |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | | | - | 12.4 | B | 82.9 | - | - | - | 12.8 | B | 96.2 144 7 | - | | |
| | | EB Right | AM | | | | 12.5 | B | 80.0 | - | - | - | 12.9 | B | 92.6 | - | | |
| | | WB Left | AM | 8.2 | A | 2.5 | 14.0 | В | 18.0 | 8.3 | A | 2.5 | 14.5 | B | 21.1 | - | | |
| | | WB Through | AM | | A | | 11.5 | В | 26.3 54.2 | | A | | 17.9 | В | 36.7 60.5 | - | - | |
| | | | PM | | | | 12.1 | В | 77.7 | | | | 12.5 | В | 94.3 | - | | |
| 5 | Maxella Avenue Driveway / Maxella Avenue (Unsignalized) | NB Right | AM PM | 9.4 9.9 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.5 9.9 | A A | 0.0 0.0 | 9.6 10.2 | A B | 0.0 0.0 | 9.7 10.2 | A B | 0.0 0.0 | | | |
| 6 | Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue | NB Left | AM PM | 17.9 22.4 | B C | 59.4 77.2 | 18.5 22.7 | B C | 60.7 77.9 | 19.3 30.5 | B C | 67.2 116.9 | 20.0 31.2 | B C | 68.8 118.3 | | | |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 18.6 13.0 | B B | 280.9 151.8 | 19.8 13.0 | B B | 299.1 154.0 | 21.9 13.5 | C B | 327.0 174.9 | 24.0 13.6 | C B | 352.3 177.5 | - | | |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 19.5 25.9 | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 19.5 25.9 | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 20.6 27.4 | 10.7 10.8 | B B | 20.6 27.4 | - | | |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 24.1 16.8 | C B | 44.2 22.7 | 25.1 16.9 | C B | 45.3 22.8 | 26.7 18.0 | C B | 51.1 27.4 | 27.8 18.1 | C B | 52.5 27.5 | | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 12.5 13.9 | B B | 128.1 189.4 | 12.7 14.0 | B B | 137.1 192.1 | 12.9 15.1 | B B | 145.6 218.0 | 13.0 15.3 | B B | 155.0 221.1 | - | | |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 12.6 14.0 | B B | 122.7 180.2 | 12.7 14.1 | B B | 131.5 183.8 | 12.9 15.2 | B B | 139.3 208.9 | 13.1 15.4 | B B | 148.0 211.9 | | | |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 13.4 15.4 | B B | 47.9 72.3 | 13.7 15.5 | B B | 55.0 74.5 | 14.0 16.8 | B B | 57.6 90.4 | 14.3 17.0 | B B | 65.2 92.4 | | | |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 11.3 11.8 | B B | 38.6 57.2 | 11.3 11.8 | B B | 40.7 57.8 | 11.4 12.0 | B B | 45.3 68.3 | 11.5 12.0 | B B | 47.1 68.8 | - | | |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 12.0 12.9 | B B | 55.2 81.0 | 12.1 12.9 | B B | 57.9 81.5 | 12.4 13.2 | B B | 66.9 89.5 | 12.5 13.2 | B B | 69.7 89.9 | - | | |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 12.5 13.9 | B B | 27.5 44.7 | 12.6 13.9 | B B | 27.6 44.7 | 12.9 14.5 | B B | 29.6 48.9 | 12.9 14.6 | B B | 29.8 49.0 | - | - | |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 11.1 | B | 31.7 52.6 | 11.2 | B | 33.7 53.1 | 11.2 | B | 35.7 61.0 | 11.2 | B | 37.4 61.5 | - | | |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 11.3 11.8 | BB | 32.5 50.1 | 11.3 11.8 | B B | 32.5 50.5 | 11.4 12.0 | BB | 35.4 57.8 | 11.4 12.1 | BB | 35.9 58.4 | | | |
| 7 | Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Northerly Driveway | NB Left | AM PM | | | | | | | | - | - | | | | - | | |
| | (Unsignalized) | EB Right | AM PM | | | - | | | | | - | - | | - | - | - | - | |

| | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W/ | 13-Apr-21 OPTION B + |
|-----|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|----------|-----------------|--------------|----------|-------------------------|
| | N TEROPORTON | TRAFFIC | PEAK | YEAR | 2020 EXIS | STING | YEAR 2020 E | XISTING | W/ OPTION B | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | O OPTION B | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE V | / OPTION B | IMP | ROVEMEN | VTS |
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| 8 | Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Southerly Driveway - Villa | NB Left | AM PM | 9.5 10.9 | A B | 2.5 5.0 | 10.0 11.2 | A B | 7.5 10.0 | 9.9 11.5 | A B | 2.5 7.5 | 10.4 11.8 | B B | 7.5 10.0 | 14.7 18.9 | B B | 36.1 49.8 |
| | (Unsignalized; Signalized w/ Improvements) | NB Through | AM PM | | | - | - | | | | | - | | | - | 9.9 8.8 | A A | 183.0 116.0 |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | | | | | | | | | - | | | - | 9.9 8.8 | A A | 182.8 115.4 |
| | | SB Left | AM | 9.4 | A | 0.0 | 9.4 | A | 0.0 | 9.6 | A | 0.0 | 9.6 | А | 0.0 | 11.6 | в | 1.6 |
| | | SB Through | AM | | - | - | - | - | | | - | | | - | - | 10.3 | В | 205.8 |
| | | SB Right | PM AM | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | | | - | 11.6 | B B | 261.7 202.0 |
| | | | PM | | | | | | | | | | | | | 11.7 | В | 256.0 |
| | | EB Left/Right | AM PM | 28.3 118.5 | D F | 10.0 142.5 | 35.7 162.8 | E F | 60.0 222.5 | 35.3 230.9 | E F | 12.5 200.0 | 50.7 311.3 | F F | 82.5 300.0 | 24.6 25.9 | C C | 79.8 132.5 |
| | | WB Left/Right | AM PM | 23.2 21.4 | C C | 7.5 5.0 | 29.5 24.2 | D C | 10.0 5.0 | 27.3 25.5 | D D | 10.0 5.0 | 36.0 29.5 | E D | 15.0 7.5 | 23.3 23.2 | C C | 16.7 9.0 |
| 9 | Mindanao Way/ Glencoe Avenue | NB Left | AM PM | 195.5 54.1 | F D | 892.7 276.3 | 234.5 59.2 | F E | 1037.7 293.5 | 283.1 101.4 | F F | 1182.0 397.3 | 326.7 111.5 | F F | 1333.7 427.1 | 22.0 23.4 | C C | 308.2 183.2 |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 20.9 19.1 | C B | 233.0 133.3 | 20.9 19.1 | C B | 233.0 133.3 | 21.4 19.4 | C B | 251.8 152.4 | 21.4 19.4 | C B | 251.8 152.4 | 14.8 17.6 | B B | 209.1 143.7 |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 21.0 19.1 | C B | 225.5 129.9 | 21.0 19.1 | C B | 225.5 129.9 | 21.5 19.4 | C B | 243.0 147.9 | 21.5 19.4 | C B | 243.0 147.9 | 14.8 17.6 | B B | 201.8 139.5 |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 25.9 21.7 | C C | 6.1 7.0 | 25.9 21.7 | C C | 6.1 7.0 | 26.9 22.4 | C C | 7.0 8.6 | 26.9 22.4 | C C | 7.0 8.6 | 29.2 26.7 | C C | 7.4 9.5 |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 19.7 20.6 | B C | 171.2 218.4 | 19.7 20.6 | B C | 175.4 219.4 | 20.0 21.1 | B C | 189.3 240.8 | 20.0 21.1 | C C | 192.7 242.2 | 35.2 34.1 | D C | 250.7 304.2 |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 19.7 20.6 | B C | 161.9 210.0 | 19.8 20.7 | B C | 164.8 211.0 | 20.0 21.2 | C C | 178.3 230.8 | 20.1 21.2 | C C | 181.6 231.6 | 35.4 34.3 | D C | 238.7 290.9 |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 14.3 16.0 | B B | 42.5 86.1 | 14.5 16.1 | B B | 48.2 87.0 | 14.7 16.8 | B B | 51.8 98.6 | 15.0 16.9 | B B | 57.9 99.3 | 21.8 19.0 | C B | 72.7 106.7 |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 12.7 13.6 | B B | 73.6 122.1 | 12.8 13.6 | B B | 77.0 122.7 | 13.0 13.9 | B B | 86.0 135.4 | 13.0 13.9 | B B | 89.5 136.0 | 18.9 15.5 | B B | 112.8 146.0 |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 19.4 28.6 | B C | 295.3 473.9 | 20.9 29.4 | C C | 330.7 485.7 | 20.9 35.3 | C D | 330.7 567.3 | 22.7 36.9 | C D | 369.6 583.1 | 11.1 18.1 | B B | 252.7 409.3 |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 14.1 17.5 | B B | 25.8 83.0 | 14.2 17.5 | B B | 25.9 83.0 | 14.6 18.5 | B B | 29.3 99.3 | 14.7 18.6 | B B | 29.4 99.3 | 21.3 20.8 | с с | 36.9 106.6 |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 12.4 12.6 | B B | 57.0 66.0 | 12.5 12.6 | B B | 58.5 66.5 | 12.5 12.8 | B B | 61.6 74.8 | 12.5 12.8 | B B | 63.1 75.6 | 18.1 14.3 | B B | 79.4 81.0 |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 12.5 12.6 | B B | 56.7 64.9 | 12.5 12.6 | B B | 58.0 65.6 | 12.5 12.8 | B B | 61.0 73.7 | 12.6 12.8 | B B | 62.5 74.2 | 18.2 14.3 | B B | 78.9 79.6 |

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13-Apr-21 |
|----|---|------------|----------|-------------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|---------|------------------|----------------|---------|------------------|----------------|----------|------------------|-------------|----------|------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W/ | OPTION B + |
| NO | INTEDSECTION | TRAFFIC | PEAK | YEAF DELAV 121 | C 2020 EXIS | STING | YEAR 2020 E | LOS 121 | V/ OPTION B | YEAR 2026 F | UTURE W | O OPTION B | YEAR 2026 | FUTURE W | OUFUE 12 | IMP | ROVEMEN | NTS |
| 10 | Mindanao Way/ SR-90 Westbound | NB Left | AM PM | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 14.6 | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 14.6 | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 15.4 | 31.5 31.7 | C C | 6.2 15.4 | | | |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 14.0 13.4 | BB | 158.0 120.6 | 14.1 13.4 | BB | 160.4 121.1 | 14.3 13.8 | B | 174.0 136.9 | 14.4 13.8 | BB | 176.5 137.5 | | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 31.0 51.3 | C D | 257.8 478.2 | 31.6 52.3 | C D | 270.7 484.8 | 32.2 73.0 | C F | 282.9 607.0 | 33.0 74.7 | C F | 296.2 616.3 | | | |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 33.7 62.4 | C E | 267.8 520.3 | 34.6 63.5 | C E | 282.1 527.4 | 35.6 84.7 | D F | 295.5 650.1 | 36.7 86.3 | D F | 310.6 659.2 | | | |
| | | WB Left | AM PM | 26.8 23.1 | C C | 330.0 251.9 | 26.8 23.1 | C C | 330.0 251.9 | 29.4 25.1 | C C | 369.5 297.5 | 29.4 25.1 | C C | 369.5 297.5 | | | |
| | | WB Through | AM PM | 97.0 31.6 | F C | 969.8 442.1 | 102.2 31.9 | F C | 1009.1 446.8 | 130.4 47.2 | F D | 1222.9 594.9 | 135.9 48.2 | F D | 1265.3 603.6 | | | |
| | | WB Right | AM PM | 160.0 23.8 | F C | 1250.5 243.7 | 172.8 24.1 | F C | 1337.4 248.7 | 200.3 25.6 | F C | 1525.8 277.0 | 213.4 26.0 | F C | 1616.4 282.6 | | | |
| 11 | Mindanao Way/ SR-90 Eastbound (Simplical) | NB Through | AM PM | 197.8 144.4 | F F | 760.8 587.7 | 202.7 145.7 | F F | 777.0 592.0 | 241.2 200.4 | F F | 902.7 768.5 | 246.2 201.8 | F F | 919.4 773.1 | - | | |
| | (signanzed) | NB Right | AM PM | 474.9 394.0 | F F | 1498.1 1261.5 | 474.9 394.0 | F F | 1498.1 1261.5 | 539.1 497.8 | F F | 1683.9 1564.6 | 539.1 497.8 | F F | 1683.9 1564.6 | | | |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 27.7 33.3 | C C | 197.3 303.4 | 28.2 33.6 | C C | 211.2 307.3 | 28.4 36.8 | C D | 215.8 343.2 | 29.0 37.3 | C D | 230.2 348.0 | | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 17.5 18.7 | B B | 304.5 344.5 | 17.6 18.7 | B B | 306.8 345.5 | 18.4 20.6 | B C | 336.3 403.2 | 18.5 20.6 | B C | 338.6 404.4 | | | |
| | | EB Left | AM PM | 17.9 17.8 | B | 17.3 10.3 | 17.9 17.8 | B | 17.3 10.3 | 18.0 17.8 | B | 20.9 11.5 | 18.0 17.8 | B | 20.9 11.5 | | | |
| | | EB Through | AM PM | 40.1 35.9 | D | 518.7 474.6 | 40.1 35.9 | D | 518.7 474.6 | 57.4 46.2 | E D | 668.3 574.1 | 57.4 46.2 | E D | 668.3 574.1 | | | |
| | | EB Right | AM PM | 40.3 35.9 | D | 517.7 473.0 | 40.3 35.9 | D | 517.7 473.0 | 57.8 46.3 | D | 668.1 573.4 | 57.8 46.3 | E D | 668.1 573.4 | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13-Apr-21 |
|-----|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|-------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|--------------|--|----------------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| | | TRAFFIC | PEAK | YEAR | R 2020 EXIS | TING | YEAR 2020 E | XISTING V | V/ OPTION B | YEAR 2026 FUTURE W/O OPTION B | | YEAR 2026 FUTURE W/ OPTION B | | YEAR 2026 FUTURE W/ OPTION B + IMPROVEMENTS | | | | |
| NO. | INTERSECTION | MOVEMENT | HOUR | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] | DELAY [2] | LOS [3] | QUEUE [4] |
| 12 | Mindanao Way/ La Villa Marina | NB Left | AM PM | 9.3 9.5 | A A | 10.6 12.3 | 9.3 9.5 | A A | 10.6 12.3 | 9.4 9.7 | A A | 11.2 13.6 | 9.4 9.7 | A A | 11.2 13.6 | | | |
| | (Signalized) | NB Through | AM PM | 14.7 13.5 | B B | 302.9 258.9 | 14.7 13.5 | B B | 305.1 259.3 | 15.5 14.5 | B B | 332.4 297.6 | 15.6 14.5 | B B | 334.7 298.0 | - | | |
| | | NB Right | AM PM | 14.7 13.5 | B B | 299.3 254.6 | 14.8 13.5 | B B | 301.5 255.5 | 15.6 14.6 | B B | 328.7 293.1 | 15.6 14.6 | B B | 331.6 294.1 | - | | - |
| | | SB Left | AM PM | 6.9 6.6 | A A | 14.1 30.1 | 6.9 6.6 | A A | 14.1 30.1 | 7.6 7.6 | A A | 15.1 32.1 | 7.6 7.6 | A A | 15.1 32.1 | - | | |
| | | SB Through | AM PM | 5.3 5.6 | A A | 139.4 153.7 | 5.3 5.6 | A A | 140.4 154.0 | 5.6 6.0 | A A | 156.3 183.4 | 5.6 6.0 | A A | 158.1 183.7 | | | |
| | | SB Right | AM PM | 5.3 5.6 | A A | 138.1 153.1 | 5.4 5.6 | A A | 139.2 153.4 | 5.6 6.0 | A A | 155.0 182.8 | 5.6 6.0 | A A | 156.7 183.1 | - | | |
| | | EB Left/Through/Right | AM PM | 32.1 32.7 | C C | 24.6 49.3 | 32.1 32.7 | C C | 24.6 49.3 | 32.1 32.8 | C C | 26.4 52.0 | 32.1 32.8 | C C | 26.4 52.0 | | | |
| | | WB Left/Through/Right | AM PM | 45.0 34.4 | D C | 236.9 112.5 | 45.0 34.4 | D C | 236.9 112.5 | 49.2 34.6 | D C | 260.0 119.6 | 49.2 34.6 | D C | 260.0 119.6 | | | |

| [1] [2] | Pursuant to LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines, July 20 Control delay reported in seconds per vehicle. | 20, the Highway Capacity Manua | l (HCM) methodology for signalized and unsignalized in | tersections was utilized to calculate vehicle queuing | | | | | |
|------------|---|--------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| [5] | Signalized intersection Levels of Service were based on the following | criteria. | Unsignatized intersection Levels of Service were based on the following criteria. | | | | | | |
| | Control Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Control Delay (s/veh) | LOS | | | | | |
| | <= 10 | A | <= 10 | A | | | | | |
| | > 10-20 | В | > 10-15 | В | | | | | |
| | > 20-35 | С | > 15-25 | С | | | | | |
| | > 35-55 | D | > 25-35 | D | | | | | |
| | > 55-80 | E | > 35-50 | E | | | | | |
| | > 80 | F | > 50 | F | | | | | |

[4] The 95th percentile queue is the maximum back of queue with 95th percentile traffic volumes. The HCM 6th Edition methodology worksheets report queues in number of vehicles, however an average vehicle length of 25 feet was assumed for analysis purposes. The reported queues therefore represent the calculated maximum back of queue in feet.

>

As the answer is "yes" to both of the screening criteria questions (i.e., the Project will require a discretionary action and the Project will generate more than 250 daily trips), further analysis is required to evaluate Project access, safety and circulation.

5.2.2 Evaluation Criteria

For operational evaluation of land use projects, the City's TAG (Section 3.3.3 thereof) requires a quantitative evaluation of the Project's expected access and circulation operations. Project access is considered constrained if the Project's traffic would contribute to unacceptable queuing on an Avenue or Boulevard (as designated in the Mobility Plan 2035) at Project driveway(s) or would cause or substantially extend queuing at nearby signalized intersections. Unacceptable or extended queuing may be defined as follows:

- Spillover from turn pockets into through lanes.
- Block cross streets or alleys.
- Contribute to gridlock congestion. For the purposes of this section, "gridlock" is defined as the condition where traffic queues between closely spaced intersections and impedes the flow of traffic through upstream intersections.

The TAG acknowledges that demand for curbside space has substantially increased due to the continued expansion of driver-for-hire transportation network companies (TNCs) and shared mobility services. As such, the TAG states that a transportation assessment should characterize the onsite loading demand of the project frontage and answer the following questions:

- Would the project result in passenger loading demand that could not be accommodated within any proposed onsite passenger loading facility?
 - No, as discussed in Section 2.7, passenger loading and unloading for Option A would occur within the westerly residential building's parking garage. Passenger loading and unloading for Option B would occur in the drop-off/pick-up zone located on the westerly portion of the Project Site. While passenger loading and unloading will occur internally to the Project Site, some intermittent curbside loading/unloading may occur along the Project Site's Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue frontages.
- Would accommodating the passenger loading demand create pedestrian or bicycle conflicts? Which curbside management options should be explored to better address passenger loading needs in the public right-of-way?
 - No pedestrian or bicycle conflicts due to potential loading/unloading activities are anticipated to occur because activity will occur internal to the Project Site, minimizing the need to utilize the curbside surrounding the Project Site for loading and unloading. For any curbside loading/unloading zones that may be proposed by the Applicant, the City would require the Applicant to install appropriate signage and

pavement/curb markings. Any installations that fall within the City's (public) rightof-way would require prior review and approval by LADOT.

5.2.3 Project Operational and Passenger Loading Evaluation Methodology

Based on coordination with LADOT staff and as presented in the transportation assessment MOU for Option A and Option B, the following 12 study intersections were identified for operational evaluation of whether the Project's traffic would contribute to unacceptable queuing on an Avenue or Boulevard:

- 1. Walgrove Avenue / Washington Boulevard (Unsignalized) [City of Culver City]
- 2. Lincoln Boulevard / Marina Pointe Drive Maxella Avenue
- 3. Del Rey Avenue / Maxella Avenue (Unsignalized)
- 4. Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue (Unsignalized without Project; Signalized with Project)
- 5. Maxella Avenue Driveway / Maxella Avenue
- 6. Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue
- 7. Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Northerly Driveway¹⁴ (Unsignalized)
- 8. Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Southerly Driveway Villa Velletri Driveway (Unsignalized)
- 9. Mindanao Way / Glencoe Avenue
- 10. Mindanao Way / SR-90 (Marina Expressway) Westbound
- 11. Mindanao Way / SR-90 (Marina Expressway) Eastbound
- 12. Mindanao Way / La Villa Marina

The study locations were based on proximity to the Project Site and the importance of the intersections in terms of the Project's site access and circulation scheme.

The analysis was prepared based on the *Highway Capacity Manual*¹⁵ (HCM) operational analysis methodology pursuant to the City's TAG. Intersection analyses were prepared utilizing the *HCS7* software package, which implements the Highway Capacity Manual operational methods. In addition, specifics such as traffic volume data, lane configurations, available vehicle storage lengths, crosswalk locations, posted speed limits, traffic signal timing and phasing for signalized

¹⁴ As stated in Section 3.3.2, Option B does not propose a northerly driveway along Glencoe Avenue. However, for consistency purposes, the intersection is included as a study intersection for both Option A and Option B.

¹⁵ *Highway Capacity Manual 6th Edition*, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies of Sciences-Engineering-Medicine, 2016.

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

locations, etc., were coded in the *HCS7* software. The operational analysis was prepared utilizing the following data previously presented herein:

- Project Peak Hour Traffic Generation: Refer to Subsection 2.8.1
- Project Trip Distribution and Assignment: Refer to Subsection 2.8.2
- Existing Vehicle Network: Refer to Subsection 3.3
- Existing Weekday AM and PM Hour Traffic Count Data: Refer to Subsection 3.4
- Related Projects (i.e., within a 0.75-mile radius) and Ambient Traffic Growth: Refer to Subsection 3.5

LADOT confirmed the appropriateness of the above data in the transportation assessment MOU it approved for Option A and Option B. The transportation assessment MOU prepared by LLG for both the Option A and Option B are attached to this report in *Appendix A*.

The operational analysis of vehicle queuing at the study intersections was prepared for the following conditions:

- (a) Existing (2020) conditions.
- (b) Condition (a) with completion and occupancy of the Project.
- (c) Condition (a) plus 1.0% annual ambient traffic growth through year 2026 and with completion and occupancy of the related projects (i.e., future cumulative baseline)
- (d) Condition (c) with completion and occupancy of the Project.
- (e) Condition (d) with Project improvements, if necessary.

Pursuant to the City's TAG, the HCM methodology for signalized and unsignalized intersections was utilized to calculate vehicle queuing. The operation analysis reports the control delay (in seconds), Levels of Service (LOS), and 95th percentile queues (in feet) for all approaches for the signalized intersections and the minor street approaches for the unsignalized intersections. The 95th percentile queue is the maximum back of queue with 95th percentile traffic volumes. The HCM 6th Edition methodology worksheets report queues in number of vehicles. As such, an average vehicle length of 25 feet, which includes the length of the vehicle and spacing between vehicles, was assumed for analysis purposes. The reported queues therefore represent the calculated maximum back of queue in feet. The summary of the operational analysis of the study intersections is provided in *Tables 5–2* and *5–3* for Option A and Option B, respectively. *Appendix J* and *Appendix K* contain the HCM methodology worksheets for the study intersections for the Option A and Option B, respectively.

The existing traffic volumes at the study intersections during the weekday AM and PM peak hours are displayed in *Figures 3–12* and *3–13*, respectively. The "Existing with Option A" traffic volumes at the study intersections during the weekday AM and PM peak hours are

illustrated in *Figures 5–1* and *5–2*, respectively. The "Existing with Option B" traffic volumes at the study intersections during the weekday AM and PM peak hours are illustrated in *Figures 5–3* and *5–4*, respectively. The "Future Cumulative Baseline" (existing, ambient growth and related projects) traffic volumes at the study intersections during the weekday AM and PM peak hours are presented in *Figures 5–5* and *5–6*, respectively. The "Future Cumulative with Option A" (existing, ambient growth, related projects, and Option A) traffic volumes at the study intersections during the weekday AM and PM peak hours are illustrated in *Figures 5–7* and *5–8*, respectively. The "Future Cumulative with Option B" (existing, ambient growth, related projects, and Option B) traffic volumes at the study intersections during the weekday AM and PM peak hours are illustrated in *Figures 5–9* and *5–10*, respectively.

As presented in *Table 5–2*, Option A would not cause or substantially extend vehicle queuing at 10 of the 12 study intersections during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. At these intersections, the change in queue length associated with Option A ranges from a slight decrease in queue length to a maximum of 47.8 feet (i.e., just less than two vehicles). Option A would result in unacceptable queuing and/or operational deficiencies at the following intersections:

- Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Southerly Driveway Villa Velletri Driveway
 - The change in queue length associated with Option A at the eastbound left/right approach under Future Cumulative with Option A conditions increases by 55.0 feet (i.e., just greater than two vehicles) during the weekday AM peak hour. During the weekday PM peak hour, the overall queue length is expected to be 192.5 feet (i.e., just less than eight vehicles) under Future Cumulative with Option A conditions.
- Mindanao Way / Glencoe Avenue
 - The change in queue length at the northbound left-turn approach under Future Cumulative with Option A conditions increases by 82.2 feet (i.e., greater than three vehicles) and 56.5 feet (i.e., greater than two vehicles) during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively.
 - The reported back of queue length at the eastbound right-turn approach is expected to be 381.3 feet during the weekday AM peak hour and 561.7 feet during the weekday PM peak hour under Future Cumulative with Option A conditions.

Improvements to these intersections have been identified and are summarized in the following sections:

- Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Southerly Driveway Villa Velletri Driveway
 - The recommended improvements consist of shifting the existing signalized Glencoe Avenue midblock crossing to the north to align with the Glencoe Avenue Southerly Driveway intersection. The resulting lane configuration on the northbound and southbound approaches of Glencoe Avenue would provide one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one shared through/right-turn lane. No changes to the eastbound



-89-



-90-



-91-

₽ jshender 10:06:21 12/14/2020 o:\0265\dwg\f5-3.dwg



-92-


-93-

exhibits ₽ jshender 16:17:08 10/01/2020 o:\0265\dwg\f5-5.dwg



-94-

exhibits ₽ jshender 10:33:35 04/21/2021 o:\0265\dwg\f5-6.dwg



-95-

₽ jshender 3:59:29 /2021 04/29/





-97-

exhibits ₽ jshender 16:03:55 04/13/2021 o:\0265\dwg\f5-9.dwg



-98-

Glencoe Avenue Southerly Driveway and westbound Villa Velletri approaches are proposed. Changes to the existing traffic signal equipment needed in conjunction with the recommended improvements would also be implemented as part of the improvement. Crosswalks would be installed on both the northbound and southbound Glencoe Avenue approaches.

- Mindanao Way / Glencoe Avenue
 - The recommended improvements consist of changing the existing traffic signal equipment to provide a northbound protected/permissive left-turn phase, as well as an eastbound overlap right-turn phase. No striping changes would be needed as part of the improvement.

As presented in *Table 5–2*, the proposed improvements to the intersections would significantly reduce the effects of the cumulative and Option A-related traffic at the intersection. A summary of the effects of the improvements at each of the intersections is provided below.

- Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Southerly Driveway Villa Velletri Driveway
 - With the proposed improvements, the overall queue length at the eastbound approach under Future Cumulative with Option A conditions is reduced by 7.5 feet during the weekday AM peak hour. During the weekday PM peak hour, the overall queue length at the eastbound approach under Future Cumulative with Option A conditions is reduced by 97.4 feet (i.e., just less than four vehicles).
- Mindanao Way / Glencoe Avenue
 - With the proposed improvements, the overall queue length at the northbound left-turn approach under Future Cumulative with Option A conditions is reduced by 960.8 feet (i.e., greater than 38 vehicles) and 266.6 feet (i.e., less than 11 vehicles) during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively.
 - With the proposed improvements, the overall queue length at the eastbound right-turn approach under Future Cumulative with Option A conditions is reduced by 122.2 feet (i.e., just less than five vehicles) and 162.9 feet (i.e., less than seven vehicles) during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

It is noted that there are delays and extended vehicle queuing on the southbound Walgrove Avenue approach to its intersection with Washington Boulevard as noted in *Table 5–2* during the existing AM and PM peak hours. These delays and vehicle queuing are expected to incrementally increase with the addition of traffic from the related projects, ambient growth and Option A. It is noted that the intersection is located within the City of Culver City and thus, any improvements to the intersection are outside the control of the City of Los Angeles.

It is likely that existing traffic volumes would satisfy standard warrants for installation of a traffic signal at the Walgrove Avenue / Washington Boulevard intersection. Further, the City of

Culver City would likely review whether the installation of a traffic signal at the Walgrove Avenue / Washington Boulevard may induce additional regional vehicle trips on Walgrove Avenue north of Washington Boulevard, which is primarily residential in nature. Accordingly, it is beyond the scope of this transportation analysis to identify and evaluate potential changes to traffic control at the Walgrove Avenue / Washington Boulevard intersection.

It is envisioned that passenger loading/unloading will occur within the drop-off/pick-up area located within Option A's onsite parking garage. No pedestrian or bicycle conflicts due to potential loading/unloading activities are anticipated to occur. While not currently proposed, for any future curbside loading/unloading zones that may be proposed by the Applicant, appropriate signage and pavement/curb markings will be required by the City and installed by the Applicant. Any installations that fall within the City's (public) right-of-way will require prior review and approval by LADOT. Thus, it is envisioned that should any curbside loading/unloading zones be proposed by the Applicant, on-street parking along the direct Option A frontages will not be allowed and some or most of the curbside space would be repurposed for loading/unloading operations.

5.2.4 Option B Project Operational and Passenger Loading Evaluation Methodology

Based on coordination with LADOT staff and as presented in the transportation assessment MOU for Option B, the 12 study intersections identified in Subsection 5.2.3 herein were identified for operational evaluation of whether Option B traffic would contribute to unacceptable queuing on an Avenue or Boulevard.

The analysis was prepared based on the HCM operational analysis methodology pursuant to the City's TAG, and intersection analyses were prepared utilizing the *HCS7* software package. LADOT confirmed the appropriateness of the data coded in the *HCS7* software when it entered into a transportation assessment MOU for Option B. The transportation assessment MOU prepared for the screening criteria set forth in the TAG is in *Appendix A*. The operational analysis of vehicle queuing at the study intersections was prepared for the conditions identified in Subsection 5.2.3 herein.

As presented in *Table 5–3*, Option B would not cause or substantially extend vehicle queuing at 10 of the 12 study intersections during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. At these intersections, the change in queue length associated with Option B ranges from a slight decrease in queue length to a maximum of 90.6 feet (i.e., greater than three vehicles). Option B would result in unacceptable queuing and/or operational deficiencies at the following intersections:

- Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Southerly Driveway Villa Velletri Driveway
 - The change in queue length associated with Option B at the eastbound left/right approach increases by 70.0 feet (i.e., just less than three vehicles) and 100 feet (i.e., four vehicles) during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively under Future Cumulative with Option B conditions. During the weekday AM peak hour, the overall queue length is expected to be 82.5 feet (i.e., just greater than three vehicles) under Future Cumulative with Option B conditions. During the weekday PM peak

hour, the overall queue length is expected to be 300 feet (i.e., 12 vehicles) under Future Cumulative with Option B conditions.

- Mindanao Way / Glencoe Avenue
 - The change in queue length at the northbound left-turn approach queue increases by 151.7 feet (i.e., just greater than six vehicles) during the weekday AM peak hour under Future Cumulative with Option B conditions.
 - The reported back of queue length at the eastbound right-turn approach is expected to be 369.6 feet during the weekday AM peak hour and 583.1 feet during the weekday PM peak hour under Future Cumulative with Option B conditions.

Improvements to these intersections have been identified and are summarized in Section 5.2.3 above. As presented in *Table 5–3*, the proposed improvements to the intersections would significantly reduce the effects of cumulative and Option B-related traffic at the intersection. A summary of the effects of the improvements at each of the intersections is provided below.

- Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Southerly Driveway Villa Velletri Driveway
 - With the proposed improvements, the overall queue length at the eastbound approach under Future Cumulative with Option B conditions is reduced by 2.7 feet during the weekday AM peak hour. During the weekday PM peak hour, the overall queue length at the eastbound approach under Future Cumulative with Option B conditions is reduced by 167.5 feet (i.e., just less than seven vehicles).
- Mindanao Way / Glencoe Avenue
 - With the proposed improvements, the overall queue length at the northbound left-turn approach under Future Cumulative with Option B conditions is reduced by 1025.5 feet (i.e., just greater than 41 vehicles) and 243.9 feet (i.e., just less than 10 vehicles) during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively.
 - With the proposed improvements, the overall queue length at the eastbound right-turn approach under Future Cumulative with Option B conditions is reduced by 116.9 feet (i.e., less than five vehicles) and 173.8 feet (i.e., just less than eight vehicles) during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

It is envisioned that passenger loading/unloading will occur within the Option B drop-off/pick-up area located along the east side of Ocean Way, along the westerly portion of the Project Site. No pedestrian or bicycle conflicts due to potential loading/unloading activities are anticipated to occur. While not currently proposed, for any future curbside loading/unloading zones that may be proposed by the Applicant, appropriate signage and pavement/curb markings will be required by the City and installed by the Applicant. Any installations that fall within the City's (public) right-of-way will require prior review and approval by LADOT. Thus, it is envisioned that should any curbside loading/unloading zones be proposed by the Applicant, on-street parking

along the direct Option B frontages will not be allowed and some or most of the curbside space would be repurposed for loading/unloading operations.

5.3 Project Construction Effect on Nearby Mobility

The project construction evaluation addresses activity associated with project construction and major in-street construction of infrastructure projects.

5.3.1 Screening Criteria

For land use projects, if the answer is yes to any of the following questions, further analysis will be required to assess whether project construction would negatively affect pedestrian, bicycle, transit, or vehicle circulation:

- Would a project that requires construction activities to take place within the right-of-way of a Boulevard or Avenue (as designated in Mobility Plan 2035) which would necessitate temporary lane, alley, or street closures for more than one day (including day and evening hours, and overnight closures if on a residential street)?
 - No.
- Would a project require construction activities to take place within the right-of-way of a Collector or Local Street (as designated in the Mobility Plan 2035) which would necessitate temporary lane, alley, or street closures for more than seven days (including day and evening hours, and including overnight closures if on a residential street)?
 - No.
- Would in-street construction activities result in the loss of regular vehicle, bicycle, or pedestrian access, including loss of existing bicycle parking to an existing land use for more than one day, including day and evening hours and overnight closures if access is lost to residential units?
 - Yes. Temporary closures of the sidewalks along the Project Site's Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue frontages may be required during portions of the construction period. However, signs would be posted advising pedestrians of temporary sidewalk closures and providing alternative routes. No bicycle routes/lanes in the Project study area would require temporary closure. Additionally, the Applicant will prepare and implement a Construction Management Plan that will reduce construction-related impacts on the surrounding community, and will minimize potential conflicts between construction activities, street traffic, bicyclists, and pedestrians.
- Would in-street construction activities result in the loss of regular ADA pedestrian access to an existing transit station, stop, or facility (e.g., layover zone) during revenue hours?
 - No.

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

- Would in-street construction activities result in the temporary loss for more than one day of an existing bus stop or rerouting of a bus route that serves the project site?
 - No.
- Would construction activities result in the temporary removal and/or loss of on-street metered parking for more than 30 days?
 - No.
- Would the project involve a discretionary action to construct new building of more than 1,000 square feet that require access for hauling construction materials and equipment from streets of less than 24-feet wide in a hillside area?
 - No.

As the answer is "yes" to one of the screening criteria questions, further analysis is required to evaluate whether Project construction would negatively affect pedestrian, bicycle, transit, or vehicle circulation.

5.3.2 Evaluation Criteria and Methodology

The evaluation criteria for project construction is focused on whether the proposed project would adversely affect mobility in the project vicinity during the construction process. Specifically, the City's TAG asks the following question: "Would construction of a project substantially interfere with pedestrian, bicycle, transit, or vehicle circulation and accessibility to adjoining areas?" Factors to be considered are the location of the project site, the functional classification of the adjacent street(s), the availability of alternate routes or additional capacity, temporary loss of bicycle parking, temporary loss of bus stops or rerouting of transit lines, the duration of temporary loss of access, the affected land uses, and the magnitude of the temporary construction activities.

Factors to consider when assessing a project construction's potential effect on mobility in the project area include the following:

- Temporary transportation constraints:
 - The length of time of temporary street closures or closures of two or more travel lanes;
 - The classification of the street (major arterial, state highway) affected;
 - The existing congestion levels on the affected street segments and intersections;
 - Whether the affected street directly leads to a freeway on- or off-ramp or other state highway;

- Potential safety issues involved with street or lane closures; and
- The presence of emergency services (fire, hospital, etc.) located nearby that regularly use the affected street.
- Temporary loss of access:
 - The length of time of any loss of pedestrian or bicycle circulation past a construction area;
 - The length of time of any loss of vehicular, bicycle, or pedestrian access to a parcel fronting the construction area;
 - The length of time of any loss of ADA pedestrian access to a transit station, stop, or facility;
 - The availability of nearby vehicular or pedestrian access within ¹/₄ mile of the lost access; and
 - The type of land uses affected, and related safety, convenience, and/or economic issues.
- Temporary Loss of Bus Stops or Rerouting of Bus Lines:
 - The length of time that an existing bus stop would be unavailable or that existing service would be interrupted;
 - The availability of a nearby location (within ¼ mile) to which the bus stop or route can be temporarily relocated;
 - The existence of other bus stops or routes with similar routes/destinations within a ¹/₄mile radius of the affected stops or routes; and
 - Whether the interruption would occur on a weekday, weekend or holiday, and whether the existing bus route typically provides service that/those day(s).

Descriptions of the Project location and physical setting are provided in Subsection 2.1, Project Site Location, and Section 3.0, Project Context, herein that apply to this analysis. The Project location and Project setting data items such as adjacent street classifications, public bicycle parking, inventory of existing transit lines, bus stops, etc. Per Section 3.4.4 of the TAG, the evaluation of the Project construction includes a review of whether construction activity within the street right-of-way would require any of the following:

• Street, sidewalk, or lane closures.

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

- Block existing vehicle, bicycle, or pedestrian access along a street or to parcels fronting the street.
- Modification of access to transit stations, stops, or facilities during revenue hours.
- Closure or movement of an existing bus stop or rerouting of an existing bus line.
- Creation of transportation hazards.

The City's TAG notes that a comparison of the results to the evaluation criteria are to be provided in order to determine the level of impact. The summary of the Option A and Option B construction evaluation criteria review in order to determine level of impact is provided in *Table* 5-4.

As presented in *Table 5–4*, it is concluded that Option A and Option B construction would not result in the closure of two or more travel lanes, would not require relocation of existing bus transit stops or routes, would not result in the loss of regular vehicle, bicycle, or pedestrian access, and would not impede emergency access.

5.3.3 Recommended Project-Specific Action Items

Due to the short-term nature of construction activities and the variable characteristics and needs of a specific project's construction phase(s), it is recommended that a construction work site traffic control plan be submitted to LADOT's Citywide Temporary Traffic Control Section or Permit Plan Review Section for review and approval prior to the start of construction activity. The construction work site traffic control plan is required to identify the location of all temporary roadway lane and/or sidewalk closures needed during project construction. Additionally, if pedestrian detours and/or temporary travel lane closures are proposed, LADOT requires submission and approval of a traffic control/management plan prior to the issuance of building permits.

Consistent with LADOT's recommendation and requirements, the Applicant will prepare a detailed Construction Staging and Traffic Management Plan (CSTMP), which will include any applicable street/lane/sidewalk closure information, a detour plan, haul route(s), and a staging plan. The plan will be based on the nature and timing of the Project's specific construction activities and will consider other projects under construction in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site. The CSTMP will also include features such as notification to adjacent project owners and occupants of upcoming construction activities, advance notification regarding any temporary transit stop relocations, and limitation of any potential roadway lane closure(s) to off-peak travel periods, to the extent feasible.

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers

Table 5-4 QUALITATIVE REVIEW OF PROJECT CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

| CRITERIA | PROJECT RESPONSE | DESCRIPTION |
|---|-----------------------|---|
| TEMPORARY TRANSPORTATION CON | STRAINTS | |
| The length of time of temporary street closures or closures of two or more travel lanes. | N/A | Project construction will not require street closures or closures of two or more travel lanes. |
| The classification of the street (major arterial, state highway) affected. | Avenue III; Collector | Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue are classified as an Avenue III and Collector, respectively, by the City of Los Angeles. |
| The existing congestion levels on the affected street segments and intersections. | Acceptable LOS | |
| Whether the affected street directly leads to a freeway on- or off-ramp or other state highway. | N/A | N/A |
| Potential safety issues involved with street or lane closures. | N/A | While safety issues are not anticipated, the Project Applicant will prepare a Construction Staging and Traffic Management Plan (CSTMP) which would detail any potential safety issues. |
| The presence of emergency services (fire, hospital, etc.) located nearby that regularly use the affected street. | None | N/A |
| TEMPORARY LOSS OF ACCE | SS | |
| The length of time of any loss of pedestrian or bicycle circulation past a construction area. | Unknown | The Project Applicant will prepare a CSTMP which would detail any loss of pedestrian or bicycle circulation past the construction of the Project. |
| The length of time of any loss of vehicular, bicycle, or pedestrian access to a parcel fronting the construction area. | Unknown | The Project Applicant will prepare a CSTMP which would detail any loss of vehicular, bicycle, or pedestrian access to a parcel fronting the construction area. |
| The length of time of any loss of ADA pedestrian access to a transit station, stop, or facility. | None | N/A |
| The availability of nearby vehicular or pedestrian access within 1/4 mile of the lost access. | None | N/A |
| The type of land uses affected, and related safety, convenience, and/or economic issues. | None | Access will be maintained for adjacent parcels in the Project vicinity. |
| TEMPORARY LOSS OF BUS STOPS OR REROUT | TING OF BUS LINES | |
| The length of time that an existing bus stop would be unavailable or that existing service would be interrupted. | N/A | No relocations proposed. |
| The availability of a nearby location (within one quarter-mile) to which the bus stop or route can be temporarily relocated. | N/A | N/A |
| The existence of other bus stops or routes with similar routes/destinations within a 1/4-mile radius of the affected stops or routes. | N/A | N/A |
| Whether the interruption would occur on a weekday, weekend or holiday, and whether the existing bus route typically provides service that/those day(s). | N/A | N/A |

6.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

• **Project Description** – Option A consists of the construction of a mixed-use development including 592 market-rate residential apartment dwelling units, 66 affordable housing dwelling units, 13,650 square feet of restaurant floor area, and 13,650 square feet of commercial floor area. Parking for Option A will be provided in two subterranean levels and two above-grade levels of parking within each of the three buildings. Option A proposes to provide a total of 1,217 parking spaces. Construction of Option A would be completed, and occupancy to occur, by the year 2026.

Option B consists of the construction a mixed-use development including 382 marketrate residential apartment dwelling units, 43 affordable housing dwelling units, 20,000 square feet of restaurant floor area, 20,000 square feet of commercial floor area, and 90,00 square feet of office floor area. Parking for Option B will be provided in an onsite parking garage with one level of at-grade parking and three levels of subterranean parking. Option B proposes to provide a total of 1,287 parking spaces. Construction of Option B would be completed, and occupancy to occur, by the year 2026.

- *Study Scope* This transportation assessment presents (i) a CEQA assessment of whether the Project conflicts or is inconsistent with local transportation-related plans and policies, (ii) a CEQA assessment of Project-related VMT, (iii) a CEQA assessment of whether the Project increases hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use, (iv) a CEQA freeway safety assessment, (v) a non-CEQA assessment of pedestrian, bicycle and transit access, (vi) a non-CEQA evaluation of Project access, safety and circulation, and (vii) a non-CEQA review of Project construction activities. LADOT confirmed the appropriateness of the analysis criteria when it entered into a transportation assessment MOU for both Option A and Option B.
- **Project Trip Generation** Option A is expected to generate 222 net new vehicle trips (67 inbound trips and 155 outbound trips) during the weekday AM peak hour. During the weekday PM peak hour, Option A is expected to generate 50 net new vehicle trips (58 inbound trips and -8 outbound trips). Option A is expected to generate 1,379 net new daily vehicle trips. Option B is expected to generate 231 net new vehicle trips (114 inbound trips and 117 outbound trips) during the weekday AM peak hour. During the weekday PM peak hour, Option B is expected to generate 59 net new vehicle trips (36 inbound trips and 23 outbound trips). Option B is expected to generate 1,979 net new daily vehicle trips.
- CEQA Analysis
 - Project Consistency with Local Plans and Policies: Option A and Option B would be generally consistent with the relevant City transportation plans, policies and programs and does not include any features that would preclude the City from completing and complying with these guiding documents and policy objectives. Therefore, both

Option A and Option B would have a less than significant impact with respect to consistency with transportation plans, policies, and programs.

Furthermore, the Applicant will comply with existing applicable City ordinances (e.g., the City's existing TDM Ordinance) and the other transportation-related requirements pursuant to the LAMC, as well as the TDM requirements of the Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan.

• *VMT Analysis:* Option A would not result in a significant VMT impact. Furthermore, based on the Option A-related VMT analysis and the conclusions discussed in Section 4.2.3 (which demonstrate that Option A falls under the City's efficiency-based impact thresholds and thus are already shown to align with the long-term VMT and GHG reduction goals of SCAG's RTP/SCS), no cumulatively significant VMT impacts are anticipated.

While the Option B Daily Work VMT per Employee is greater than the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee, LLG has proposed an alternative assessment of the VMT impacts for Option B. As stated in Section 4.2.2, the Daily Household VMT per Capita for the residential component of Option B is calculated to be 5.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, which is well below the threshold for the West Los Angeles APC of 7.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita. For the office component of Option B, the Daily Work VMT per Employee value is calculated to be reduced from 14.5 to 11.6 with consideration of TDM measures. While the Daily Work VMT per Employee value after application of TDM measures is greater than the threshold of 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee, a finding of a less than significant impact is made related to the Daily Work VMT per Employee for Option B in consideration of the "excess" mitigation provided by the TDM measures recommended for Option B. The resulting Daily Household VMT per Capita for the residential component is substantially less than the threshold of significance for the West Los Angeles APC and therefore is deemed to offset the unmitigated portion of the Daily Work VMT per Employee related to the office component. This is demonstrated through the calculation of total VMT as detailed in Appendix I. Furthermore, no cumulatively significant VMT impacts are anticipated as it relates to Option B.

Geometric Design Review: Given the classification of the roadways along the Project Site's frontage, existing physical condition of the Project Site, surrounding land uses, and planned pedestrian enhancements, no safety concerns related to geometric design are noted. Additionally, it is noted that neither Option A nor Option B will add curb cuts to the Project Site's Maxella Avenue frontage and will reduce the number of curb cuts along the Project Site's Glencoe Avenue frontage from two to one with Option A, and from two to zero with Option B. Therefore, it can be determined that neither Option A nor Option B will not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric

design feature or incompatible use, resulting in a less than significant impact determination.

- *Freeway Safety Analysis:* Neither the Option A nor Option B would add 25 or more trips to a freeway off-ramp. As trips added by Option A and Option B would not result in extended queuing onto a freeway mainline, the freeway safety impact would be less than significant.
- Non-CEQA Analysis
 - Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Access: Option A and Option B do not include any features that would permanently remove, adversely modify, or degrade pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities in the Project Site vicinity. As noted herein, it is determined that it is possible that Option A and Option B may intensify use of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities in the Project Site vicinity, however, such use is not expected to result in a deficient condition caused by Option A or Option B.
 - Project Access and Circulation Review: The Project's weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes would not cause or substantially extend vehicle queuing at 10 of the 12 study intersections analyzed (as discussed in Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4 herein). Physical improvements to these intersections have been identified and are shown to improve traffic operation at these intersections.
 - Project Construction Effect on Nearby Mobility: As construction of Option A or Option B would not result in the closure of two or more travel lanes, would not relocate existing bus transit stops or routes, and would not impede emergency access, it can be concluded that construction of either Option A or Option B would not negatively affect pedestrian, bicycle, transit, or vehicle circulation.

APPENDIX A

APPROVED TRANSPORTATION ASSESSMENT MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING



Transportation Assessment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

This MOU acknowledges that the Transportation Assessment for the following Project will be prepared in accordance with the latest version of LADOT's Transportation Assessment Guidelines:

1. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name: Paseo Marina

Project Address: 13400 Maxella Avenue

Project Description: Development of 658 residential apartment dwelling units, 13,650 square feet of restaurant floor area, and 13,650 square feet of commercial floor area.

LADOT Project Case Number: CTC20-109212 Project Site Plan attached? (Required) Yes INO

11. TRIP GENERATION

Geographic Distribution: N 20 % S 25 % E 45 % 10 % W

Illustration of Project trip distribution percentages at Study intersections attached? (Required) 🖾 Yes 🗆 No Trip Generation Rate(s): ITE 10th Edition / Other ITE 10th Edition

| Trip Generation Adjustment (Exact amount of credit subject to approval by LADOT) | Yes | No |
|---|-----|----|
| Transit Usage | X | |
| Transportation Demand Management | | X |
| Existing Active Land Use | X | |
| Previous Land Use | | X |
| Internal Trip | X | |
| Pass-By Trip | X | |

Trip generation table including a description of the proposed land uses, ITE rates, estimated morning and afternoon peak hour volumes (ins/outs/totals), proposed trip credits, etc. attached? (Required) 🗵 Yes 🗆 No

| | IN | OUT | TOTAL | |
|----------|----|-----|-------|-----------------------|
| AM Trips | 61 | 149 | 210 | NET Daily Trips 1,295 |
| PM Trips | 61 | (7) | 54 | (From VMT Calculator |

ш. STUDY AREA AND ASSUMPTIONS

Map of Study Intersections/Segments attached? X Yes INo

Project Buildout Year: 2026

Ambient Growth Rate:

1.0 % Per Yr.

Related Projects List, researched by the consultant and approved by LADOT, attached? (Required) XYes No *Forthcoming

STUDY INTERSECTIONS (May be subject to LADOT revision after access, safety and circulation analysis)

1 Walgrove Avenue / Washington Boulevard

2 Lincoln Boulevard / Maxella Avenue

3 Del Rey Avenue / Maxella Avenue

4 Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue

5 Maxella Avenue Driveway / Maxella Avenue

6 Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue

10 Mindanao Way / SR-90 Eastbound Ramps

7 Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Northerly Driveway 8 Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Southerly Driveway

11 Mindanao Way / SR-90 Westbound Ramps

12 Mindanao Way / La Villa Marina

9 Mindanao Way / Glencoe Avenue

Is this Project located on a street within the High Injury Network?
Yes No November 2019 | Page 1 of 2

LADOT

IV. ACCESS ASSESSMENT

Is the project on a lot that is 0.5-acre or more in total gross area? 🖾 Yes 🗆 No

Is the project's frontage 250 linear feet or more along an Avenue or Boulevard as classified by the City's General Plan? ⊠ Yes □ No

Is the project's building frontage encompassing an entire block along an Avenue or Boulevard as classified by the City's General Plan?
Yes X No

V. CONTACT INFORMATION

Consultant's Representative

| CONSULTANT Name: Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers | DEVELOPER RAR2-Villa Marina Center CA, LLC |
|--|---|
| Address: 20931 Burbank Boulevard, Suite C | 3501 Jamboree Road, Suite 3000 |
| Woodland Hills, CA 91367 | Newport Beach, CA 92660 |
| Phone Number: (818) 835-8648 | (949) 809-2502 |
| E-Mail: jshender@llgengineers.com | TGuiteras@Sares-Regis.com |
| Approved by: x Julia 3/5/2020 | x Churchen 3/12/20 |

*MOUs are generally valid for two years after signing. If after two years a transportation assessment has not been submitted to LADOT, the developer's representative shall check with the appropriate LADOT office to determine if the terms of this MOU are still valid or if a new MOU is needed.

Date

LADOT Representative

*Date



2 14:25:50 jshe 12/03/2019 o:\0265\dwg\f1.dwg



24/2017

Table 1 PROJECT TRIP GENERATION [1]

| | SIZE | DAILY TRIP ENDS [2] | AM PEAK HOUR VOLUMES [2] | | | PM PEAK HOUR VOLUMES [2] | | |
|--|----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|------|-------|-----------------------------|-------|-------|
| LAND USE Proposed Project | | VOLUMES | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL |
| Proposed Project | | | | 1 | 1.7* | 1. 10.1 | 1.1 | 100 |
| Apartments [3] | 658 DU | 3,580 | 62 | 175 | 237 | 177 | 113 | 290 |
| Restaurant [4] | 13,650 GSF | 1,531 | 75 | 61 | 136 | 82 | 51 | 133 |
| Commercial [5] | 13,650 GLSF | 515 | 8 | 5 | 13 | 25 | 27 | 52 |
| Subtotal | 1000 | 5,626 | 145 | 241 | 386 | 284 | 191 | 475 |
| Internal Capture [6], [7] | | (900) | (16) | (27) | (43) | (60) | (40) | (100) |
| Transit Trips (15%) [8] | | (709) | (19) | (32) | (51) | (34) | (23) | (57) |
| Subtotal Project Driveway Trips | | 4,017 | 110 | 182 | 292 | 190 | 128 | 318 |
| Existing Land Use Commercial [5] | (100,781) GLSF | (3,804) | (59) | (36) | (95) | (184) | (200) | (384) |
| Transit Trips [8] Commercial (15%) | | 571 | 9 | 5 | .14 | 28 | 30 | 58 |
| Subtotal Existing Driveway Trips | | (3,233) | (50) | (31) | (81) | (156) | (170) | (326) |
| NET INCREASE DRIVEWAY T | RIPS | 784 | 60 | 151 | 211 | 34 | (42) | (8) |
| Proposed Pass-By Trips [9] Restaurant (20%) Commercial (50%) | | (219) | (11) | (9) | (20) | (11) | (7) | (18) |
| Subtotal | | (403) | (14) | (11) | (25) | (20) | (16) | (36) |
| Existing Pass-By Trips [9] Commercial (30%) | | 970 | 15 | 9 | 24 | 47 | 51 | 98 |
| NET INCREASE "OFF-SITE" T | RIPS | 1,351 | 61 | 149 | 210 | 61 | (7) | 54 |

[1] Sources: ITE "Trip Generation Manual", 10th Edition, 2017.

[2] Trips are one-way traffic movements, entering or leaving.

[3] ITE Land Use Code 221 (Multifamily Housing [Mid-Rise]) trip generation average rates.
 Daily Trip Rate: 5.44 trips/dwelling unit; 50% inbound/50% outbound
 AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.36 trips/dwelling unit; 26% inbound/74% outbound

- PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.44 trips/dwelling unit; 61% inbound/39% outbound

[4] ITE Land Use Code 932 (High-Turnover [Sit-Down] Restaurant) trip generation average rates. - Daily Weekday Trip Rate: 112.18 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 50% inbound/50% outbound - AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 9.94 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 55% inbound/45% outbound

PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 9.77 trips/1.000 SF of floor area, 62% inbound/38% outbound
 [5] ITE Land Use Code 820 (Shopping Center) trip generation average rates.

Daily Trip Rate: 37.75 trips/1.000 SF of leasable area; 50% inbound/50% outbound
 AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.94 trips/1.000 SF of leasable area; 62% inbound/38% outbound
 PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 3.81 trips/1.000 SF of leasable area; 48% inbound/52% outbound

[6] The internal capture reduction for the residential, restaurant, retail, and office is based on the synergy between all the land uses provided within the project site, and determined via NCHRP 684 Internal Capture Estimation Tool (11% for AM Peak Hour and 21% for PM Peak Hour).

[7] Daily internal capture (16%) determined by averaging internal capture for AM Peak Hour (11%) and PM Peak Hour (21%),

per the NCHRP 684 Internal Capture Estimation Tool.

[8] A 15% transit use reduction applied based on the project site being located within 1/4 mile of a Big Blue Bus rapid stop. The trip reduction for transit trips has been applied to the proposed project and existing land uses based on the "LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines", July 2019 for developments within a 1/4 mile walking distance of a transit station or a Rapid Bus stop.

[9] Pass-by trips are made as intermediate stops on the way from an origin to a primary trip destination without a route diversion. Pass-by trips are attracted from traffic passing the site on an adjacent street or roadway that offers direct access to the site. The trip reduction for pass-by trips has been applied to the restaurant and commercial components of the project based on the "LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines", July 2019 for High Turnover Restaurant. Shopping Center less than 50,000 sf, and Shopping Center 100,000 to less than 300,000 sf.

| | NCHRP 684 Internal Trip | Capture Estimation Tool | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Project Name: | Paseo Marina | Organization: | |
| Project Location: | | Performed By: | |
| Scenario Description: | | Date: | |
| Analysis Year: | | Checked By: | |
| Analysis Period: | AM Street Peak Hour | Date: | |

| and the second se | Table 1- | A: Base Vehicle- | Trip Generation Est | imates (Single-Use Sit | e Estimate) | | |
|---|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------|--|
| | Developme | ent Data (For Infor | mation Only) | Estimated Vehicle-Trips ³ | | | |
| Land Use | ITE LUCs1 | Quantity | Units | Total | Entering | Exiting | |
| Office | 14 | | | 0 | | | |
| Retail | 820 | 13,650 | | 13 | 8 | 5 | |
| Restaurant | 932 | 13,650 | | 136 | 75 | 61 | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | 0 | | | |
| Residential | 221 | 658 | | 237 | 62 | 175 | |
| Hotel | | | | 0 | | | |
| All Other Land Uses ² | | | | 0 | | | |
| | | | | 386 | 145 | 241 | |

| | | Table 2-A: | Mode Split and Vehicle | Occupancy Estimates | mar to an | | |
|----------------------------------|------------|-------------|------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------|--|
| Land Use Veh. Occ.4 | 1 | Entering Tr | ips | Exiting Trips | | | |
| | Veh. Occ.4 | % Transit | % Non-Motorized | Veh. Occ.4 | % Transit | % Non-Motorized | |
| Office | | | | | | | |
| Retail | | 15% | | | 15% | | |
| Restaurant | 12 12 1 | 15% | | | 15% | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | | | | |
| Residential | | 15% | A DECEMBER OF | | 15% | | |
| Hotel | | | | | | 1 | |
| All Other Land Uses ² | | | | | | 6 Cu 2 | |

| Table 3-A: Average Land Use Interchange Distances (Feet Walking Distance) | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|--------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|
| Origin (From) | | - LA | | Destination (To) | | | | |
| | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | |
| Office | (c | | | | | | | |
| Retail | | | | | | | | |
| Restaurant | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | | | | | |
| Residential | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Hotel | | | | | | | | |

| Table 4-A: Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix* | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|------------------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|
| Origin (From) | 1 | Destination (To) | | | | | | | |
| | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | |
| Office | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Retail | 0 | 1000 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | |
| Restaurant | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 2 | 0 | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Residential | 0 | 1 | 15 | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |

| Table 5-A: | Computatio | ons Summary | Table 6-A: Internal Trip Capture Percentages by Land Use | | | |
|---|------------|-------------|--|----------------------|----------------|---------------|
| | Total | Entering | Exiting | Land Use | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips |
| All Person-Trips | 386 | 145 | 241 | Office | N/A | N/A |
| Internal Capture Percentage | 11% | 14% | 9% | Retail | 25% | 40% |
| | | | 1000 | Restaurant | 21% | 5% |
| External Vehicle-Trips ⁵ | 292 | 105 | 187 | Cinema/Entertainment | N/A | N/A |
| External Transit-Trips ⁶ | 52 | 19 | 33 | Residential | 5% | 9% |
| External Non-Motorized Trips ⁶ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel | N/A | N/A |

 ¹Land Use Codes (LUCs) from *Trip Generation Manual*, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.

 ²Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator.

 ³Enter trips assuming no transit or non-motorized trips (as assumed in ITE *Trip Generation Manual*).

 ⁴Enter vehicle occupancy assumed in Table 1-A vehicle trips. If vehicle occupancy changes for proposed mixed-use project, manual adjustments must be made to Tables 5-A, 9-A (O and D). Enter transit, non-motorized percentages that will result with proposed mixed-use project complete.

 ⁵Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-A.

 ⁶Person-Trips

 *Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Estimation Tool Developed by the Texas A&M Transportation Institute - Version 2013.1

| Project Name: | Paseo Marina | | |
|------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Analysis Period: | AM Street Peak Hour | | |

| | | Table 7-A: Conv | ersion of Vehicle-Trip | Ends to Person-Trip | Ends | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Land Use | Table 7-A (D): Entering Trips | | | Table 7-A (O): Exiting Trips | | |
| | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* |
| Office | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 1.00 | 8 | 8 | 1.00 | 5 | 5 |
| Restaurant | 1.00 | 75 | 75 | 1.00 | 61 | 61 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 1.00 | 62 | 62 | 1.00 | 175 | 175 |
| Hotel | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |

| | Table 8-A | (O): Internal P | Person-Trip Origin- | Destination Matrix (Computed | d at Origin) | |
|----------------------|-----------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------------------|--------------|-------|
| Origin (From) | | | | Destination (To) | | |
| | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 19 | 9 | | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 4 | 2 | 35 | 0 | | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

| - | Table 8-A (D |): Internal Per | son-Trip Origin-De | stination Matrix (Computed a | t Destination) | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|----------------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| Origin (From) | 1 | Destination (To) | | | | | | | | |
| Origin (Plotti) | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | | |
| Office | | 3 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Retail | 0 | | 38 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | | |
| Restaurant | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Residential | 0 | 1 | 15 | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |

| A REAL PROPERTY OF A REAL PROPER | T/ | able 9-A (D): Inte | rnal and External T | Frips Summary (Entering 7 | Trips) | | |
|--|----------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Destination Land Lise | 1 | Person-Trip Estim | lates | External Trips by Mode* | | | |
| Destination Land Use | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ¹ | Transit ² | Non-Motorized ² | |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Retail | 2 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 | |
| Restaurant | 16 | 59 | 75 | 50 | 9 | 0 | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Residential | 3 | 59 | 62 | 50 | 9 | 0 | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| All Other Land Uses ³ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

| | т | able 9-A (O): Inte | ernal and External | Trips Summary (Exiting T | rips) | | |
|----------------------------------|----------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Origin Lond Han | F | Person-Trip Estim | ates | External Trips by Mode* | | | |
| Origin Land Use | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ¹ | Transit ² | Non-Motorized ² | |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Retail | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | |
| Restaurant | 3 | 58 | 61 | 49 | 9 | 0 | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Residential | 16 | 159 | 175 | 135 | 24 | 0 | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| All Other Land Uses ³ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

¹Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-A ²Person-Trips

³Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator *Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

| | NCHRP 684 Internal Trip | Capture Estimation Tool | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Project Name: | Paseo Marina | Organization: | |
| Project Location: | | Performed By: | |
| Scenario Description: | | Date: | |
| Analysis Year: | | Checked By: | |
| Analysis Period: | PM Street Peak Hour | Date: | |

| | Table 1- | P: Base Vehicle- | Trip Generation Est | imates (Single-Use Sit | e Estimate) | |
|----------------------------------|---|------------------|--|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------|
| Landling | Development Data (For Information Only) | | | Estimated Vehicle-Trips ³ | | |
| Land Use | ITE LUCs1 | Quantity | Units | Total | Entering | Exiting |
| Office | 18 | | and the second sec | 0 | | |
| Retail | 820 | 13,650 | | 52 | 25 | 27 |
| Restaurant | 932 | 13,650 | | 133 | 82 | 51 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | 0 | | |
| Residential | 221 | 658 | | 290 | 177 | 113 |
| Hotel | 1 | | | 0 | | |
| All Other Land Uses ² | | 14 | | 0 | | |
| | | | | 475 | 284 | 191 |

| | | Table 2-P: | Mode Split and Vehicle | Occupancy Estimates | The second F | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------|------------------------|---|---------------|-----------------|--|
| facilities. | Entering Trips | | | | Exiting Trips | | |
| Land Use | Veh. Occ.4 | % Transit | % Non-Motorized | Veh. Occ.4 | % Transit | % Non-Motorized | |
| Office | | | | | | | |
| Retail | | 15% | | | 15% | | |
| Restaurant | | 15% | | | 15% | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | | | | |
| Residential | | 15% | | | 15% | | |
| Hotel | | | | • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | |
| All Other Land Uses ² | | | | | | | |

| | Table 3-P: Average Land Use Interchange Distances (Feet Walking Distance) | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|--------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| Origin (From) | | | | Destination (To) | | | | | | |
| | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | | |
| Office | | | | | | | | | | |
| Retail | | | | | | | | | | |
| Restaurant | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Residential | | 1 | | | | 2 | | | | |
| Hotel | | | 1 | | | N | | | | |

| | | Table 4-P: I | nternal Person-Tri | p Origin-Destination Matrix* | | |
|----------------------|--------|--------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Origin (From) | 1-1-1- | | | Destination (To) | 1 | |
| | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 0 | | 8 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 13 | | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 0 | 3 | 11 | 0 | | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

| Table 5-P: | Computatio | ons Summary | | Table 6-P: Internal | Trip Capture Percentag | ges by Land Use |
|---|------------|-------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| | Total | Entering | Exiting | Land Use | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips |
| All Person-Trips | 475 | 284 | 191 | Office | N/A | N/A |
| Internal Capture Percentage | 21% | 18% | 27% | Retail | 64% | 56% |
| | | | | Restaurant | 23% | 43% |
| External Vehicle-Trips ⁵ | 318 | 199 | 119 | Cinema/Entertainment | N/A | N/A |
| External Transit-Trips ⁶ | 55 | 34 | 21 | Residential | 9% | 12% |
| External Non-Motorized Trips ⁶ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel | N/A | N/A |

¹Land Use Codes (LUCs) from *Trip Generation Manual*, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.

²Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator.
³Enter trips assuming no transit or non-motorized trips (as assumed in ITE *Trip Generation Manual*).

⁴Enter vehicle occupancy assumed in Table 1-P vehicle trips. If vehicle occupancy changes for proposed mixed-use project, manual adjustments must be made

⁵Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-P. ⁵Person-Trips

*Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Estimation Tool Developed by the Texas A&M Transportation Institute - Version 2013.1

| Project Name: | Paseo Marina | 1.1 |
|------------------|---------------------|-----|
| Analysis Period: | PM Street Peak Hour | |

| Lond Llos | Tabl | e 7-P (D): Entering | Trips | | Table 7-P (O): Exiting Trip: | S |
|----------------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------|-----------|------------------------------|---------------|
| Land Use | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* |
| Office | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 1.00 | 25 | 25 | 1.00 | 27 | 27 |
| Restaurant | 1,00 | 82 | 82 | 1.00 | 51 | 51 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 1.00 | 177 | 177 | 1.00 | 113 | 113 |
| Hotel | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |

| | Table 8-P (| O): Internal Per | son-Trip Origin-De | estination Matrix (Computed a | t Origin) | |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Orderin (Freen) | the second second | | | Destination (To) | | |
| Origin (From) | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 1 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| Restaurant | 2 | 21 | | 4 | 9 | 4 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 5 | 47 | 24 | 0 | | 3 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

| | Table 8-P (D): | Internal Person | n-Trip Origin-Desti | nation Matrix (Computed at D | estination) | |
|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| October (Errore) | - | | | Destination (To) | | |
| Origin (From) | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office | | 2 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Retail | 0 | | 24 | 0 | 81 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 13 | | 0 | 28 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 7 | 0 |
| Residential | 0 | 3 | 11 | 0 | | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | |

| | Tat | ole 9-P (D): Interna | al and External Trip | os Summary (Entering Tri | ps) | |
|----------------------------------|----------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Destination Lond Line | Pr | erson-Trip Estimate | es | | External Trips by Mode | • |
| Destination Land Use | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ¹ | Transit ² | Non-Motorized ² |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 16 | 9 | 25 | 8 | 1 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 19 | 63 | 82 | 54 | 9 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 16 | 161 | 177 | 137 | 24 | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ³ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Sector | Та | ble 9-P (O): Intern | al and External Tri | ps Summary (Exiting Trip | s) | |
|----------------------------------|----------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Odded and the | P | erson-Trip Estimate | es | | External Trips by Mode | • |
| Origin Land Use | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ¹ | Transit ² | Non-Motorized ² |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 15 | 12 | 27 | 10 | 2 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 22 | 29 | 51 | 25 | 4 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 14 | 99 | 113 | 84 | 15 | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ³ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

¹Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-P ²Person-Trips ³Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator ^{*}Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

| 12.4 | | Wee | kday |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Land | Use Pairs | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hou |
| | To Office | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | To Retail | 28.0% | 20.0% |
| E. SELEC | To Restaurant | 63.0% | 4.0% |
| From OFFICE | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | To Residential | 1.0% | 2.0% |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | To Office | 29.0% | 2.0% |
| | To Retail | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| From DETAIL | To Restaurant | 13.0% | 29.0% |
| From RETAIL | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 4.0% |
| | To Residential | 14.0% | 26.0% |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 5.0% |
| | To Office | 31.0% | 3.0% |
| | To Retail | 14.0% | 41.0% |
| From RESTAURANT | To Restaurant | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 8.0% |
| | To Residential | 4.0% | 18.0% |
| | To Hotel | 3.0% | 7.0% |
| | To Office | 0.0% | 2.0% |
| | To Retail | 0.0% | 21.0% |
| | To Restaurant | 0.0% | 31.0% |
| FIOM CINEWAVENTER FAINWENT | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | To Residential | 0.0% | 8.0% |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 2.0% |
| | To Office | 2.0% | 4.0% |
| | To Retail | 1.0% | 42.0% |
| From RESIDENTIAL | To Restaurant | 20.0% | 21.0% |
| FION RESIDENTIAL | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | To Residential | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 3.0% |
| | To Office | 75.0% | 0.0% |
| | To Retail | 14.0% | 16.0% |
| From HOTEL | To Restaurant | 9.0% | 68.0% |
| FIGHTHOTEL | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | To Residential | 0.0% | 2.0% |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% |

| Table 7.2a Adjusted Internal Trip C | Capture Rates for Trip Destinations | within a Multi-Use | Development |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| Land Us | se Pairs | AM Deals Hours | Ruay |
| | From Office | AIVI Peak Hour | |
| | From Potail | 0.0% | 31.0% |
| | From Retain | 4.0% | 31.0% |
| To OFFICE | From Cinoma/Entortainment | 14.0% | 6.0% |
| | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 6.0% |
| | From Residential | 3.0% | 57.0% |
| | From Office | 3.0% | 0.0% |
| | From Date! | 32.0% | 0.0% |
| | From Rectaurant | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| To RETAIL | From Restaurant | 8.0% | 50.0% |
| | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 4.0% |
| | From Residential | 17.0% | 10.0% |
| | From Hotel | 4.0% | 2.0% |
| | From Office | 23.0% | 2.0% |
| | From Retail | 50.0% | 29.0% |
| To RESTAURANT | From Restaurant | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 3.0% |
| | From Residential | 20.0% | 14.0% |
| | From Hotel | 6.0% | 5.0% |
| | From Office | 0.0% | 1.0% |
| | From Retail | 0.0% | 26.0% |
| To CINEMA/ENTERTAINMENT | From Restaurant | 0.0% | 32.0% |
| | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | From Residential | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | From Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | From Office | 0.0% | 4.0% |
| | From Retail | 2.0% | 46.0% |
| To RESIDENTIAL | From Restaurant | 5.0% | 16.0% |
| | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 4.0% |
| | From Residential | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | From Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | From Office | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | From Retail | 0.0% | 17.0% |
| To HOTEL | From Restaurant | 4.0% | 71.0% |
| | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 1.0% |
| | From Residential | 0.0% | 12.0% |
| | From Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% |



CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR Version 1.2



Project Screening Criteria: Is this project required to conduct a vehicle miles traveled analysis?

Project Information



If the project is replacing an existing number of residential units with a smaller number of residential units, is the proposed project located within one-half mile of a fixed-rail or fixed-guideway transit station?



| | value | Unit | |
|---|--|----------------------------|-------|
| tail General Retail 🔹 | 100.781 | ksf | - |
| etail General Retail | 100.781 | ksf | |
| | | | |
| lick here to add a single custom land use type (will l | be included in | the above I | list) |
| lick here to add a single custom land use type (will l Proposed Project La | be included in and Use | the above I | list) |
| lick here to add a single custom land use type (will l Proposed Project La Land Use Type tail General Retail | be included in Ind Use Value 13,65 | the above I Unit ksf | list) |
| lick here to add a single custom land use type (will I Proposed Project La Land Use Type tail General Retail | be included in and Use Value 13.65 658 | the above Unit ksf | list) |

Click here to add a single custom land use type (will be included in the above list)

Project Screening Summary

| Existing Land Use | Propos Proje | sed ct |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| 3,434 | 4,72 | 9 |
| Daily Vehicle Trips | Daily Vehicl | e Trips |
| 26,012 | 32,639 | |
| Daily VMT | Daily VI | ИТ |
| Tier 1 Scree | ening Criteria | |
| Project will have less resid to existing residential unit mile of a fixed-rail station. | ential units compa s & is within one-l | nalf |
| Tier 2 Scree | ening Criteria | |
| The net increase in daily t | rips < 250 trips | 1,295 Net Daily Trip |
| The net increase in daily V | 'MT ≤ 0 | 6,627 Net Daily VM |
| The proposed project con | sists of only retail | 27 300 |
| | | 27.500 |

Measuring the Miles

CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR Version 1.2



Project Information



| Proposed Project Land Use Type | Value | Uni |
|--|-------|-----|
| Housing Multi-Family | 658 | DU |
| Retail General Retail | 13.65 | ksf |
| Retail High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant | 13.65 | ksf |

| se 🔽 to denote if the TDM strate | egy is part of the | proposed project or is a | mitigation strategy |
|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Max Home Based TDM Max Work Based TDM / | Achieved? Achieved? | Proposed Project No No | With Mitigation No No |
| A | Park | king | E. DENT |
| Reduce Parking Supply | 100 city co | ode parking provision for | the project site |
| Proposed Prj Mitigation | 74 actual | parking provision for the | e project site |
| Unbundle Parking | 150 month site | nly parking cost (dollar) f | or the project |
| Parking Cash-Out | 50 percer | nt of employees eligible | |
| Price Workplace Parking | 6.00 _ c | laily parking charge (doll | lar) |
| Proposed Prj Mitigation | 25 percer parkin | nt of employees subject t g | o priced |
| Residential Area Parking Permits Proposed Prj Mitigation | 200 _ c | ost (dollar) of annual pe | rmit |
| B | Tra | nsit | |
| C Edu | cation & Er | ncouragement | |
| D Co | mmute Tri | p Reductions | |
| Đ | Shared M | Vobility | |
| F | Bicycle Infr | astructure | |
| G Neir | ahborhood | Enhancement | and the second |

TDM Strategies

Analysis Results

| Proposed | With |
|--|--|
| Project | Mitigation |
| 4,729 | 4,729 |
| Daily Vehicle Trips | Daily Vehicle Trips |
| 32,639 | 32,639 |
| Daily VMT | Daily VMT |
| 10.2 | 10.2 |
| Houseshold VMT | Houseshold VMT |
| per Capita | per Capita |
| N/A | N/A |
| Work VMT | Work VMT |
| per Employee | per Employee |
| | |
| Significant | /MT Impact? |
| Significant V Household: Yes | /MT Impact? Household: Yes |
| Significant V Household: Yes Threshold = 7.4 | /MT Impact? Household: Yes |
| Significant Mousehold: Yes Threshold = 7.4 15% Below APC | /MT Impact? Household: Yes Threshold = 7.4 15% Below APC |
| Significant V Household: Yes Threshold = 7.4 15% Below APC Work: N/A | VMT Impact? Household: Yes Threshold = 7.4 15% Below APC Work: N/A |
| Significant V Household: Yes Threshold = 7.4 15% Below APC Work: N/A Threshold = 11.1 | /MT Impact? Household: Yes Threshold = 7.4 15% Below APC Work: N/A Threshold = 11.1 |

Measuring the Miles

Report 1: Project & Analysis Overview

Date: December 4, 2019 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Proposed Project Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| Project Information | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|----------|--|
| Land Use Type | | Value | Units | |
| | Single Family | 0 | DU | |
| | Multi Family | 658 | DU | |
| Housing | Townhouse | 0 | DU | |
| | Hotel | 0 | Rooms | |
| and a set in | Motel | 0 | Rooms | |
| | Family | 0 | DU | |
| Affordable Housing | Senior | 0 | DU | |
| ajjoruuble nousing | Special Needs | 0 | DU | |
| | Permanent Supportive | 0 | DU | |
| | General Retail | 13.650 | ksf | |
| | Furniture Store | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Pharmacy/Drugstore | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Supermarket | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Bank | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Health Club | 0.000 | ksf | |
| Potoil | High-Turnover Sit-Down | 10.000 | | |
| Retail | Restaurant | 13.650 | ksf | |
| | Fast-Food Restaurant | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Quality Restaurant | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Auto Repair | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Home Improvement | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Free-Standing Discount | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Movie Theater | 0 | Seats | |
| Office | General Office | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Medical Office | 0.000 | ksf | |
| Industrial | Light Industrial | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Manufacturing | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Warehousing/Self-Storage | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | University | 0 | Students | |
| | High School | 0 | Students | |
| School | Middle School | 0 | Students | |
| | Elementary | 0 | Students | |
| 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | Private School (K-12) | 0 | Students | |
| Other | Service of the service service of | 0 | Trins | |

Project and Analysis Overview

3 of 13

Report 1: Project & Analysis Overview

Date: December 4, 2019 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Proposed Project Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| | Analysis I | Results | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--|
| | Total Employe | es: 82 | | |
| | Total Populati | on: 1,483 | | |
| Propo | sed Project | With M | litigation | |
| 4,729 | Daily Vehicle Trips | 4,729 | Daily Vehicle Trips | |
| 32,639 | Daily VMT | 32,639 | Daily VMT | |
| 10.2 | Household VMT per Capita | 10.2 | Household VMT pe Capita | |
| N/A | Work VMT per Employee | N/A | Work VMT per Employee | |
| | Significant VN | /IT Impact? | | |
| | APC: West Lo | s Angeles | | |
| | Impact Threshold: 15% | Below APC Average | | |
| | Household | d = 7.4 | | |
| | Work = | 11.1 | | |
| Proposed Project | | With N | With Mitigation | |
| VMT Threshold | Impact | VMT Threshold | Impact | |
| Household > 7.4 | Yes | Household > 7.4 | Yes | |
| Work > 11.1 | N/A | Work > 11.1 | N/A | |

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: December 4, 2019 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Proposed Project Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| Strategy Type | | Description | Proposed Project | Mitigations |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|-------------|
| | Reduce parking supply | City code parking provision (spaces) | 0 | 0 |
| Parking | | Actual parking provision (spaces) | 0 | 0 |
| | Unbundle parking | Monthly cost for parking (\$) | \$0 | \$0 |
| | Parking cash-out | Employees eligible (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | Price workplace parking | Daily parking charge (\$) | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| | | Employees subject to priced parking (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | Residential area parking permits | Cost of annual permit (\$) | \$0 | \$0 |

(cont. on following page)

Report 2: TDM Inputs 5 of 13

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: December 4, 2019 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Proposed Project Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| Strategy Type | | Description | Proposed Project | Mitigations |
|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|
| | | Reduction in headways (increase in frequency) (%) | 0% | 0% |
| Reduc heady Transit Imple neigh Trans | Reduce transit headways | Existing transit mode share (as a percent of total daily trips) (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | | Lines within project site improved (<50%, >=50%) | 0 | 0 |
| | Implement neighborhood shuttle | Degree of implementation (low, medium, high) | 0 | 0 |
| | | Employees and residents eligible (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | Transit subsidies | Employees and residents eligible (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | | Amount of transit subsidy per passenger (daily equivalent) (\$) | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Education & Encouragement | Voluntary travel behavior change program | Employees and residents participating (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | Promotions and marketing | Employees and residents participating (%) | 0% | 0% |

Report 2: TDM Inputs 6 of 13
Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: December 4, 2019 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Proposed Project Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| Strate | gy Туре | Description | Proposed Project | Mitigations |
|----------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|
| | Required commute trip reduction program | Employees participating (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | Alternative Work Schedules and | Employees participating (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | Telecommute | Type of program | 0 | 0 |
| Commute Trip Reductions | | Degree of implementation (low, medium, high) | 0 | 0 |
| | Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle | Employees eligible (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | | Employer size (small, medium, large) | 0 | 0 |
| | Ride-share program | Employees eligible (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | Car share | Car share project setting (Urban, Suburban, All Other) | 0 | 0 |
| Shared Mobility | Bike share | Within 600 feet of existing bike share station - OR- implementing new bike share station (Yes/No) | 0 | D |
| | School carpool program | Level of implementation (Low, Medium, High) | 0 | 0 |

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: December 4, 2019 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Proposed Project Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| TDM Strategy Inputs, Cont. | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|------------------|-------------|--|--|--|
| Strate | egy Type | Description | Proposed Project | Mitigations | | | |
| | Implement/Improve on-street bicycle facility | Provide bicycle facility along site (Yes/No) | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Bicycle Infrastructure | Include Bike parking per LAMC | Meets City Bike Parking Code (Yes/No) | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | Include secure bike parking and showers | Includes indoor bike parking/lockers, showers, & repair station (Yes/No) | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | Traffic calming | Streets with traffic calming improvements (%) | 0% | 0% | | | |
| Neighborhood | improvements | Intersections with traffic calming improvements (%) | 0% | 0% | | | |
| cimancement | Pedestrian network improvements | Included (within project and connecting off- site/within project only) | 0 | 0 | | | |

Report 2: TDM Inputs 8 of 13

Report 3: TDM Outputs

Date: December 4, 2019 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Proposed Project

Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292

| (| |
|----------------|--|
| and the second | |
| | |

| | | | | TDI | I Adjustm | ents by T | rip Purpo | ose & Stra | itegy | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|------------|------------|---------------|------------|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|---|
| | | | | | | Place type | : Suburbar | n Center | | | | | | |
| | | Home Be | ased Work | Home B | ased Work | Home B | ased Other | Home B | ased Other | Non-Home | Based Other | Non-Home | Based Other | |
| | | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Attr | Mitigated | Proposed | luction | Attr | action | Source |
| | Reduce parking supply | 0% | 0% | 0% | /196 | 0% | 0% | of the second | Wittigateu | Proposed | witigated | Proposed | Witigated | |
| | Hobundlo parking | 000 | 010 | 070 | 070 | 070 | 0% | 070 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| | onoundie parking | 070 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy |
| Parking | Parking cash-out | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | Appendix, Parking |
| | Price workplace parking | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | sections 1 - 5 |
| | Residential area parking permits | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |
| | Reduce transit headways | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| Transit | Implement neighborhood shuttle | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, Transit sections 1 - 3 |
| | Transit subsidies | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| Education & | Voluntary travel behavior change program | 0% | <i>D%</i> | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, |
| Encouragement | Promotions and marketing | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | Encouragement |
| | Required commute trip reduction program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| Commute Trip Reductions | Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommute Program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, Commute Trip |
| | Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | Reductions sections 1 - 4 |
| | Ride-share program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| | Car-share | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | TDM Strategy |
| Shared Mobility | Bike share | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | Appendix, Shared |
| | School carpool program | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | Mobility sections 1 - 3 |

Report 3: TDM Outputs

Date: December 4, 2019 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Proposed Project Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| | | | | TDM Ac | ljustment | ts by Trip | Purpose | & Strateg | y, Cont. | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|----------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------------|---|
| | | | | | | Place type | : Suburbar | Center | | | | | | |
| | | Home B Proc | ased Work duction | Home B Attr | ased Work action | Home Bi Proc | ased Other luction | Home B Attr | ased Other action | Non-Home Proc | e Based Other duction | Non-Home Attr | Based Other | Source |
| | | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | |
| | Implement/ Improve on-street bicycle facility | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | TDM Strategy |
| Bicycle Infrastructure | Include Bike parking per LAMC | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | Appendix, Bicycle Infrastructure |
| | Include secure bike parking and showers | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | sections 1 - 3 |
| Neighborhood | Traffic calming improvements | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, |
| Enhancement | Pedestrian network improvements | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | Neighborhood Enhancement sections 1 - 2 |

| | | | | Final Con | nbined & | Maximur | n TDM Ef | fect | | | | |
|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-------------|
| | Home Ba Produ | sed Work uction | Home Ba Attra | sed Work action | Home Ba. Produ | sed Other Iction | Home Ba Attro | sed Other action | Non-Home Produ | Based Other action | Non-Home Attra | Based Other |
| | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated |
| COMBINED TOTAL | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| MAX. TDM EFFECT | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

| = Mini | i mum (X%, 1-[(1-A)*(1 - where X%= | В)]) |
|--------|--|------|
| PLACE | urban | 75% |
| TYPE | compact infill | 40% |
| MAX: | suburban center | 20% |
| | suburban | 15% |

Note: (1-[(1-A)*(1-B)...]) reflects the dampened combined effectiveness of TDM Strategies (e.g., A, B,...). See the TDM Strategy Appendix (*Transportation Assessment Guidelines Attachment G*) for further discussion of dampening.

> Report 3: TDM Outputs 10 of 13

Report 4: MXD Methodology

Date: December 4, 2019 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Proposed Project Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| | MXD M | lethodology - Pro | ject Without | TDM | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------|---------------------|----------------|---------|
| | Unadjusted Trips | MXD Adjustment | MXD Trips | Average Trip Length | Unadjusted VMT | MXD VMT |
| Home Based Work Production | 891 | -22.4% | 691 | 8.2 | 7.306 | 5.666 |
| Home Based Other Production | 2,386 | -28.9% | 1,696 | 5.6 | 13.362 | 9,498 |
| Non-Home Based Other Production | 512 | -10.5% | 458 | 7.2 | 3.686 | 3,298 |
| Home-Based Work Attraction | 119 | -40.3% | 71 | 11.4 | 1.357 | 809 |
| Home-Based Other Attraction | 1,607 | -29.4% | 1.135 | 6.7 | 10.767 | 7 605 |
| Non-Home Based Other Attraction | 752 | -9.8% | 678 | 8.5 | 6,392 | 5,763 |

| | MXD N | lethodology w | ith TDM Measu | ures | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|
| | | Proposed Project | | Project | with Mitigation M | easures |
| 1 | TDM Adjustment | Project Trips | Project VMT | TDM Adjustment | Mitigated Trips | Mitigated VMT |
| Home Based Work Production | 0.0% | 691 | 5,666 | 0.0% | 691 | 5.666 |
| Home Based Other Production | 0.0% | 1,696 | 9,498 | 0.0% | 1.696 | 9.498 |
| Non-Home Based Other Production | 0,0% | 458 | 3,298 | 0.0% | 458 | 3,298 |
| Home-Based Work Attraction | 0.0% | 71 | 809 | 0.0% | 71 | 809 |
| Home-Based Other Attraction | 0.0% | 1,135 | 7.605 | 0.0% | 1,135 | 7 605 |
| Non-Home Based Other Attraction | 0.0% | 678 | 5,763 | 0.0% | 678 | 5,763 |

| M | XD VMT Methodology Per Capita & Pe | er Employee |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| | Total Populat Total Employ A | tion: 1,483 ees: 82 APC: West Los Angeles |
| | Proposed Project | Project with Mitigation Measures |
| Total Home Based Production VMT | 15,164 | 15,164 |
| Total Home Based Work Attraction VMT | 809 | 809 |
| Total Home Based VMT Per Capita | 10.2 | 10.2 |
| Total Work Based VMT Per Employee | N/A | N/A |

VMT Calculator User Agreement

The Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), in partnership with the Department of City Planning and Fehr & Peers, has developed the City of Los Angeles Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Calculator to estimate project-specific daily household VMT per capita and daily work VMT per employee for land use development projects. This application, the VMT Calculator, has been provided to You, the User, to assess vehicle miles traveled (VMT) outcomes of land use projects within the City of Los Angeles. The term "City" as used below shall refer to the City of Los Angeles. The terms "City" and "Fehr & Peers" as used below shall include their respective affiliates, subconsultants, employees, and representatives.

The City is pleased to be able to provide this information to the public. The City believes that the public is most effectively served when they are provided access to the technical tools that inform the public review process of private and public land use investments. However, in using the VMT Calculator, You agree to be bound by this VMT Calculator User Agreement (this Agreement).

VMT Calculator Application for the City of Los Angeles. The City's consultant calibrated the VMT Calculator's parameters in 2018 to estimate travel patterns of locations in the City, and validated those outcomes against empirical data. However, this calibration process is limited to locations within the City, and practitioners applying the VMT Calculator outside of the City boundaries should not apply these estimates without further calibration and validation of travel patterns to verify the VMT Calculator's accuracy in estimating VMT in such other locations.

Limited License to Use. This Agreement gives You a limited, non-transferrable, non-assignable, and nonexclusive license to use and execute a copy of the VMT Calculator on a computer system owned, leased or otherwise controlled by You in Your own facilities, as set out below, provided You do not use the VMT Calculator in an unauthorized manner, and that You do not republish, copy, distribute, reverse-engineer, modify, decompile, disassemble, transfer, or sell any part of the VMT Calculator, and provided that You know and follow the terms of this Agreement. Your failure to follow the terms of this Agreement shall automatically terminate this license and Your right to use the VMT Calculator.

Ownership. You understand and acknowledge that the City owns the VMT Calculator, and shall continue to own it through Your use of it, and that no transfer of ownership of any kind is intended in allowing You to use the VMT Calculator.

Warranty Disclaimer. In spite of the efforts of the City and Fehr & Peers, some information on the VMT Calculator may not be accurate. The VMT Calculator, OUTPUTS AND ASSOCIATED DATA ARE PROVIDED "as is" WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, whether expressed, implied, statutory, or otherwise including but not limited to, the implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose.

Limitation of Liability. It is understood that the VMT Calculator is provided without charge. Neither the City nor Fehr & Peers can be responsible or liable for any information derived from its use, or for any delays, inaccuracies, incompleteness, errors or omissions arising out of your use of the VMT Calculator or with respect to the material contained in the VMT Calculator. You understand and agree that Your sole remedy against the City or Fehr & Peers for loss or damage caused by any defect or failure of the

VMT Calculator, regardless of the form of action, whether in contract, tort, including negligence, strict liability or otherwise, shall be the repair or replacement of the VMT Calculator to the extent feasible as determined solely by the City. In no event shall the City or Fehr & Peers be responsible to You or anyone else for, or have liability for any special, indirect, incidental or consequential damages (including, without limitation, damages for loss of business profits or changes to businesses costs) or lost data or downtime, however caused, and on any theory of liability from the use of, or the inability to use, the VMT Calculator, whether the data, and/or formulas contained in the VMT Calculator are provided by the City or Fehr & Peers, or another third party, even if the City or Fehr & Peers have been advised of the possibility of such damages.

This Agreement and License shall be governed by the laws of the State of California without regard to their conflicts of law provisions, and shall be effective as of the date set forth below and, unless terminated in accordance with the above or extended by written amendment to this Agreement, shall terminate on the earlier of the date that You are not making use of the VMT Calculator or one year after the beginning of Your use of the VMT Calculator.

By using the VMT Calculator, You hereby waive and release all claims, responsibilities, liabilities, actions, damages, costs, and losses, known and unknown, against the City and Fehr & Peers for Your use of the VMT Calculator.

Before making decisions using the information provided in this application, contact City LADOT staff to confirm the validity of the data provided.

Print and sign below, and submit to LADOT along with the transportation assessment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

| You, the User | |
|----------------|--|
| Βγ: | Jash |
| Print Name: | Jason Shender |
| Title: | Transportation Planner II |
| Company: | Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers |
| Address: | 20931 Burbank Boulevard, Suite C Woodland Hills, CA 91367 |
| Phone: | (818) 835-8648 |
| Email Address: | jshender@llgengineers.com |
| Date: | 12/4/2019 |

· · · · · ·



Transportation Assessment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

This MOU acknowledges that the Transportation Assessment for the following Project will be prepared in accordance with the latest version of LADOT's Transportation Assessment Guidelines:

١. **PROJECT INFORMATION**

Project Name: Paseo Marina (Option B)

Project Address: 13400 Maxella Avenue

Project Description: Development of 425 apartment dwelling units, 20,000 square feet of restaurant floor area, 20,000 square feet of commercial floor area, and 90,000 square feet of office floor area.

LADOT Project Case Number: CTC20-109212 Project Site Plan attached? (Required) Yes INO

11. TRIP GENERATION

Geographic Distribution: N 20 % S 25 % E 45 % 10 % W

Illustration of Project trip distribution percentages at Study intersections attached? (Required) 🖾 Yes 🗆 No Trip Generation Rate(s): ITE 10th Edition / Other ITE 10th Edition

| Trip Generation Adjustment (Exact amount of credit subject to approval by LADOT) | Yes | No |
|---|-----|----|
| Transit Usage | X | |
| Transportation Demand Management | | X |
| Existing Active Land Use | X | |
| Previous Land Use | Ö | |
| Internal Trip | X | |
| Pass-By Trip | X | |

Trip generation table including a description of the proposed land uses, ITE rates, estimated morning and afternoon peak hour volumes (ins/outs/totals), proposed trip credits, etc. attached? (Required) I Yes D No.



III. STUDY AREA AND ASSUMPTIONS

Project Buildout Year: 2026 Ambient Growth Rate: 1.0 % Per Yr. Related Projects List, researched by the consultant and approved by LADOT, attached? (Required) X Yes No *Forthcoming Map of Study Intersections/Segments attached? X Yes INO STUDY INTERSECTIONS (May be subject to LADOT revision after access, safety and circulation analysis) 1 Walgrove Avenue / Washington Boulevard

2 Lincoln Boulevard / Maxella Avenue 3 Del Rey Avenue / Maxella Avenue

4 Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue

5 Maxella Avenue Driveway / Maxella Avenue

6 Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue

- 7 Glencoe Avenue / Glencoe Avenue Driveway
- 8 Mindanao Way / Glencoe Avenue
- 9 Mindanao Way / SR-90 Eastbound Ramps
- 10 Mindanao Way / SR-90 Westbound Ramps
- 11 Mindanao Way / La Villa Marina

Is this Project located on a street within the High Injury Network?
Yes No November 2019 | Page 1 of 2



ACCESS ASSESSMENT 1V.

Is the project on a lot that is 0.5-acre or more in total gross area? 🖾 Yes 🗆 No

Is the project's frontage 250 linear feet or more along an Avenue or Boulevard as classified by the City's General Plan? XYes No

Is the project's building frontage encompassing an entire block along an Avenue or Boulevard as classified by the City's General Plan?
Yes
No

CONTACT INFORMATION V.

Consultant's Representative

| | CONSULTANT | DEVELOPER |
|--------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Name: Lins | scott, Law & Greenspan, Engineer | rs RAR2-Villa Marina Center CA, LLC |
| Address: 20 | 931 Burbank Boulevard, Suite C | 3501 Jamboree Road, Suite 3000 |
| W | oodland Hills, CA 91367 | Newport Beach, CA 92660 |
| Phone Numbe | r: (818) 835-8648 | (949) 809-2502 |
| E-Mail: jshe | ender@llgengineers.com | DPowers@Sares-Regis.com |
| Approved by: | x Jabla 4 | 4/10/2020 × Ampl 5/13/2020 |
| | Consultant's Representative | Date LADOT Representative *Date |

*MOUs are generally valid for two years after signing. If after two years a transportation assessment has not been submitted to LADOT, the developer's representative shall check with the appropriate LADOT office to determine if the terms of this MOU are still valid or if a new MOU is needed.





o:\0265\dwg\option b project\f1.dwg 04/10/2020 09:43:27 jshender lig exhibits color.ctb



o:\0265\dwg\option b project\f2.dwg 04/10/2020 09:41:55 jshender llg exhibits co

Table 1 PROJECT TRIP GENERATION [1] OPTION B PROJECT

| | 10.00 | AM PEAK HOUR VOLUMES [2] | | | PM PEAK HOUR VOLUMES [2] | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|------|-------|-----------------------------|-------|-------|
| LAND USE | SIZE | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL |
| Proposed Project | | 1.1 | 1 | | | 1.0 | 1.1.1 |
| Apartments [3] | 425 DU | 40 | 113 | 153 | 114 | 73 | 187 |
| Restaurant [4] | 20,000 GSF | 109 | 90 | 199 | 121 | 74 | 195 |
| Commercial [5] | 20,000 GLSF | 12 | 7 | 19 | 36 | 40 | 76 |
| Office [6] | 90,000 GLSF | 89 | 15 | 104 | 17 | 87 | 104 |
| Subtotal | | 250 | 225 | 475 | 288 | 274 | 562 |
| Internal Capture [7] | | (60) | (54) | (114) | (86) | (82) | (168) |
| Transit Trips (15%) [8] | | (29) | (26) | (55) | (30) | (29) | (59) |
| Subtotal Project Driveway Trips | | 161 | 145 | 306 | 172 | 163 | 335 |
| Existing Land Use | | | | 1.1 | | 1.1.1 | |
| Commercial [5] | (100,781) GLSF | (59) | (36) | (95) | (184) | (200) | (384) |
| Transit Trips [8] | 11 222 3 | 1.000 | 1 | 1.11 | | | |
| Commercial (15%) | | 9 | 5 | 14 | 28 | 30 | 58 |
| Subtotal Existing Driveway Trips | | (50) | (31) | (81) | (156) | (170) | (326) |
| NET INCREASE DRIVEWAY TRII | PS | 111 | 114 | 225 | 16 | (7) | 9 |
| Proposed Pass-By Trips [9] | | | | | | 1.74 | |
| Restaurant (20%) | | (14) | (12) | (26) | (14) | (9) | (23) |
| Commercial (50%) | | (4) | (2) | (6) | (11) | (12) | (23) |
| Subtotal | | (18) | (14) | (32) | (25) | (21) | (46) |
| Existing Pass-By Trips (9) | | | | | 1.71 | | 1.1 |
| Commercial (30%) | | 15 | 9 | 24 | 47 | 51 | 98 |
| NET INCREASE "OFF-SITE" TRI | PS | 108 | 109 | 217 | 38 | 23 | 61 |

[1] Sources: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, 2017.

[2] Trips are one-way traffic movements, entering or leaving.

[3] ITE Land Use Code 221 (Multifamily Housing [Mid-Rise]) trip generation average rates.
 - AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.36 trips/dwelling unit; 26% inbound/74% outbound

- PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.44 trips/dwelling unit; 61% inbound/39% outbound

[4] ITE Land Use Code 932 (High-Turnover [Sit-Down] Restaurant) trip generation average rates.
 AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 9.94 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 55% inbound/45% outbound

PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 9.77 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 62% inbound/38% outbound
 [5] ITE Land Use Code 820 (Shopping Center) trip generation average rates.

AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 0.94 trips/1,000 SF of leasable area; 62% inbound/38% outbound
 PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 3.81 trips/1,000 SF of leasable area; 48% inbound/52% outbound

[6] ITE Land Use Code 710 (General Office Building) trip generation average rates.
 AM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 1.16 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 86% inbound/14% outbound

- PM Peak Hour Trip Rate: 1.15 trips/1,000 SF of floor area; 16% inbound/84% outbound
 The internal capture reduction for the residential, restaurant, retail, and office is based on the synergy between all the land uses provided within the project site, and determined via NCHRP 684
- Internal Capture Estimation Tool (24% for AM Peak Hour and 30% for PM Peak Hour).
 [8] A 15% transit use reduction applied based on the project site being located within 1/4 mile of a Big Blue Bus rapid stop. The trip reduction for transit trips has been applied to the proposed project and and existing land uses based on the *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2019 for

developments within a 1/4 mile walking distance of a transit station or a Rapid Bus stop. [9] Pass-by trips are made as intermediate stops on the way from an origin to a primary trip destination

without a route diversion. Pass-by trips are attracted from traffic passing the site on an adjacent street or roadway that offers direct access to the site. The trip reduction for pass-by trips has been applied to the restaurant and commercial components of the project based on the *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*. July 2019 for High Turnover Restaurant, Shopping Center less than 50,000 sf, and Shopping Center 100,000 sf to less than 300,000 sf.

LLG Ref. 5-16-0265-1 Paseo Marina Project

| NCHRP 684 Internal Trip Capture Estimation Tool | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|
| Project Name: | Paseo Marina (Option B) | Organization: | | | | |
| Project Location: | | Performed By: | | | | |
| Scenario Description: | | Date: | | | | |
| Analysis Year: | | Checked By: | | | | |
| Analysis Period: | AM Street Peak Hour | Date: | | | | |

| | Table 1 | -A: Base Vehicle- | Trip Generation Est | timates (Single-Use Sit | e Estimate) | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------|--|
| t and then | Developme | ent Data (For Inform | mation Only) | Estimated Vehicle-Trips ³ | | | |
| Land Use | ITE LUCs1 | Quantity | Units | Total | Entering | Exiting | |
| Office | 710 | 90,000 | | 104 | 89 | 15 | |
| Retail | 820 | 20,000 | | 19 | 12 | 7 | |
| Restaurant | 932 | 20,000 | | 199 | 109 | 90 | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | -171-1711-1 | 1.1.1 | | 0 | | | |
| Residential | 221 | 425 | | 153 | 40 | 113 | |
| Hotel | | | 1 | 0 | | | |
| All Other Land Uses ² | 1 1 mar 1 mar 1 | | | 0 | | | |
| | | 1 | | 475 | 250 | 225 | |

| | | Table 2-A: | Mode Split and Vehicle | Occupancy Estimates | | | |
|----------------------------------|------------|-------------|------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------|--|
| Land Use | | Entering Tr | ips | Exiting Trips | | | |
| | Veh. Occ.4 | % Transit | % Non-Motorized | Veh. Occ.4 | % Transit | % Non-Motorized | |
| Office | | 15% | | | 15% | | |
| Retail | | 15% | | | 15% | | |
| Restaurant | | 15% | | | 15% | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | 1 C | | | |
| Residential | | 15% | | | 15% | | |
| Hotel | | | | | | | |
| All Other Land Uses ² | | | | | | | |

| Table 3-A: Average Land Use Interchange Distances (Feet Walking Distance) | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---------|-----------------|----------------------|---|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| 011-15 | Destination (To) | | | | | | | | |
| Origin (From) | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | |
| Office | 11 1 | 1 | 6 | | | | | | |
| Retail | | | Contraction of | | | | | | |
| Restaurant | 2 |), ···· | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | the second second | 19 | Las de seres de | | (I | | | | |
| Residential | | | | | | | | | |
| Hotel | 1 | | | | and the second se | and the second second | | | |

| Table 4-A: Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix* | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|----------|------------|----------------------|-------------|---------|--|--|--|
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) | | | | | | | | |
| | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | |
| Office | | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Retail | 2 | line and | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | |
| Restaurant | 12 | 1 | | 0 | 2 | 0 | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Residential | 2 | 1 | 22 | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1. S. S | | | |

| Table 5-A: Computations Summary | | | | Table 6-A: Internal Trip Capture Percentages by Land Use | | | |
|---|-------|----------|---------|--|----------------|---------------|--|
| | Total | Entering | Exiting | Land Use | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips | |
| All Person-Trips | 475 | 250 | 225 | Office | 18% | 87% | |
| Internal Capture Percentage | 24% | 23% | 25% | Retail | 50% | 57% | |
| | | A | | Restaurant | 29% | 17% | |
| External Vehicle-Trips ⁵ | 307 | 163 | 144 | Cinema/Entertainment | N/A | N/A | |
| External Transit-Trips ⁶ | 54 | 30 | 24 | Residential | 8% | 22% | |
| External Non-Motorized Trips ⁶ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel | N/A | N/A | |

| nd Use Codes (LUCs) from Trip Generation Manual, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. |
|--|
| al estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator. |
| ter trips assuming no transit or non-motorized trips (as assumed in ITE Trip Generation Manual). |
| ter vehicle occupancy assumed in Table 1-A vehicle trips. If vehicle occupancy changes for proposed mixed-use project, manual adjustments must be m ables 5-A, 9-A (O and D). Enter transit, non-motorized percentages that will result with proposed mixed-use project complete. |
| hicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-A. |
| rson-Trips |
| licates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number. |

1

Estimation Tool Developed by the Texas A&M Transportation Institute - Version 2013.1

E

| Project Name: | Paseo Marina (Option B |
|------------------|------------------------|
| Analysis Period: | AM Street Peak Hour |

| | | Table 7-A: Conv | ersion of Vehicle-Trip | Ends to Person-Trip | Ends | | |
|----------------------|-----------|--------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--|
| Land Use | Tat | ole 7-A (D): Enter | ing Trips | Table 7-A (O): Exiting Trips | | | |
| | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | |
| Office | 1.00 | 89 | 89 | 1.00 | 15 | 15 | |
| Retail | 1.00 | 12 | 12 | 1.00 | 7 | 7 | |
| Restaurant | 1.00 | 109 | 109 | 1.00 | 90 | 90 | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | |
| Residential | 1.00 | 40 | 40 | 1.00 | 113 | 113 | |
| Hotel | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | |

| Table 8-A (O): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Origin) | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|--------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) | | | | | | | | |
| | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | |
| Office | 1 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Retail | 2 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | |
| Restaurant | 28 | 13 | | 0 | 4 | 3 | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Residential | 2 | 1 | 23 | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |

| 1 | Table 8-A (D) | : Internal Pers | son-Trip Origin-De | stination Matrix (Computed a | t Destination) | 200 200 | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|----------------|---------|--|--|--|--|
| Origin (From) | | Destination (To) | | | | | | | | |
| | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | | |
| Office | | 4 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Retail | 4 | | 55 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | | |
| Restaurant | 12 | 1 | | 0 | 2 | 0 | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Residential | 3 | 2 | 22 | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| Hotel | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |

| | Та | ble 9-A (D): Inter | rnal and External 7 | Trips Summary (Entering | Trips) | and the second se | |
|----------------------------------|----------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|---|--|
| Destination Land Use | F | Person-Trip Estim | nates | External Trips by Mode* | | | |
| | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ¹ | Transit ² | Non-Motorized ² | |
| Office | 16 | 73 | 89 | 62 | 11 | 0 | |
| Retail | 6 | 6 | 12 | 5 | 1 | 0 | |
| Restaurant | 32 | 77 | 109 | 65 | 12 | 0 | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Residential | 3 | 37 | 40 | 31 | 6 | 0 | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| All Other Land Uses ³ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0. | 0 | 0 | |

| (i | Ta | able 9-A (O): Inte | ernal and External | Trips Summary (Exiting 1 | rips) | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Origin Land Use | Person-Trip Estimates | | | External Trips by Mode* | | | |
| | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ¹ | Transit ² | Non-Motorized ² | |
| Office | 13 | 2 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | |
| Retail | 4 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | |
| Restaurant | 15 | 75 | 90 | 64 | 11 | 0 | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Residential | 25 | 88 | 113 | 75 | 13 | 0 | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| All Other Land Uses ³ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

¹Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-A

²Person-Trips

³Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator *Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

| | NCHRP 684 Internal Trip C | apture Estimation Tool | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Project Name: | Paseo Marina (Option B) | Organization: | |
| Project Location: | | Performed By: | |
| Scenario Description: | | Date: | |
| Analysis Year: | | Checked By: | |
| Analysis Period: | PM Street Peak Hour | Date: | |

| Land Use | Developme | ent Data (For Inform | mation Only) | Estimated Vehicle-Trips ³ | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|----------|---------|
| | ITE LUCs1 | Quantity | Units | Total | Entering | Exiting |
| Office | 710 | 90,000 | | 104 | 17 | 87 |
| Retail | 820 | 20,000 | | 76 | 36 | 40 |
| Restaurant | 932 | 20,000 | | 195 | 121 | 74 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | 0 | | |
| Residential | 221 | 425 | | 187 | 114 | 73 |
| Hotel | 1 | | | 0 | | |
| All Other Land Uses ² | 1.1.1.1.1.1.1 | · | | 0 | | |
| | | 10000 | | 562 | 288 | 274 |

| | | Table 2-P: | Mode Split and Vehicle | Occupancy Estimates | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------|
| Land Use | Entering Trips | | | Exiting Trips | | |
| | Veh. Occ.4 | % Transit | % Non-Motorized | Veh. Occ.4 | % Transit | % Non-Motorized |
| Office | | 15% | | | 15% | |
| Retail | | 15% | | and the second second | 15% | |
| Restaurant | | 15% | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | 15% | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | | | |
| Residential | 1 | 15% | | | 15% | |
| Hotel | | | | | | |
| All Other Land Uses ² | | a second | | | | |

| Origin (From) | Destination (To) | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|--------|---------------|--|-------------|-------|--|--|--|
| | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | |
| Office | 120 | | | | | | | | |
| Retail | | 45.4 | | | | | | | |
| Restaurant | | | - | | | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | Marine and the | | I THE HEAD IN | | | | | | |
| Residential | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | |
| Hotel | Land David V | | inem based | and the second s | | | | | |

| Origin (From) | Destination (To) | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|--------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|
| | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | |
| Office | | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | |
| Retail | 1 | | 12 | 0 | 10 | 0 | | |
| Restaurant | 2 | 18 | Ne se se | 0 | 13 | 0 | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | |
| Residential | 3 | 4 | 15 | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |

| Table 5-P: | Computatio | ns Summary | Table 6-P: Internal Trip Capture Percentages by Land Use | | | |
|---|------------|------------|--|----------------------|----------------|---------------|
| | Total | Entering | Exiting | Land Use | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips |
| All Person-Trips | 562 | 288 | 274 | Office | 35% | 8% |
| Internal Capture Percentage | 30% | 30% | 31% | Retail | 69% | 58% |
| | | | 1997 - 19 | Restaurant | 24% | 45% |
| External Vehicle-Trips ⁵ | 332 | 172 | 160 | Cinema/Entertainment | N/A | N/A |
| External Transit-Trips ⁶ | 60 | 31 | 29 | Residential | 22% | 30% |
| External Non-Motorized Trips ⁶ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel | N/A | N/A |

| d Use Codes (LUCs) from Trip Generation Manual, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. |
|---|
| al estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator. |
| er trips assuming no transit or non-motorized trips (as assumed in ITE Trip Generation Manual). |
| er vehicle occupancy assumed in Table 1-P vehicle trips. If vehicle occupancy changes for proposed mixed-use project, manual adjustments must |
| icle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-P. |
| son-Trips |
| cates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number. |
| Estimation Tool Developed by the Texas A&M Transportation Institute - Version 2013.1 |
| |

| Project Name: | Paseo Marina (Option E |
|------------------|------------------------|
| Analysis Period: | PM Street Peak Hour |

| | 1 7.1 | able /-I . Convers | nus to reison-inp En | uə | | |
|----------------------|-----------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Land Use | Tabl | e 7-P (D): Entering | Trips | | Table 7-P (O): Exiting Trip | S |
| | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* |
| Office | 1.00 | 17 | 17 | 1.00 | 87 | 87 |
| Retail | 1.00 | 36 | 36 | 1.00 | 40 | 40 |
| Restaurant | 1.00 | 121 | 121 | 1.00 | 74 | 74 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 1.00 | 114 | 114 | 1.00 | 73 | 73 |
| Hotel | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |

| 230.000 | | | | Destination (To) | | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|
| Origin (From) | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office | | 17 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Retail | 1 | | 12 | 2 | 10 | 2 |
| Restaurant | 2 | 30 | | 6 | 13 | 5 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 3 | 31 | 15 | 0 | | 2 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

| | Table 8-P (D) | Internal Person | n-Trip Origin-Dest | ination Matrix (Computed at D | Destination) | |
|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|-------|
| Origin (From) | 1 | | Contraction and | Destination (To) | | |
| Origin (From) | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office | | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Retail | 5 | | 35 | 0 | 52 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 5 | 18 | | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1 | 1 | 4 | | 5 | 0 |
| Residential | 10 | 4 | 17 | 0 | | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | |

| | Tab | ole 9-P (D): Interna | and External Trip | s Summary (Entering Tri | ps) | |
|----------------------------------|----------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Destination Land Line | Pe | erson-Trip Estimate | es | External Trips by Mode* | | |
| Destination Land Use | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ¹ | Transit ² | Non-Motorized ² |
| Office | 6 | 11 | 17 | 9 | 2 | 0 |
| Retail | 25 | 11 | 36 | 9 | 2 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 29 | 92 | 121 | 78 | 14 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 25 | 89 | 114 | 76 | 13 | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ³ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | Та | ble 9-P (O): Intern | al and External Tri | ps Summary (Exiting Trip | os) | |
|----------------------------------|----------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Origin Land Line | P | erson-Trip Estimate | es | External Trips by Mode* | | |
| Origin Land Use | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ¹ | Transit ² | Non-Motorized ² |
| Office | 7 | 80 | 87 | 68 | 12 | 0 |
| Retail | 23 | 17 | 40 | 14 | 3 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 33 | 41 | 74 | 35 | 6 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 22 | 51 | 73 | 43 | 8 | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ³ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

¹Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-P ²Person-Trips

³Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator *Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

| Land | Lee Paire | Wee | kday |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Lanu | Use Fails | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hou |
| | To Office | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | To Retail | 28.0% | 20.0% |
| From OFFICE | To Restaurant | 63.0% | 4.0% |
| FIGHTOFFICE | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | To Residential | 1.0% | 2.0% |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | To Office | 29.0% | 2.0% |
| | To Retail | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| From DETAIL | To Restaurant | 13.0% | 29.0% |
| From RETAIL | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 4.0% |
| | To Residential | 14.0% | 26.0% |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 5.0% |
| From RESTAURANT | To Office | 31.0% | 3.0% |
| | To Retail | 14.0% | 41.0% |
| | To Restaurant | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 8.0% |
| | To Residential | 4.0% | 18.0% |
| | To Hotel | 3.0% | 7.0% |
| | To Office | 0.0% | 2.0% |
| | To Retail | 0.0% | 21.0% |
| | To Restaurant | 0.0% | 31.0% |
| From CINEWA/ENTERTAINWENT | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | To Residential | 0.0% | 8.0% |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 2.0% |
| | To Office | 2.0% | 4.0% |
| | To Retail | 1.0% | 42.0% |
| E DEDIDENTAL | To Restaurant | 20.0% | 21.0% |
| From RESIDEN HAL | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | To Residential | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 3.0% |
| | To Office | 75.0% | 0.0% |
| | To Retail | 14.0% | 16.0% |
| From LIOTEL | To Restaurant | 9.0% | 68.0% |
| From HOTEL | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | To Residential | 0.0% | 2.0% |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | | | |

| | | 1Mo | okday | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------|--|
| Land Use Pairs | | AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hou | | |
| | From Office | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| | From Retail | 4.0% | 31.0% | |
| | From Restaurant | 14.0% | 30.0% | |
| TO OFFICE | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 6.0% | |
| | From Residential | 3.0% | 57.0% | |
| | From Hotel | 3.0% | 0.0% | |
| | From Office | 32.0% | 8.0% | |
| | From Retail | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| To RETAIL | From Restaurant | 8.0% | 50.0% | |
| | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 4.0% | |
| | From Residential | 17.0% | 10.0% | |
| | From Hotel | 4.0% | 2.0% | |
| | From Office | 23.0% | 2.0% | |
| | From Retail | 50.0% | 29.0% | |
| | From Restaurant | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| TORESTROUGHT | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 3.0% | |
| | From Residential | 20.0% | 14.0% | |
| | From Hotel | 6.0% | 5.0% | |
| | From Office | 0.0% | 1.0% | |
| | From Retail | 0.0% | 26.0% | |
| | From Restaurant | 0.0% | 32.0% | |
| TO CINEWA/ENTERTAINWENT | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| | From Residential | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| | From Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| | From Office | 0.0% | 4.0% | |
| | From Retail | 2.0% | 46.0% | |
| TO RESIDENTIAL | From Restaurant | 5.0% | 16.0% | |
| TOTREOIDENTIAL | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 4.0% | |
| | From Residential | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| | From Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| | From Office | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| | From Retail | 0.0% | 17.0% | |
| To HOTE! | From Restaurant | 4.0% | 71.0% | |
| TOTOTEE | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 1.0% | |
| | From Residential | 0.0% | 12.0% | |
| | From Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% | |





CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR Version 1.2



Project Screening Criteria: Is this project required to conduct a vehicle miles traveled analysis?

Project Information



If the project is replacing an existing number of residential units with a smaller number of residential units, is the proposed project located within one-half mile of a fixed-rail or fixedguideway transit station?

| Existing Lar | nd U | se | | | |
|------------------------|------|---------|------|--|--|
| Land Use Type | | Value | Unit | | |
| tail General Retail | - | 100.781 | ksf | | |
| etail General Retail | | 100.781 | ksf | | |

Click here to add a single custom land use type (will be included in the above list)

Proposed Project Land Use

| Land Use Type | Value | Unit | |
|--|-------|------|---|
| Office General Office - | 90 | ksf | - |
| Housing Multi-Family | 425 | DU | |
| Retail General Retail | 20 | ksf | |
| Retail High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant | 20 | ksf | |
| Office General Office | 90 | ksf | |

Click here to add a single custom land use type (will be included in the above list)

Project Screening Summary

| Land Use | Propos Projec | ed :t |
|---|---|---|
| 3,434 Daily Vehicle Trips | 5,322 Daily Vehicle | 2 Trips |
| 26,012 Daily VMT | 39,62 Daily VM | 3 |
| Tier 1 Screen | ning Criteria | |
| to existing residential units mile of a fixed-rail station. | & is within one-h | alf 🔲 |
| Tier 2 Screet | ning Criteria | |
| The net increase in daily tri | ps < 250 trips | 1,888 Net Daily Trip |
| The net increase in daily tri | ning Criteria ps < 250 trips ⁄/T ≤ 0 | 1,888 Net Daily Trip 13,611 Net Daily VM |
| The net increase in daily tri The net increase in daily VN The proposed project consi land uses ≤ 50,000 square fi | ning Criteria ps < 250 trips $AT \le 0$ ists of only retail eet total. | 1,888 Net Daily Trip 13,611 Net Daily VM1 40.000 ksf |



CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR Version 1.2



Project Information



| Proposed Project Land Use Type | Value | Uni |
|--|-------|-----|
| Housing Multi-Family | 425 | DU |
| Retail General Retail | 20 | ksf |
| Retail High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant | 20 | ksf |
| Office General Office | 90 | ksf |

| Max Home Based TDM | Achieve | Proposed Project | With Mitigation |
|--|---------|---|------------------|
| Max Work Based TDM | Achieve | d? No | No |
| A | | Parking | - 3 |
| Reduce Parking Supply | 100 | city code parking provision for | the project site |
| Proposed Prj Mitigation | 74 | actual parking provision for the | e project site |
| Unbundle Parking | 150 | monthly parking cost (dollar) for site | or the project |
| Parking Cash-Out | 50 | percent of employees eligible | |
| Price Workplace Parking | 6.00 | daily parking charge (doll | ar) |
| Proposed Prj Mitigation | 25 | percent of employees subject t parking | o priced |
| Residential Area Parking Permits Proposed Prj Mitigation | 200 | cost (dollar) of annual per | mit |
| B | | Transit | |
| C Edu | cation | & Encouragement | |
| D Co | mmut | e Trip Reductions | 201 |
| E | Shar | red Mobility | NAME AND AND |
| F | Bicycle | Infrastructure | |
| G Neid | hborh | ood Enhancement | and a second |

TDM Strategies

Analysis Results

| Proposed Project | With Mitigation | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| 5,322 | 5.322 | | | | |
| Daily Vehicle Trips | Daily Vehicle Trips | | | | |
| 39,623 | 39,623 | | | | |
| Daily VMT | Daily VMT | | | | |
| 10.1 | 10.1 | | | | |
| Houseshold VMT per Capita | Houseshold VMT per Capita | | | | |
| 12.6 | 12.6 | | | | |
| Work VMT | Work VMT | | | | |
| per Employee | per Employee | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Significant | /MT Impact? | | | | |
| Significant \ Household: Yes | /MT Impact? Household: Ye | | | | |
| Significant N Household: Yes Threshold = 7.4 15% Below APC | /MT Impact? Household: Ye Threshold = 7.4 15% Below APC | | | | |
| Significant N Household: Yes Threshold = 7.4 15% Below APC Work: Yes | /MT Impact? Household: Ye Threshold = 7.4 15% Below APC Work: Yes | | | | |
| Significant N Household: Yes Threshold = 7.4 15% Below APC Work: Yes Threshold = 11.1 | /MT Impact? Household: Ye Threshold = 7.4 15% Below APC Work: Yes Threshold = 11.1 | | | | |

Measuring the Miles

Report 1: Project & Analysis Overview

Date: April 10, 2020 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| | Project Informa | tion | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------|----------|--|
| Land | d Use Type | Value | Units | |
| | Single Family | 0 | DU | |
| | Multi Family | 425 | DU | |
| Housing | Townhouse | 0 | DU | |
| | Hotel | 0 | Rooms | |
| | Motel | 0 | Rooms | |
| | Family | 0 | DU | |
| Affordable Housing | Senior | 0 | DU | |
| Ajjorauble Housing | Special Needs | 0 | DU | |
| | Permanent Supportive | 0 | DU_ | |
| | General Retail | 20.000 | ksf | |
| | Furniture Store | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Pharmacy/Drugstore | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Supermarket | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Bank | 0.000 | ksf | |
| Retail | Health Club | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | High-Turnover Sit-Down | 20.000 | 1.6 | |
| | Restaurant | 20.000 | KST | |
| | Fast-Food Restaurant | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Quality Restaurant | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Auto Repair | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Home Improvement | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Free-Standing Discount | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Movie Theater | 0 | Seats | |
| Office | General Office | 90.000 | ksf | |
| Onice | Medical Office | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Light Industrial | 0.000 | ksf | |
| Industrial | Manufacturing | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | Warehousing/Self-Storage | 0.000 | ksf | |
| | University | 0 | Student | |
| | High School | 0 | Student | |
| School | Middle School | 0 | Students | |
| | Elementary | 0 | Students | |
| and the second second | Private School (K-12) | 0 | Students | |
| Other | | 0 | Trips | |

Project and Analysis Overview 3 of 13

Report 1: Project & Analysis Overview

Date: April 10, 2020 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| | Analysis F | Results | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| | Total Employe | ees: 480 | | |
| | Total Populati | on: 958 | | |
| Propo | sed Project | With N | litigation | |
| 5,322 | Daily Vehicle Trips | 5,322 | Daily Vehicle Trips | |
| 39,623 | Daily VMT | 39,623 | Daily VMT | |
| 10.1 | Household VMT per Capita | 10.1 | Household VMT per Capita | |
| 12.6 | Work VMT per Employee | 12.6 | Work VMT per Employee | |
| | Significant VM | IT Impact? | | |
| | APC: West Lo | s Angeles | | |
| | Impact Threshold: 15% | Below APC Average | | |
| | Household | d = 7.4 | | |
| | Work = : | 11.1 | | |
| Propo | sed Project | With N | litigation | |
| VMT Threshold | Impact | VMT Threshold | Impact | |
| Household > 7.4 | Yes | Household > 7.4 | Yes | |
| Work > 11.1 | Yes | Work > 11.1 | Yes | |

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: April 10, 2020 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| TDM Strategy Inputs | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|
| Stra | itegy Type | Description | Proposed Project | Mitigations | | | |
| | Doduco prelúpa supelu | City code parking provision (spaces) | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | Reduce parking supply | Actual parking provision (spaces) | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | Unbundle parking | Monthly cost for parking (\$) | \$0 | \$0 | | | |
| Parking | Parking cash-out | Employees eligible (%) | 0% | 0% | | | |
| | Price workplace | Daily parking charge (\$) | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | | | |
| | parking | Employees subject to priced parking (%) | 0% | 0% | | | |
| | Residential area parking permits | Cost of annual permit (\$) | \$0 | \$0 | | | |

(cont. on following page)

Report 2: TDM Inputs 5 of 13

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: April 10, 2020 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| Strate | еду Туре | Description | Proposed Project | Mitigations | |
|---------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|-------------|--|
| | | Reduction in | | | |
| | | headways (increase | 0% | 0% | |
| | | in frequency) (%) | | | |
| | Reduce transit | shtue (as a percent | | | |
| | headways | of total daily trins) | 0% | 0% | |
| | neaurays | (%) | | | |
| | | Lines within project | | | |
| | | site improved (<50%, | 0 | 0 | |
| | | >=50%) | | 0 | |
| | | Degree of | | | |
| Transit | Imploment | implementation (low, | 0 | | |
| | naighborhood shuttle | medium, high) | | | |
| | neighbornoou snuttie | Employees and | 09/ | 0.04 | |
| | | residents eligible (%) | 0% | 076 | |
| | | Employees and | | | |
| | | residents eligible (%) | 0% | 0% | |
| | Transit subsidies | Amount of transit | | | |
| | | subsidy per | | | |
| | | passenger (daily | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | |
| | | equivalent) (\$) | | | |
| | Voluntary travel | Employees and | | | |
| Education & | behavior change | residents | 0% | 0% | |
| | program | participating (%) | | | |
| incouragement | Promotions and | residents | 00/ | 00% | |
| | marketing | participating (%) | 0% | 0% | |
| | | Is a constrainty (20) | | | |

Report 2: TDM Inputs 6 of 13

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: April 10, 2020 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| Strate | ду Туре | Description | Proposed Project | Mitigations | |
|----------------------------|---|--|------------------|-------------|--|
| | Required commute trip reduction program | Employees – participating (%) | 0% | 0% | |
| | Alternative Work Schedules and | Employees participating (%) | 0% | 0% | |
| | Telecommute | Type of program | 0 | 0 | |
| Commute Trip Reductions | | Degree of implementation (low, medium, high) | 0 | 0 | |
| | Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle | Employees eligible (%) | 0% | 0% | |
| | | Employer size (small, medium, large) | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ride-share program | Employees eligible (%) | 0% | 0% | |
| | Car share | Car share project setting (Urban, Suburban, All Other) | 0 | 0 | |
| Shared Mobility | Bike share | Within 600 feet of existing bike share station - OR- implementing new bike share station (Yes/No) | 0 | 0 | |
| | School carpool program | Level of implementation (Low, Medium, High) | 0 | 0 | |

Report 2: TDM Inputs 7 of 13

Date: April 10, 2020 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



Report 2: TDM Inputs

| TDM Strategy Inputs, Cont. | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|
| Strate | egy Type | Description | Proposed Project | Mitigations | | | | |
| | Implement/Improve on-street bicycle facility | Provide bicycle facility along site (Yes/No) | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Bicycle Infrastructure | Include Bike parking per LAMC | Meets City Bike Parking Code (Yes/No) | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| | Include secure bike parking and showers | Includes indoor bike parking/lockers, showers, & repair station (Yes/No) | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| | Traffic calming | Streets with traffic calming improvements (%) | 0% | 0% | | | | |
| Neighborhood Enhancement | improvements | Intersections with traffic calming improvements (%) | 0% | 0% | | | | |
| | Pedestrian network improvements | Included (within project and connecting off- site/within project only) | 0 | D | | | | |

Report 2: TDM Inputs 8 of 13

Report 3: TDM Outputs

Date: April 10, 2020 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| | | | | TDM | 1 Adjustm | ents by T | rip Purpo | ose & Stra | tegy | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------------------|------------|------------|------------|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|---|
| | | Home B | ased Work | Home B | ased Work | Place type Home B | : Suburban | Home Bo | ased Other | Non-Home | Based Other | Non-Home | Based Other | |
| | | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Source |
| | Reduce parking supply | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| | Unbundle parking | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy |
| Parking | Parking cash-out | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | Appendix, Parking |
| | Price workplace parking | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1 - 5 |
| | Residential area parking permits | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |
| | Reduce transit headways | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| Transit | Implement neighborhood shuttle | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | Appendix, Transit sections 1 - 3 |
| | Transit subsidies | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| Education & | Voluntary travel behavior change program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, Education & Encouragement sections 1 - 2 |
| Encouragement | Promotions and marketing | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| | Required commute trip reduction program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| Commute Trip Reductions | Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommute Program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, Commute Trip |
| Reductions | Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | Reductions sections 1 - 4 |
| | Ride-share program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| | Car-share | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | TDM Strategy |
| Shared Mobility | Bike share | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | Appendix, Shared |
| | School carpool program | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | Mobility sections 1 - 3 |

Report 3: TDM Outputs

Date: April 10, 2020 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| | | | | TDM Ac | ljustment | ts by Trip | Purpose | & Strateg | y, Cont. | | | | | |
|--------------|---|----------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------------|------------------|-------------|---|
| | | | | | | Place type | : Suburbar | Center | | | | | | |
| | | Home B Proc | ased Work duction | Home B Attr | ased Work action | Home B Proc | ased Other luction | Home Be Attr | ased Other action | Non-Home Proc | Based Other duction | Non-Home Attr | Based Other | Source |
| | | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | |
| Bicycle | Implement/ Improve on-street bicycle facility | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, Bicycle Infrastructure sections 1 - 3 |
| | Include Bike parking per LAMC | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| | Include secure bike parking and showers | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0,0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| Neighborhood | Traffic calming improvements | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, |
| Enhancement | Pedestrian network improvements | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0,0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | Neighborhood Enhancement |

| | | | | Final Con | nbined & | Maximur | n TDM Ef | fect | | | | |
|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| | Home Ba Produ | sed Work uction | Home Ba Attra | sed Work action | Home Ba. Produ | sed Other uction | Home Ba Attro | sed Other action | Non-Home Produ | Based Other uction | Non-Home Attro | Based Other action |
| | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated |
| COMBINED TOTAL | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| MAX. TDM EFFECT | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

| = Min | = Minimum (X%, 1-[(1-A)*(where X%= PLACE urban TYPE compact infill MAX: suburban center | В)]) |
|-------|--|------|
| PLACE | urban | 75% |
| TYPE | compact infill | 40% |
| MAX: | suburban center | 20% |
| | suburban | 15% |

Note: (1-[(1-A)*(1-B)...]) reflects the dampened combined effectiveness of TDM Strategies (e.g., A, B,...). See the TDM Strategy Appendix (*Transportation Assessment Guidelines Attachment G*) for further discussion of dampening.

> Report 3: TDM Outputs 10 of 13

Report 4: MXD Methodology

Date: April 10, 2020 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| | MXD M | MXD Methodology - Project Without TDM | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------|----------------|---------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Unadjusted Trips | MXD Adjustment | MXD Trips | Average Trip Length | Unadjusted VMT | MXD VMT | | | | | | |
| Home Based Work Production | 575 | -25.0% | 431 | 8.2 | 4,715 | 3,534 | | | | | | |
| Home Based Other Production | 1,541 | -29.4% | 1,088 | 5.6 | 8,630 | 6.093 | | | | | | |
| Non-Home Based Other Production | 868 | -11.1% | 772 | 7.2 | 6,250 | 5.558 | | | | | | |
| Home-Based Work Attraction | 696 | -24.0% | 529 | 11.4 | 7,934 | 6.031 | | | | | | |
| Home-Based Other Attraction | 2,236 | -28.9% | 1,589 | 6.7 | 14,981 | 10.646 | | | | | | |
| Non-Home Based Other Attraction | 1,023 | -10.8% | 913 | 8.5 | 8,696 | 7.761 | | | | | | |

MXD Methodology with TDM Measures

| | Proposed Project | | | Project with Mitigation Measures | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| | TDM Adjustment | Project Trips | Project VMT | TDM Adjustment | Mitigated Trips | Mitigated VMT |
| Home Based Work Production | 0,0% | 431 | 3,534 | 0.0% | 431 | 3,534 |
| Home Based Other Production | 0.0% | 1,088 | 6,093 | 0.0% | 1,088 | 6,093 |
| Non-Home Based Other Production | 0.0% | 772 | 5,558 | 0.0% | 772 | 5,558 |
| Home-Based Work Attraction | 0.0% | 529 | 6,031 | 0.0% | 529 | 6,031 |
| Home-Based Other Attraction | 0.0% | 1,589 | 10,646 | 0.0% | 1,589 | 10,646 |
| Non-Home Based Other Attraction | 0.0% | 913 | 7,761 | 0.0% | 913 | 7,761 |

| | MXD VMT Methodology Per Capita & Pe | er Employee | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | Total Populat | ion: 958 | | |
| | Total Employ | ees: 480 | | |
| | APC: West Los Angeles | | | |
| | Proposed Project | Project with Mitigation Measures | | |
| Total Home Based Production VMT | 9,627 | 9,627 | | |
| Total Home Based Work Attraction VMT | 6,031 | 6,031 | | |
| Total Home Based VMT Per Capita | 10.1 | 10.1 | | |
| Total Work Based VMT Per Employee | 12.6 | 12.6 | | |

VMT Calculator User Agreement

The Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), in partnership with the Department of City Planning and Fehr & Peers, has developed the City of Los Angeles Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Calculator to estimate project-specific daily household VMT per capita and daily work VMT per employee for land use development projects. This application, the VMT Calculator, has been provided to You, the User, to assess vehicle miles traveled (VMT) outcomes of land use projects within the City of Los Angeles. The term "City" as used below shall refer to the City of Los Angeles. The terms "City" and "Fehr & Peers" as used below shall include their respective affiliates, subconsultants, employees, and representatives.

The City is pleased to be able to provide this information to the public. The City believes that the public is most effectively served when they are provided access to the technical tools that inform the public review process of private and public land use investments. However, in using the VMT Calculator, You agree to be bound by this VMT Calculator User Agreement (this Agreement).

VMT Calculator Application for the City of Los Angeles. The City's consultant calibrated the VMT Calculator's parameters in 2018 to estimate travel patterns of locations in the City, and validated those outcomes against empirical data. However, this calibration process is limited to locations within the City, and practitioners applying the VMT Calculator outside of the City boundaries should not apply these estimates without further calibration and validation of travel patterns to verify the VMT Calculator's accuracy in estimating VMT in such other locations.

Limited License to Use. This Agreement gives You a limited, non-transferrable, non-assignable, and nonexclusive license to use and execute a copy of the VMT Calculator on a computer system owned, leased or otherwise controlled by You in Your own facilities, as set out below, provided You do not use the VMT Calculator in an unauthorized manner, and that You do not republish, copy, distribute, reverse-engineer, modify, decompile, disassemble, transfer, or sell any part of the VMT Calculator, and provided that You know and follow the terms of this Agreement. Your failure to follow the terms of this Agreement shall automatically terminate this license and Your right to use the VMT Calculator.

Ownership. You understand and acknowledge that the City owns the VMT Calculator, and shall continue to own it through Your use of it, and that no transfer of ownership of any kind is intended in allowing You to use the VMT Calculator.

Warranty Disclaimer. In spite of the efforts of the City and Fehr & Peers, some information on the VMT Calculator may not be accurate. The VMT Calculator, OUTPUTS AND ASSOCIATED DATA ARE PROVIDED "as is" WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, whether expressed, implied, statutory, or otherwise including but not limited to, the implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose.

Limitation of Liability. It is understood that the VMT Calculator is provided without charge. Neither the City nor Fehr & Peers can be responsible or liable for any information derived from its use, or for any delays, inaccuracies, incompleteness, errors or omissions arising out of your use of the VMT Calculator or with respect to the material contained in the VMT Calculator. You understand and agree that Your sole remedy against the City or Fehr & Peers for loss or damage caused by any defect or failure of the

VMT Calculator, regardless of the form of action, whether in contract, tort, including negligence, strict liability or otherwise, shall be the repair or replacement of the VMT Calculator to the extent feasible as determined solely by the City. In no event shall the City or Fehr & Peers be responsible to You or anyone else for, or have liability for any special, indirect, incidental or consequential damages (including, without limitation, damages for loss of business profits or changes to businesses costs) or lost data or downtime, however caused, and on any theory of liability from the use of, or the inability to use, the VMT Calculator, whether the data, and/or formulas contained in the VMT Calculator are provided by the City or Fehr & Peers, or another third party, even if the City or Fehr & Peers have been advised of the possibility of such damages.

This Agreement and License shall be governed by the laws of the State of California without regard to their conflicts of law provisions, and shall be effective as of the date set forth below and, unless terminated in accordance with the above or extended by written amendment to this Agreement, shall terminate on the earlier of the date that You are not making use of the VMT Calculator or one year after the beginning of Your use of the VMT Calculator.

By using the VMT Calculator, You hereby waive and release all claims, responsibilities, liabilities, actions, damages, costs, and losses, known and unknown, against the City and Fehr & Peers for Your use of the VMT Calculator.

Before making decisions using the information provided in this application, contact City LADOT staff to confirm the validity of the data provided.

Print and sign below, and submit to LADOT along with the transportation assessment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

| You, the User | 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1 | | |
|----------------|--|--|--|
| By: | gash | | |
| Print Name: | Jason Shender | | |
| Title: | Transportation Planner II | | |
| Company: | Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineer | | |
| Address: | 20931 Burbank Boulevard, Suite C Woodland Hills, CA 91367 | | |
| Phone: | (818) 835-8648 | | |
| Email Address: | jshender@llgengineers.com | | |
| Date: | 4/10/2020 | | |

APPENDIX B

CONCEPT PLAN OCEAN WAY / MAXELLA AVENUE



o:\0265\design\dwg\p0265c2b-02.dwg 09/22/2020 14:51:03 jshender IIg exhibits color.ctb
APPENDIX C

NCHRP INTERNAL CAPTURE TOOL OUTPUTS

| | NCHRP 684 Internal Trip Capture Estimation Tool | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Project Name: | Paseo Marina - Option A | | Organization: | | | | | | | | |
| Project Location: | | | Performed By: | | | | | | | | |
| Scenario Description: | | | Date: | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year: | | | Checked By: | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Period: | AM Street Peak Hour | | Date: | | | | | | | | |

| Table 1-A: Base Vehicle-Trip Generation Estimates (Single-Use Site Estimate) | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------|----------------|--|--------------------------------------|----------|---------|--|--|
| Law dillar | Developm | ent Data (For Inf | ormation Only) | | Estimated Vehicle-Trips ³ | | | | |
| Land Use | ITE LUCs ¹ | Quantity | Units | | Total | Entering | Exiting | | |
| Office | | | | | 0 | | | | |
| Retail | 820 | 13,650 | | | 13 | 8 | 5 | | |
| Restaurant | 932 | 13,650 | | | 136 | 75 | 61 | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | | 0 | | | | |
| Residential | 221 | 592 | | | 191 | 50 | 141 | | |
| Hotel | | | | | 0 | | | | |
| All Other Land Uses ² | | | | | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | | 340 | 133 | 207 | | |

| | | | | _ | | | | | | |
|---|------------|--------------|-----------------|-----|------------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|--|--|
| Table 2-A: Mode Split and Vehicle Occupancy Estimates | | | | | | | | | | |
| L en d H e e | | Entering Tri | ps | | | Exiting Trips | | | | |
| Land Use | Veh. Occ.4 | % Transit | % Non-Motorized | 1 | Veh. Occ. ⁴ | % Transit | % Non-Motorized | | | |
| Office | | | | , [| | | | | | |
| Retail | | 15% | | , [| | 15% | | | | |
| Restaurant | | 15% | | , [| | 15% | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | , [| | | | | | |
| Residential | | 15% | | , [| | 15% | | | | |
| Hotel | | | | , [| | | | | | |
| All Other Land Uses ² | | | | , [| | | | | | |

| Table 3-A: Average Land Use Interchange Distances (Feet Walking Distance) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|------------------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Origina (France) | | Destination (To) | | | | | | | | | |
| Oligin (Floin) | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | | | |
| Office | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Retail | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Restaurant | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Residential | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hotel | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Table 4-A: Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix* | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|------------------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Origin (From) | | Destination (To) | | | | | | | | | |
| | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | | | |
| Office | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Retail | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | | | |
| Restaurant | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 2 | 0 | | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Residential | 0 | 1 | 15 | 0 | | 0 | | | | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |

| Table 5-A: Computations Summary | | | | Table 6-A: Internal Trip Capture Percentages by Land Use | | | |
|---|-------|----------|---------|--|----------------|---------------|--|
| | Total | Entering | Exiting | Land Use | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips | |
| All Person-Trips | 340 | 133 | 207 | Office | N/A | N/A | |
| Internal Capture Percentage | 12% | 16% | 10% | Retail | 25% | 40% | |
| | | | | Restaurant | 21% | 5% | |
| External Vehicle-Trips ⁵ | 253 | 95 | 158 | Cinema/Entertainment | N/A | N/A | |
| External Transit-Trips ⁶ | 45 | 17 | 28 | Residential | 6% | 11% | |
| External Non-Motorized Trips ⁶ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel | N/A | N/A | |

*Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Estimation Tool Developed by the Texas A&M Transportation Institute - Version 2013.1

| Project Name: | Paseo Marina - Option A |
|------------------|-------------------------|
| Analysis Period: | AM Street Peak Hour |

| Table 7-A: Conversion of Vehicle-Trip Ends to Person-Trip Ends | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-------------------|---------------|---|-----------|-----------------------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|
| Land Lies | Tab | le 7-A (D): Enter | ing Trips | | 1 | able 7-A (O): Exiting Trips | | | | | |
| Land Use | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | | | | |
| Office | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Retail | 1.00 | 8 | 8 | | 1.00 | 5 | 5 | | | | |
| Restaurant | 1.00 | 75 | 75 | | 1.00 | 61 | 61 | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Residential | 1.00 | 50 | 50 | | 1.00 | 141 | 141 | | | | |
| Hotel | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | | | | |

| Table 8-A (O): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Origin) | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|--------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) | | | | | | | | | |
| Oligili (FIOIII) | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | | |
| Office | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Retail | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | | |
| Restaurant | 19 | 9 | | 0 | 2 | 2 | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Residential | 3 | 1 | 28 | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |

| Table 8-A (D): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Destination) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|--------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Destination (To) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ongin (From) | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | | | |
| Office | | 3 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Retail | 0 | | 38 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | | | |
| Restaurant | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Residential | 0 | 1 | 15 | 0 | | 0 | | | | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |

| | Table 9-A (D): Internal and External Trips Summary (Entering Trips) | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|------------------|-------|--|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | Person-Trip Esti | mates | | External Trips by Mode* | | | | | | |
| Destination Land Use | Internal | External | Total | | Vehicles ¹ | Transit ² | Non-Motorized ² | | | | |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Retail | 2 | 6 | 8 | | 5 | 1 | 0 | | | | |
| Restaurant | 16 | 59 | 75 | | 50 | 9 | 0 | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Residential | 3 | 47 | 50 | | 40 | 7 | 0 | | | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| All Other Land Uses ³ | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |

| | Table 9-A (O): Internal and External Trips Summary (Exiting Trips) | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|------------------|-------|--|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | Person-Trip Esti | mates | | External Trips by Mode* | | | | | |
| Oligin Land Ose | Internal | External | Total | | Vehicles ¹ | Transit ² | Non-Motorized ² | | | |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Retail | 2 | 3 | 5 | | 3 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Restaurant | 3 | 58 | 61 | | 49 | 9 | 0 | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Residential | 16 | 125 | 141 | | 106 | 19 | 0 | | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| All Other Land Uses ³ | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |

¹Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-A

²Person-Trips

³Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator *Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

| NCHRP 684 Internal Trip Capture Estimation Tool | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|--|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Project Name: | Paseo Marina - Option A | | Organization: | | | | | |
| Project Location: | | | Performed By: | | | | | |
| Scenario Description: | | | Date: | | | | | |
| Analysis Year: | | | Checked By: | | | | | |
| Analysis Period: | PM Street Peak Hour | | Date: | | | | | |

| | Table 1 | -P: Base Vehicle | e-Trip Generation | Esti | mates (Single-Use | Site Estimate) | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| Land Llas | Developme | ent Data (<i>For Info</i> | ormation Only) | | | Estimated Vehicle-Trips ³ | |
| Land Use | ITE LUCs ¹ | Quantity | Units | | Total | Entering | Exiting |
| Office | | | | 1 [| 0 | | |
| Retail | 820 | 13,650 | | 1 [| 52 | 25 | 27 |
| Restaurant | 932 | 13,650 | | 1 [| 133 | 82 | 51 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | | 0 | | |
| Residential | 221 | 592 | | 1 [| 233 | 142 | 91 |
| Hotel | | | | 1 [| 0 | | |
| All Other Land Uses ² | | | | 1 [| 0 | | |
| | | | | 1 [| 418 | 249 | 169 |

| Table 2-P: Mode Split and Vehicle Occupancy Estimates | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|--------------|-----------------|--|------------|---------------|-----------------|--|--|--|
| and Use | | Entering Tri | ps | | | Exiting Trips | | | | |
| Land Ose | Veh. Occ.4 | % Transit | % Non-Motorized | | Veh. Occ.4 | % Transit | % Non-Motorized | | | |
| Office | | | | | | | | | | |
| Retail | | 15% | | | | 15% | | | | |
| Restaurant | | 15% | | | | 15% | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | | | | | | | |
| Residential | | 15% | | | | 15% | | | | |
| Hotel | | | | | | | | | | |
| All Other Land Uses ² | | | | | | | | | | |

| Table 3-P: Average Land Use Interchange Distances (Feet Walking Distance) | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|--------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|
| Origin (From) | | | | Destination (To) | | | | | |
| | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | |
| Office | | | | | | | | | |
| Retail | | | | | | | | | |
| Restaurant | | | | | | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | | | | | | |
| Residential | | | | | | | | | |
| Hotel | | | | | | | | | |

| Table 4-P: Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix* | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|--------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) | | | | | | | | | |
| | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | | |
| Office | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Retail | 0 | | 8 | 0 | 7 | 0 | | | | |
| Restaurant | 0 | 13 | | 0 | 9 | 0 | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Residential | 0 | 3 | 11 | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |

| Table 5-P | : Computatio | ns Summary | | Table 6-P: Interna | Table 6-P: Internal Trip Capture Percentages by Land Use | | | |
|---|--------------|------------|---------|----------------------|--|---------------|--|--|
| | Total | Entering | Exiting | Land Use | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips | | |
| All Person-Trips | 418 | 249 | 169 | Office | N/A | N/A | | |
| Internal Capture Percentage | 24% | 20% | 30% | Retail | 64% | 56% | | |
| | | | | Restaurant | 23% | 43% | | |
| External Vehicle-Trips ⁵ | 269 | 169 | 100 | Cinema/Entertainment | N/A | N/A | | |
| External Transit-Trips ⁶ | 47 | 29 | 18 | Residential | 11% | 15% | | |
| External Non-Motorized Trips ⁶ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel | N/A | N/A | | |

¹Land Use Codes (LUCs) from *Trip Generation Manual*, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.

²Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator.

³Enter trips assuming no transit or non-motorized trips (as assumed in ITE *Trip Generation Manual*).

⁴Enter vehicle occupancy assumed in Table 1-P vehicle trips. If vehicle occupancy changes for proposed mixed-use project, manual adjustments must be ⁵Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-P.

⁶Person-Trips

*Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Estimation Tool Developed by the Texas A&M Transportation Institute - Version 2013.1

| Project Name: | Paseo Marina - Option A |
|------------------|-------------------------|
| Analysis Period: | PM Street Peak Hour |

| Table 7-P: Conversion of Vehicle-Trip Ends to Person-Trip Ends | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-------------------|---------------|---|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--|
| Land Use | Table | 7-P (D): Entering | g Trips | | Table 7-P (O): Exiting Trips | | | |
| | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | T | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | |
| Office | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | |
| Retail | 1.00 | 25 | 25 | | 1.00 | 27 | 27 | |
| Restaurant | 1.00 | 82 | 82 | | 1.00 | 51 | 51 | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | |
| Residential | 1.00 | 142 | 142 | | 1.00 | 91 | 91 | |
| Hotel | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | |

| Table 8-P (O): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Origin) | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|--------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) | | | | | | | | |
| | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | |
| Office | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Retail | 1 | | 8 | 1 | 7 | 1 | | | |
| Restaurant | 2 | 21 | | 4 | 9 | 4 | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Residential | 4 | 38 | 19 | 0 | | 3 | | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |

| Table 8-P (D): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Destination) | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|--------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|
| Origin (From) | | | | Destination (To) | | | | | |
| | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | |
| Office | | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | | | |
| Retail | 0 | | 24 | 0 | 65 | 0 | | | |
| Restaurant | 0 | 13 | | 0 | 23 | 0 | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 6 | 0 | | | |
| Residential | 0 | 3 | 11 | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | | | | |

| | Table 9-P (D): Internal and External Trips Summary (Entering Trips) | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Destination Land Use | P | erson-Trip Estima | ates | | External Trips by Mode* | | | | | |
| | Internal | External | Total | T | Vehicles ¹ | Transit ² | Non-Motorized ² | | | |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Retail | 16 | 9 | 25 | | 8 | 1 | 0 | | | |
| Restaurant | 19 | 63 | 82 | | 54 | 9 | 0 | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Residential | 16 | 126 | 142 | | 107 | 19 | 0 | | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| All Other Land Uses ³ | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |

| | Table 9-P (O): Internal and External Trips Summary (Exiting Trips) | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------|--|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| | P | erson-Trip Estima | tes | | External Trips by Mode* | | | | |
| Origin Land Use | Internal | External | Total | | Vehicles ¹ | Transit ² | Non-Motorized ² | | |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Retail | 15 | 12 | 27 | | 10 | 2 | 0 | | |
| Restaurant | 22 | 29 | 51 | | 25 | 4 | 0 | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Residential | 14 | 77 | 91 | | 65 | 12 | 0 | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| All Other Land Uses ³ | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

¹Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-P

²Person-Trips

³Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator *Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

| Table 7.1a Adjusted Internal Trip Capture Rates for Trip Origins within a Multi-Use Development | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|
| land | Wee | kday | | | | | |
| | | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour | | | | |
| | To Office | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | | |
| | To Retail | 28.0% | 20.0% | | | | |
| | To Restaurant | 63.0% | 4.0% | | | | |
| From OFFICE | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | | |
| | To Residential | 1.0% | 2.0% | | | | |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | | |
| | To Office | 29.0% | 2.0% | | | | |
| | To Retail | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | | |
| | To Restaurant | 13.0% | 29.0% | | | | |
| From RETAIL | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 4.0% | | | | |
| From OFFICE From RETAIL From RESTAURANT From CINEMA/ENTERTAINMENT From RESIDENTIAL | To Residential | 14.0% | 26.0% | | | | |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 5.0% | | | | |
| | To Office | 31.0% | 3.0% | | | | |
| | To Retail | 14.0% | 41.0% | | | | |
| | To Restaurant | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | | |
| From RESTAURANT | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 8.0% | | | | |
| | To Residential | 4.0% | 18.0% | | | | |
| | To Hotel | 3.0% | 7.0% | | | | |
| | To Office | 0.0% | 2.0% | | | | |
| | To Retail | 0.0% | 21.0% | | | | |
| | To Restaurant | 0.0% | 31.0% | | | | |
| FIOTI CINEMA/ENTERTAINMENT | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | | |
| From RESTAURANT | To Residential | 0.0% | 8.0% | | | | |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 2.0% | | | | |
| | To Office | 2.0% | 4.0% | | | | |
| | To Retail | 1.0% | 42.0% | | | | |
| | To Restaurant | 20.0% | 21.0% | | | | |
| From RESIDENTIAL | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | | |
| | To Residential | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | | |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 3.0% | | | | |
| | To Office | 75.0% | 0.0% | | | | |
| | To Retail | 14.0% | 16.0% | | | | |
| | To Restaurant | 9.0% | 68.0% | | | | |
| | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | | |
| | To Residential | 0.0% | 2.0% | | | | |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | | |

| Table 7.2a Adjusted Internal Trip Capture Rates for Trip Destinations within a Multi-Use I | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|--|--|--|
| | Paire | Wee | kday | | | |
| Laild Use | | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour | | | |
| | From Office | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | |
| | From Retail | 4.0% | 31.0% | | | |
| | From Restaurant | 14.0% | 30.0% | | | |
| 10 OFFICE | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 6.0% | | | |
| | From Residential | 3.0% | 57.0% | | | |
| | From Hotel | 3.0% | 0.0% | | | |
| | From Office | 32.0% | 8.0% | | | |
| | From Retail | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | |
| | From Restaurant | 8.0% | 50.0% | | | |
| TORETAIL | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 4.0% | | | |
| | From Residential | 17.0% | 10.0% | | | |
| | From Hotel | 4.0% | 2.0% | | | |
| | From Office | 23.0% | 2.0% | | | |
| | From Retail | 50.0% | 29.0% | | | |
| | From Restaurant | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | |
| TO RESTAURANT | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 3.0% | | | |
| | From Residential | 20.0% | 14.0% | | | |
| | From Hotel | 6.0% | 5.0% | | | |
| | From Office | 0.0% | 1.0% | | | |
| | From Retail | 0.0% | 26.0% | | | |
| | From Restaurant | 0.0% | 32.0% | | | |
| TO CINEMA/ENTERTAINMENT | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | |
| | From Residential | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | |
| | From Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | |
| | From Office | 0.0% | 4.0% | | | |
| | From Retail | 2.0% | 46.0% | | | |
| | From Restaurant | 5.0% | 16.0% | | | |
| TO RESIDENTIAL | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 4.0% | | | |
| | From Residential | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | |
| | From Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | |
| | From Office | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | |
| | From Retail | 0.0% | 17.0% | | | |
| | From Restaurant | 4.0% | 71.0% | | | |
| TOHUTEL | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 1.0% | | | |
| | From Residential | 0.0% | 12.0% | | | |
| | From Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | |

| | NCHRP 684 Internal Trip Capture Estimation Tool | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Project Name: | Paseo Marina (Option B) | | Organization: | | | | | | |
| Project Location: | | | Performed By: | | | | | | |
| Scenario Description: | | | Date: | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year: | | | Checked By: | | | | | | |
| Analysis Period: | AM Street Peak Hour | | Date: | | | | | | |

| | Table 1-A: Base Vehicle-Trip Generation Estimates (Single-Use Site Estimate) | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|-------------------|----------------|--|--------------------------------------|----------|---------|--|
| Land Line | Developm | ent Data (For Inf | ormation Only) | | Estimated Vehicle-Trips ³ | | | |
| Land Use | ITE LUCs ¹ | Quantity | Units | | Total | Entering | Exiting | |
| Office | 710 | 90,000 | | | 104 | 89 | 15 | |
| Retail | 820 | 20,000 | | | 19 | 12 | 7 | |
| Restaurant | 932 | 20,000 | | | 199 | 109 | 90 | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | | 0 | | | |
| Residential | 221 | | 382 | | 138 | 36 | 102 | |
| Hotel | | | | | 0 | | | |
| All Other Land Uses ² | | | | | 0 | | | |
| | | | | | 460 | 246 | 214 | |

| | Table 2-A: Mode Split and Vehicle Occupancy Estimates | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--|------------|---------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| Lond Have | Entering Trips | | | | | Exiting Trips | | | | | |
| Land Use | Veh. Occ.4 | % Transit | % Non-Motorized | | Veh. Occ.4 | % Transit | % Non-Motorized | | | | |
| Office | | 15% | | | | 15% | | | | | |
| Retail | | 15% | | | | 15% | | | | | |
| Restaurant | | 15% | | | | 15% | | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Residential | | 15% | | | | 15% | | | | | |
| Hotel | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All Other Land Uses ² | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Table 3-A: Average Land Use Interchange Distances (Feet Walking Distance) | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|--------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|
| Origin (From) | | | | Destination (To) | | | | | |
| Oligin (From) | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | |
| Office | | | | | | | | | |
| Retail | | | | | | | | | |
| Restaurant | | | | | | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | | | | | | |
| Residential | | | | | | | | | |
| Hotel | | | | | | | | | |

| Table 4-A: Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix* | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|------------------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Origin (From) | | Destination (To) | | | | | | | | | |
| Origin (From) | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | | | |
| Office | | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Retail | 2 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | | | |
| Restaurant | 12 | 1 | | 0 | 2 | 0 | | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Residential | 2 | 1 | 20 | 0 | | 0 | | | | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |

| Table 5-A | : Computatio | ns Summary | | Table 6-A: Interna | Table 6-A: Internal Trip Capture Percentages by Land Use | | | |
|---|--------------|------------|---------|----------------------|--|---------------|--|--|
| | Total | Entering | Exiting | Land Use | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips | | |
| All Person-Trips | 460 | 246 | 214 | Office | 18% | 87% | | |
| Internal Capture Percentage | 24% | 22% | 26% | Retail | 50% | 57% | | |
| | | | | Restaurant | 28% | 17% | | |
| External Vehicle-Trips ⁵ | 298 | 162 | 136 | Cinema/Entertainment | N/A | N/A | | |
| External Transit-Trips ⁶ | 52 | 29 | 23 | Residential | 8% | 23% | | |
| External Non-Motorized Trips ⁶ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel | N/A | N/A | | |

¹Land Use Codes (LUCs) from *Trip Generation Manual*, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.
 ²Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator.
 ³Enter trips assuming no transit or non-motorized trips (as assumed in ITE *Trip Generation Manual*).
 ⁴Enter vehicle occupancy assumed in Table 1-A vehicle trips. If vehicle occupancy changes for proposed mixed-use project, manual adjustments must be made to Tables 5-A, 9-A (O and D). Enter transit, non-motorized percentages that will result with proposed mixed-use project complete.

⁵Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-A

⁶Person-Trips

*Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Estimation Tool Developed by the Texas A&M Transportation Institute - Version 2013.1

| Project Name: | Paseo Marina (Option B) |
|------------------|-------------------------|
| Analysis Period: | AM Street Peak Hour |

| Table 7-A: Conversion of Vehicle-Trip Ends to Person-Trip Ends | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--|--|
| Landling | Table 7-A (D): Entering Trips | | | | Table 7-A (O): Exiting Trips | | | | |
| Land Ose | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | | |
| Office | 1.00 | 89 | 89 | | 1.00 | 15 | 15 | | |
| Retail | 1.00 | 12 | 12 | | 1.00 | 7 | 7 | | |
| Restaurant | 1.00 | 109 | 109 | | 1.00 | 90 | 90 | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Residential | 1.00 | 36 | 36 | | 1.00 | 102 | 102 | | |
| Hotel | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | | |

| Table 8-A (O): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Origin) | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| Origin (From) | | | | Destination (To) | | | | | | |
| Origin (From) | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | | |
| Office | | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Retail | 2 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | | |
| Restaurant | 28 | 13 | | 0 | 4 | 3 | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Residential | 2 | 1 | 20 | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |

| Table 8-A (D): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Destination) | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|--------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| | Destination (To) | | | | | | | | | |
| Oligili (FIOIII) | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | | |
| Office | | 4 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Retail | 4 | | 55 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | | |
| Restaurant | 12 | 1 | | 0 | 2 | 0 | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Residential | 3 | 2 | 22 | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| Hotel | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |

| | Table 9-A (D): Internal and External Trips Summary (Entering Trips) | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|----------|-------|--|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Destinction Land Llas | Person-Trip Estimates | | | | External Trips by Mode* | | | | | |
| Destination Land Use | Internal | External | Total | | Vehicles ¹ | Transit ² | Non-Motorized ² | | | |
| Office | 16 | 73 | 89 | | 62 | 11 | 0 | | | |
| Retail | 6 | 6 | 12 | | 5 | 1 | 0 | | | |
| Restaurant | 30 | 79 | 109 | | 67 | 12 | 0 | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Residential | 3 | 33 | 36 | | 28 | 5 | 0 | | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| All Other Land Uses ³ | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |

| | Table 9-A (O): Internal and External Trips Summary (Exiting Trips) | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|----------|-------|--|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Person-Trip Estimates | | | | External Trips by Mode* | | | | | |
| Oligin Land Ose | Internal | External | Total | | Vehicles ¹ | Transit ² | Non-Motorized ² | | | |
| Office | 13 | 2 | 15 | | 2 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Retail | 4 | 3 | 7 | | 3 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Restaurant | 15 | 75 | 90 | | 64 | 11 | 0 | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Residential | 23 | 79 | 102 | | 67 | 12 | 0 | | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| All Other Land Uses ³ | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |

¹Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-A

²Person-Trips

³Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator *Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

| NCHRP 684 Internal Trip Capture Estimation Tool | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|--|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Project Name: | Paseo Marina (Option B) | | Organization: | | | | | | |
| Project Location: | | | Performed By: | | | | | | |
| Scenario Description: | | | Date: | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year: | | | Checked By: | | | | | | |
| Analysis Period: | PM Street Peak Hour | | Date: | | | | | | |

| | Table 1 | -P: Base Vehicle | -Trip Generation | Estimates | (Single-Use | Site Estimate) | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|---|------------------|-----------|-------------|--------------------------------------|---------|--|--|
| Land Llas | Developm | Development Data (For Information Only) | | | | Estimated Vehicle-Trips ³ | | | |
| Land Use | ITE LUCs ¹ | Quantity | Units | | Total | Entering | Exiting | | |
| Office | 710 | 90,000 | | | 104 | 17 | 87 | | |
| Retail | 820 | 20,000 | | | 76 | 36 | 40 | | |
| Restaurant | 932 | 20,000 | | | 195 | 121 | 74 | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | | 0 | | | | |
| Residential | 221 | 382 | | | 168 | 102 | 66 | | |
| Hotel | | | | | 0 | | | | |
| All Other Land Uses ² | | | | | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | | 543 | 276 | 267 | | |

| Table 2-P: Mode Split and Vehicle Occupancy Estimates | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|--------------|-----------------|--|------------|---------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | Entering Tri | ps | | | Exiting Trips | | | |
| Land Use | Veh. Occ.4 | % Transit | % Non-Motorized | | Veh. Occ.4 | % Transit | % Non-Motorized | | |
| Office | | 15% | | | | 15% | | | |
| Retail | | 15% | | | | 15% | | | |
| Restaurant | | 15% | | | | 15% | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | | | | | | |
| Residential | | 15% | | | | 15% | | | |
| Hotel | | | | | | | | | |
| All Other Land Uses ² | | | | | | | | | |

| Table 3-P: Average Land Use Interchange Distances (Feet Walking Distance) | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|------------------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|
| Origin (From) | | Destination (To) | | | | | | | |
| | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | |
| Office | | | | | | | | | |
| Retail | | | | | | | | | |
| Restaurant | | | | | | | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | | | | | | | | | |
| Residential | | | | | | | | | |
| Hotel | | | | | | | | | |

| Table 4-P: Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix* | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|--------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) | | | | | | | | |
| | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | |
| Office | | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | | |
| Retail | 1 | | 12 | 0 | 10 | 0 | | | |
| Restaurant | 2 | 18 | | 0 | 13 | 0 | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Residential | 3 | 4 | 14 | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |

| Table 5-P: Computations Summary | | | | Table 6-P: Interna | Table 6-P: Internal Trip Capture Percentages by Land Use | | | |
|---|-------|----------|---------|----------------------|--|---------------|--|--|
| | Total | Entering | Exiting | Land Use | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips | | |
| All Person-Trips | 543 | 276 | 267 | Office | 35% | 8% | | |
| Internal Capture Percentage | 31% | 30% | 31% | Retail | 69% | 58% | | |
| | | | | Restaurant | 23% | 45% | | |
| External Vehicle-Trips ⁵ | 317 | 162 | 155 | Cinema/Entertainment | N/A | N/A | | |
| External Transit-Trips ⁶ | 58 | 30 | 28 | Residential | 25% | 32% | | |
| External Non-Motorized Trips ⁶ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel | N/A | N/A | | |

¹Land Use Codes (LUCs) from *Trip Generation Manual*, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.

²Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator.

³Enter trips assuming no transit or non-motorized trips (as assumed in ITE *Trip Generation Manual*).

⁴Enter vehicle occupancy assumed in Table 1-P vehicle trips. If vehicle occupancy changes for proposed mixed-use project, manual adjustments must be ⁵Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-P.

⁶Person-Trips

*Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Estimation Tool Developed by the Texas A&M Transportation Institute - Version 2013.1

| Project Name: | Paseo Marina (Option B) |
|------------------|-------------------------|
| Analysis Period: | PM Street Peak Hour |

| Table 7-P: Conversion of Vehicle-Trip Ends to Person-Trip Ends | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--|
| | Table 7-P (D): Entering Trips | | | | Table 7-P (O): Exiting Trips | | | |
| Land Use | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | T | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | |
| Office | 1.00 | 17 | 17 | | 1.00 | 87 | 87 | |
| Retail | 1.00 | 36 | 36 | | 1.00 | 40 | 40 | |
| Restaurant | 1.00 | 121 | 121 | | 1.00 | 74 | 74 | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | |
| Residential | 1.00 | 102 | 102 | | 1.00 | 66 | 66 | |
| Hotel | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | |

| Table 8-P (O): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Origin) | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|--------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) | | | | | | | | |
| | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | | |
| Office | | 17 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | | |
| Retail | 1 | | 12 | 2 | 10 | 2 | | | |
| Restaurant | 2 | 30 | | 6 | 13 | 5 | | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Residential | 3 | 28 | 14 | 0 | | 2 | | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |

| Table 8-P (D): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Destination) | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|------------------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|
| Origin (From) | | Destination (To) | | | | | | |
| Oligin (From) | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel | | |
| Office | | 3 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | | |
| Retail | 5 | | 35 | 0 | 47 | 0 | | |
| Restaurant | 5 | 18 | | 0 | 16 | 0 | | |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1 | 1 | 4 | | 4 | 0 | | |
| Residential | 10 | 4 | 17 | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Hotel | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | | | |

| Table 9-P (D): Internal and External Trips Summary (Entering Trips) | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|----------|-------|---|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Destination Land Llas | Person-Trip Estimates | | | | External Trips by Mode* | | |
| Destination Land Ose | Internal | External | Total | T | Vehicles ¹ | Transit ² | Non-Motorized ² |
| Office | 6 | 11 | 17 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 0 |
| Retail | 25 | 11 | 36 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 28 | 93 | 121 | | 79 | 14 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 25 | 77 | 102 | 1 | 65 | 12 | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ³ | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Table 9-P (O): Internal and External Trips Summary (Exiting Trips) | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|-----------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| | P | Person-Trip Estimates | | | External Trips by Mode* | | |
| Origin Land Use | Internal | External | Total | 1 | Vehicles ¹ | Transit ² | Non-Motorized ² |
| Office | 7 | 80 | 87 | | 68 | 12 | 0 |
| Retail | 23 | 17 | 40 | | 14 | 3 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 33 | 41 | 74 | | 35 | 6 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 21 | 45 | 66 | | 38 | 7 | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ³ | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

¹Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-P

²Person-Trips

³Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator *Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

| Table 7.1a Adjusted Internal Trip Capture Rates for Trip Origins within a Multi-Use Development | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|--|--|
| Lond | | Wee | Weekday | | |
| | ise Pairs | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour | | |
| | To Office | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |
| | To Retail | 28.0% | 20.0% | | |
| | To Restaurant | 63.0% | 4.0% | | |
| From OFFICE | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |
| | To Residential | 1.0% | 2.0% | | |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |
| | To Office | 29.0% | 2.0% | | |
| | To Retail | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |
| | To Restaurant | 13.0% | 29.0% | | |
| From RETAIL | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 4.0% | | |
| | To Residential | 14.0% | 26.0% | | |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 5.0% | | |
| | To Office | 31.0% | 3.0% | | |
| | To Retail | 14.0% | 41.0% | | |
| | To Restaurant | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |
| From RESTAURANT | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 8.0% | | |
| | To Residential | 4.0% | 18.0% | | |
| | To Hotel | 3.0% | 7.0% | | |
| | To Office | 0.0% | 2.0% | | |
| | To Retail | 0.0% | 21.0% | | |
| | To Restaurant | 0.0% | 31.0% | | |
| From CINEMA/ENTERTAINMENT | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |
| | To Residential | 0.0% | 8.0% | | |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 2.0% | | |
| | To Office | 2.0% | 4.0% | | |
| | To Retail | 1.0% | 42.0% | | |
| | To Restaurant | 20.0% | 21.0% | | |
| From RESIDENTIAL | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |
| | To Residential | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 3.0% | | |
| | To Office | 75.0% | 0.0% | | |
| | To Retail | 14.0% | 16.0% | | |
| | To Restaurant | 9.0% | 68.0% | | |
| | To Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |
| | To Residential | 0.0% | 2.0% | | |
| | To Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |

| Table 7.2a Adjusted Internal Trip Capture Rates for Trip Destinations within a Multi-Use Development | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|--|--|
| L and Lise | Paire | Wee | kday | | |
| Laild Use | | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour | | |
| | From Office | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |
| | From Retail | 4.0% | 31.0% | | |
| To OFFICE | From Restaurant | 14.0% | 30.0% | | |
| | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 6.0% | | |
| | From Residential | 3.0% | 57.0% | | |
| | From Hotel | 3.0% | 0.0% | | |
| | From Office | 32.0% | 8.0% | | |
| | From Retail | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |
| | From Restaurant | 8.0% | 50.0% | | |
| TORETAIL | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 4.0% | | |
| | From Residential | 17.0% | 10.0% | | |
| | From Hotel | 4.0% | 2.0% | | |
| | From Office | 23.0% | 2.0% | | |
| | From Retail | 50.0% | 29.0% | | |
| | From Restaurant | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |
| TO RESTAURANT | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 3.0% | | |
| | From Residential | 20.0% | 14.0% | | |
| | From Hotel | 6.0% | 5.0% | | |
| | From Office | 0.0% | 1.0% | | |
| | From Retail | 0.0% | 26.0% | | |
| | From Restaurant | 0.0% | 32.0% | | |
| TO CINEMA/ENTERTAINMENT | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |
| | From Residential | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |
| | From Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |
| | From Office | 0.0% | 4.0% | | |
| | From Retail | 2.0% | 46.0% | | |
| | From Restaurant | 5.0% | 16.0% | | |
| TO RESIDENTIAL | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 4.0% | | |
| | From Residential | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |
| | From Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |
| | From Office | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |
| | From Retail | 0.0% | 17.0% | | |
| | From Restaurant | 4.0% | 71.0% | | |
| TOHUTEL | From Cinema/Entertainment | 0.0% | 1.0% | | |
| | From Residential | 0.0% | 12.0% | | |
| | From Hotel | 0.0% | 0.0% | | |

APPENDIX D

LADOT VMT CALCULATOR OUTPUT OPTION A

CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR Version 1.3



Project Screening Criteria: Is this project required to conduct a vehicle miles traveled analysis?

Existing Land Use

Project Information



Is the project replacing an existing number of residential units with a smaller number of residential units AND is located within one-half mile of a fixed-rail or fixed-guideway transit station?

| Land Use Type | | Value | Unit | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---------|------|---|--|--|
| Retail General Retail | Ŧ | 100.781 | ksf | • | | |
| Retail General Retail | | 100.781 | ksf | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Click here to add a single custom land use type (will be included in the above list)

Proposed Project Land Use

| Land Use Type | | Value | Unit | |
|---|----|-----------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Retail General Retail | - | 13.65 | ksf | • |
| Housing Multi-Family Housing Affordable Housing - Family Retail High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurar Retail General Retail | nt | 592 66 13.65 13.65 | DU DU ksf ksf | |

Project Screening Summary

| Existing Land Use | Proposed Project | | | |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| 3,595 | 4,974 | | | |
| Daily Vehicle Trips | Daily Vehicle | e Trips | | |
| 29,609 | 37.347 | | | |
| Daily VMT | Daily VM | ИТ | | |
| Tier 1 Scree | ning Criteria | | | |
| Project will have less residential units compared to existing residential units & is within one-half mile of a fixed-rail station. | | | | |
| The net increase in daily tri | ps < 250 trips | 1,379 Net Daily Trips | | |
| The net increase in daily VMT ≤ 0 | | 7,738 Net Daily VMT | | |
| The proposed project consists of only retail land uses ≤ 50,000 square feet total.27.300 ksf | | 27.300 ksf | | |
| The proposed project is required to perform VMT analysis. | | | | |

🔍 Yes 🔍 No

Click here to add a single custom land use type (will be included in the above list)

Measuring the Miles

CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR Version 1.3



Project Information



| Proposed Project Land Use Type | Value | Unit |
|--|-------|------|
| Housing Multi-Family | 592 | DU |
| Housing Affordable Housing - Family | 66 | DU |
| Retail High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant | 13.65 | ksf |
| Retail General Retail | 13.65 | ksf |

TDM Strategies

Select each section to show individual strategies Use ✓ to denote if the TDM strategy is part of the proposed project or is a mitigation strategy Max Home Based TDM Achieved? No Max Work Based TDM Achieved? No No No Max Work Based TDM Achieved? No Parking Reduce Parking Supply 100 city code parking provision for the project site

100 city code parking provision for the project site 74 actual parking provision for the project site Proposed Prj 🔲 Mitigation Unbundle Parking monthly parking cost (dollar) for the project 175 Proposed Prj 🔲 Mitigation site Parking Cash-Out 50 percent of employees eligible Proposed Prj 🔲 Mitigation Price Workplace Parking daily parking charge (dollar) 6.00 _ percent of employees subject to priced 50 , parking Proposed Prj 📃 Mitigation **Residential Area Parking** cost (dollar) of annual permit 200 Permits _ Proposed Prj 🔲 Mitigation В Transit C **Education & Encouragement** D **Commute Trip Reductions** E **Shared Mobility** F **Bicycle Infrastructure** G **Neighborhood Enhancement**

Analysis Results

| Proposed Project | With Mitigation |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 4,974 | 4,974 |
| Daily Vehicle Trips | Daily Vehicle Trips |
| 37,347 | 37,347 |
| Daily VMT | Daily VMT |
| 6.9 | 6.9 |
| Houseshold VMT per Capita | Houseshold VMT per Capita |
| N/A | N/A |
| Work VMT | Work VMT |
| per Employee | per Employee |
| Significant | /MT Impact? |
| Household: No | Household: No |
| Threshold = 7.4 | Threshold = 7.4 |
| 15% Below APC | 15% Below APC |
| Work: N/A | Work: N/A |
| Threshold = 11.1 | Threshold = 11.1 |
| 15% Below APC | 15% Below APC |
| | |

Measuring the Miles

Report 1: Project & Analysis Overview

Date: April 27, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option A Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| Project Information | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|----------|--|--|
| Land | Use Туре | Value | Units | | |
| | Single Family | 0 | DU | | |
| | Multi Family | 592 | DU | | |
| Housing | Townhouse | 0 | DU | | |
| | Hotel | 0 | Rooms | | |
| | Motel | 0 | Rooms | | |
| | Family | 66 | DU | | |
| | Senior | 0 | DU | | |
| Affordable Housing | Special Needs | 0 | DU | | |
| | Permanent Supportive | 0 | DU | | |
| | General Retail | 13.650 | ksf | | |
| | Furniture Store | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Pharmacy/Drugstore | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Supermarket | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Bank | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Health Club | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| Datati | High-Turnover Sit-Down | h-Turnover Sit-Down | | | |
| Retail | Restaurant | 13.650 | kst | | |
| | Fast-Food Restaurant | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Quality Restaurant | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Auto Repair | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Home Improvement | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Free-Standing Discount | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Movie Theater | 0 | Seats | | |
| Office | General Office | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| Office | Medical Office | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Light Industrial | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| Industrial | Manufacturing | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Warehousing/Self-Storage | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | University | 0 | Students | | |
| | High School | 0 | Students | | |
| School | Middle School | 0 | Students | | |
| | Elementary | 0 | Students | | |
| | Private School (K-12) | 0 | Students | | |
| Other | | 0 | Trips | | |

Project and Analysis Overview

Report 1: Project & Analysis Overview

Date: April 27, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option A Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| | Analysis Results | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| | Total Employees: 82 | | | | | |
| | Total Population: | 1,541 | | | | |
| Propose | ed Project | With Mi | tigation | | | |
| 4,974 | Daily Vehicle Trips | 4,974 | Daily Vehicle Trips | | | |
| 37,347 | Daily VMT | 37,347 | Daily VMT | | | |
| 6.0 | Household VMT | 6.0 | Household VMT per | | | |
| 6.9 | 6.9 per Capita | | Capita | | | |
| | N/A Work VMT per Employee | | Work VMT per | | | |
| N/A | | | Employee | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Significant VMT | Impact? | | | | |
| | APC: West Los A | Angeles | | | | |
| | Impact Threshold: 15% Belo | ow APC Average | | | | |
| | Household = 7 | 7.4 | | | | |
| | Work = 11.1 | | | | | |
| Propose | ed Project | With Mitigation | | | | |
| VMT Threshold | Impact | VMT Threshold | Impact | | | |
| Household > 7.4 | No | Household > 7.4 | No | | | |
| Work > 11.1 | N/A | Work > 11.1 | N/A | | | |

Date: April 27, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option A Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



Report 2: TDM Inputs

| Strategy Type Description Proposed Project Mitigations Reduce parking supply City code parking provision (spaces) 0 0 Actual parking 0 0 0 Inbundle parking Monthly cost for parking (\$) \$0 \$0 Parking Parking cash-out Employees eligible (%) 0% 0% Price workplace parking permits Employees subject to priced parking (%) 0% 0% Residential area parking permits Cost of annual permit (\$) \$0 \$0 | | TE | OM Strategy Inpu | uts | | |
|--|------------------|----------------------------------|---|------------------|-------------|--|
| Reduce parking supply City code parking provision (spaces) 0 0 Actual parking provision (spaces) 0 0 Unbundle parking Monthly cost for parking (\$) \$0 \$0 Parking Parking cash-out Monthly cost for parking (\$) \$0 \$0 Parking Parking cash-out Employees eligible (%) 0% 0% Price workplace parking Daily parking charge (\$) \$0.00 \$0.00 Residential area parking permits Cost of annual permit (\$) \$0 \$0 Residential area parking permits Cost of annual permit (\$) \$0 \$0 (cont. on following page) (cont. on following page) \$0 \$0 | Stra | tegy Туре | Description | Proposed Project | Mitigations | |
| Parking 0 0 Unbundle parking Monthly cost for parking (\$) \$0 \$0 Parking Parking cash-out Employees eligible (%) 0% 0% Parking Parking cash-out Employees eligible (%) 0% 0% Parking Parking cash-out Employees eligible (%) 0% 0% Price workplace parking Employees subject to priced parking (%) 0% 0% Residential area parking permits Cost of annual permit (\$) \$0 \$0 (cont. on following page) \$0 \$0 \$0 | | Reduce narkina supply | City code parking provision (spaces) | 0 | 0 | |
| ParkingMonthly cost for parking (\$)\$0\$0Parking cash-outEmployees eligible (%)0%0%Price workplace parkingDaily parking charge (\$)\$0.00\$0.00Employees subject to priced parking (%)0%0%Residential area parking permitsCost of annual permit (\$)\$0\$0(cont. on following page) | | | Actual parking provision (spaces) | 0 | 0 | |
| Parking Parking cash-out Employees eligible (%) 0% 0% Parking Daily parking charge parking \$0.00 \$0.00 Residential area parking permits Employees subject to priced parking (%) 0% 0% Residential area parking permits Cost of annual permit (\$) \$0 \$0 (cont. on following page) (cont. on following page) (cont. on following page) | | Unbundle parking | Monthly cost for parking (\$) | \$0 | \$0 | |
| Daily parking charge (\$)\$0.00\$0.00Price workplace parkingEmployees subject to priced parking (%)0%0%Residential area parking permitsCost of annual permit (\$)\$0\$0(cont. on following page) | Parking cash-out | | Employees eligible (%) | 0% | 0% | |
| parkingEmployees subject to priced parking (%)0%0%Residential area parking permitsCost of annual permit (\$)\$0\$0(cont. on following page) | | Price workplace | Daily parking charge (\$) | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | |
| Residential area parking permits Cost of annual permit (\$) \$0 \$0 (cont. on following page) | | parking | Employees subject to priced parking (%) | 0% | 0% | |
| (cont. on following page) | | Residential area parking permits | Cost of annual permit (\$) | \$0 | \$0 | |
| | | (| cont. on following page | 2) | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: April 27, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option A Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| Strate | еду Туре | Description | Proposed Project | Mitigations |
|------------------------------|--|--|------------------|-------------|
| | | Reduction in headways (increase in frequency) (%) | 0% | 0% |
| Transit | Reduce transit headways | Existing transit mode share (as a percent of total daily trips) (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | | Lines within project site improved (<50%, >=50%) | 0 | 0 |
| | Implement | Degree of implementation (low, medium, high) | 0 | 0 |
| | neighborhood shuttle | Employees and residents eligible (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | | Employees and residents eligible (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | Transit subsidies | Amount of transit subsidy per passenger (daily equivalent) (\$) | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Education & Encouragement | Voluntary travel behavior change program | Employees and residents participating (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | Promotions and marketing | Employees and residents participating (%) | 0% | 0% |

Date: April 27, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option A Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



Report 2: TDM Inputs

| Strate | gy Туре | Description | Proposed Project | Mitigations |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|------------------|-------------|
| Required commute trip reduction program | | Employees participating (%) | 0% | 0% |
| Commute Trip Reductions | Alternative Work Schedules and | Employees participating (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | Telecommute | Type of program | 0 | 0 |
| | | Degree of implementation (low, medium, high) | 0 | 0 |
| | Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle | Employees eligible (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | | Employer size (small, medium, large) | 0 | 0 |
| | Ride-share program | Employees eligible (%) | 0% | 0% |
| Shared Mobility | Car share | Car share project setting (Urban, Suburban, All Other) | 0 | 0 |
| | Bike share | Within 600 feet of existing bike share station - OR- implementing new bike share station (Yes/No) | 0 | 0 |
| | School carpool program | Level of implementation (Low, Medium, High) | 0 | 0 |

Date: April 27, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option A Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



Report 2: TDM Inputs

| TDM Strategy Inputs, Cont. | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|------------------|-------------|--|--|--|
| Strate | еду Туре | Description | Proposed Project | Mitigations | | | |
| Implement/Improve on-street bicycle facility | | Provide bicycle facility along site (Yes/No) | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Bicycle Infrastructure | Include Bike parking per LAMC | Meets City Bike Parking Code (Yes/No) | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | Include secure bike parking and showers | Includes indoor bike parking/lockers, showers, & repair station (Yes/No) | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Neighborhood Enhancement | Traffic calming | Streets with traffic calming improvements (%) | 0% | 0% | | | |
| | improvements | Intersections with traffic calming improvements (%) | 0% | 0% | | | |
| | Pedestrian network improvements | Included (within project and connecting off- site/within project only) | 0 | 0 | | | |

Report 3: TDM Outputs

Date: April 27, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option A Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| | TDM Adjustments by Trip Purpose & Strategy | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------|---------------------|--------------------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|--|
| | | | | | | Place type | Suburban | Center | | | | | | |
| | | Ноте Ва | ised Work | Ноте Ва | ised Work | Ноте Ва | ised Other | Ноте Ва | ised Other | Non-Home | Based Other | Non-Home | Based Other | |
| | | Proposed | uction Mitigated | <u>Attra</u> Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | uction Mitigated | Attro Proposed | Action Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | <u>Attr</u> | action Mitigated | Source |
| | Deduce certine constru | 006 | | 00/ | Wittigated | 00% | Wittigated | 000 | ivitigated | 00/ | Ivirtigated | 00% | Wittigated | |
| | | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| | Unbundle parking | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy |
| Parking | Parking cash-out | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | Appendix, Parking |
| | Price workplace parking | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1 - 5 |
| | Residential area parking permits | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |
| | Reduce transit headways | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy |
| Transit | Implement neighborhood shuttle | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | Appendix, Transit sections 1 - 3 |
| | Transit subsidies | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| Education & | Voluntary travel behavior change program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, Education & |
| Encouragement | Promotions and marketing | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | Encouragement sections 1 - 2 |
| | Required commute trip reduction program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| Commute Trip Reductions | Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommute Program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, Commute Trip |
| Reductions | Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | sections 1 - 4 |
| | Ride-share program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| | Car-share | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | TDM Strategy |
| Shared Mobility | Bike share | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | Appendix, Shared |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | School carpool program | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | Mobility sections 0% 1 - 3 |

Report 3: TDM Outputs

Date: April 27, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option A Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| | TDM Adjustments by Trip Purpose & Strategy, Cont. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---|
| | Place type: Suburban Center | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Home Bo Prod | ased Work uction | Home Ba Attra | nsed Work action | Home Bo Prod | ased Other luction | Home Ba Attro | nsed Other action | Non-Home Prod | Based Other uction | Non-Home Attro | Based Other action | Source |
| | | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | |
| Bicycle Infrastructure | Implement/ Improve on-street bicycle facility | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | TDM Strategy |
| | Include Bike parking per LAMC | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | Appendix, Bicycle Infrastructure |
| | Include secure bike parking and showers | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | sections 1 - 3 |
| Neighborhood | Traffic calming improvements | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, |
| Enhancement | Pedestrian network improvements | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | Neighborhood Enhancement sections 1 - 2 |

| | Final Combined & Maximum TDM Effect | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|--|----------|---------------------|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| | Home Based Work Ho Production | | Home Ba Attra | Based Work Home Bo traction Proc | | used Other Home Based Other Attraction Attraction | | sed Other oction | Non-Home Based Other Production | | Non-Home Based Othe Attraction | |
| | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated |
| COMBINED TOTAL | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| MAX. TDM EFFECT | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

| = Min | = Minimum (X%, 1-[(1-A)*(1-B)]) | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------------------------|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| where X%= | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| PLACE | urban | 75% | | | | | | |
| ТҮРЕ | compact infill | 40% | | | | | | |
| MAX: | suburban center | 20% | | | | | | |
| | suburban | 15% | | | | | | |

Note: (1-[(1-A)*(1-B)...]) reflects the dampened combined effectiveness of TDM Strategies (e.g., A, B,...). See the TDM Strategy Appendix (*Transportation Assessment Guidelines Attachment G*) for further discussion of dampening.

> Report 3: TDM Outputs 10 of 13

Report 4: MXD Methodology

Date: April 27, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option A Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| MXD Methodology - Project Without TDM | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------|---------------------|----------------|---------|--|
| | Unadjusted Trips | MXD Adjustment | MXD Trips | Average Trip Length | Unadjusted VMT | MXD VMT | |
| Home Based Work Production | 586 | -14.3% | 502 | 8.3 | 4,864 | 4,167 | |
| Home Based Other Production | 1,624 | -32.0% | 1,104 | 5.9 | 9,582 | 6,514 | |
| Non-Home Based Other Production | 1,270 | -5.3% | 1,203 | 7.4 | 9,398 | 8,902 | |
| Home-Based Work Attraction | 119 | -31.1% | 82 | 12.6 | 1,499 | 1,033 | |
| Home-Based Other Attraction | 1,949 | -26.6% | 1,431 | 7.5 | 14,618 | 10,733 | |
| Non-Home Based Other Attraction | 696 | -6.3% | 652 | 9.2 | 6,403 | 5,998 | |

MXD Methodology with TDM Measures

| | | Proposed Project | | Project with Mitigation Measures | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--|
| | TDM Adjustment | Project Trips | Project VMT | TDM Adjustment | Mitigated Trips | Mitigated VMT | |
| Home Based Work Production | 0.0% | 502 | 4,167 | 0.0% | 502 | 4,167 | |
| Home Based Other Production | 0.0% | 1,104 | 6,514 | 0.0% | 1,104 | 6,514 | |
| Non-Home Based Other Production | 0.0% | 1,203 | 8,902 | 0.0% | 1,203 | 8,902 | |
| Home-Based Work Attraction | 0.0% | 82 | 1,033 | 0.0% | 82 | 1,033 | |
| Home-Based Other Attraction | 0.0% | 1,431 | 10,733 | 0.0% | 1,431 | 10,733 | |
| Non-Home Based Other Attraction | 0.0% | 652 | 5,998 | 0.0% | 652 | 5,998 | |

| MXD VMT Methodology Per Capita & Per Employee | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Total Population: 1,541 | | | | | | | | |
| Total Employees: 82 | | | | | | | | |
| APC: West Los Angeles | | | | | | | | |
| | Proposed Project Project with Mitigation Measures | | | | | | | |
| Total Home Based Production VMT | 10,681 | 10,681 | | | | | | |
| Total Home Based Work Attraction VMT | 1,033 | 1,033 | | | | | | |
| Total Home Based VMT Per Capita | 6.9 | 6.9 | | | | | | |
| Total Work Based VMT Per Employee | N/A | N/A | | | | | | |

VMT Calculator User Agreement

The Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), in partnership with the Department of City Planning and Fehr & Peers, has developed the City of Los Angeles Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Calculator to estimate project-specific daily household VMT per capita and daily work VMT per employee for land use development projects. This application, the VMT Calculator, has been provided to You, the User, to assess vehicle miles traveled (VMT) outcomes of land use projects within the City of Los Angeles. The term "City" as used below shall refer to the City of Los Angeles. The terms "City" and "Fehr & Peers" as used below shall include their respective affiliates, subconsultants, employees, and representatives.

The City is pleased to be able to provide this information to the public. The City believes that the public is most effectively served when they are provided access to the technical tools that inform the public review process of private and public land use investments. However, in using the VMT Calculator, You agree to be bound by this VMT Calculator User Agreement (this Agreement).

VMT Calculator Application for the City of Los Angeles. The City's consultant calibrated the VMT Calculator's parameters in 2018 to estimate travel patterns of locations in the City, and validated those outcomes against empirical data. However, this calibration process is limited to locations within the City, and practitioners applying the VMT Calculator outside of the City boundaries should not apply these estimates without further calibration and validation of travel patterns to verify the VMT Calculator's accuracy in estimating VMT in such other locations.

Limited License to Use. This Agreement gives You a limited, non-transferrable, non-assignable, and nonexclusive license to use and execute a copy of the VMT Calculator on a computer system owned, leased or otherwise controlled by You in Your own facilities, as set out below, provided You do not use the VMT Calculator in an unauthorized manner, and that You do not republish, copy, distribute, reverse-engineer, modify, decompile, disassemble, transfer, or sell any part of the VMT Calculator, and provided that You know and follow the terms of this Agreement. Your failure to follow the terms of this Agreement shall automatically terminate this license and Your right to use the VMT Calculator.

Ownership. You understand and acknowledge that the City owns the VMT Calculator, and shall continue to own it through Your use of it, and that no transfer of ownership of any kind is intended in allowing You to use the VMT Calculator.

Warranty Disclaimer. In spite of the efforts of the City and Fehr & Peers, some information on the VMT Calculator may not be accurate. The VMT Calculator, OUTPUTS AND ASSOCIATED DATA ARE PROVIDED "as is" WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, whether expressed, implied, statutory, or otherwise including but not limited to, the implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose.

Limitation of Liability. It is understood that the VMT Calculator is provided without charge. Neither the City nor Fehr & Peers can be responsible or liable for any information derived from its use, or for any delays, inaccuracies, incompleteness, errors or omissions arising out of your use of the VMT Calculator or with respect to the material contained in the VMT Calculator. You understand and agree that Your sole remedy against the City or Fehr & Peers for loss or damage caused by any defect or failure of the

VMT Calculator, regardless of the form of action, whether in contract, tort, including negligence, strict liability or otherwise, shall be the repair or replacement of the VMT Calculator to the extent feasible as determined solely by the City. In no event shall the City or Fehr & Peers be responsible to You or anyone else for, or have liability for any special, indirect, incidental or consequential damages (including, without limitation, damages for loss of business profits or changes to businesses costs) or lost data or downtime, however caused, and on any theory of liability from the use of, or the inability to use, the VMT Calculator, whether the data, and/or formulas contained in the VMT Calculator are provided by the City or Fehr & Peers, or another third party, even if the City or Fehr & Peers have been advised of the possibility of such damages.

This Agreement and License shall be governed by the laws of the State of California without regard to their conflicts of law provisions, and shall be effective as of the date set forth below and, unless terminated in accordance with the above or extended by written amendment to this Agreement, shall terminate on the earlier of the date that You are not making use of the VMT Calculator or one year after the beginning of Your use of the VMT Calculator.

By using the VMT Calculator, You hereby waive and release all claims, responsibilities, liabilities, actions, damages, costs, and losses, known and unknown, against the City and Fehr & Peers for Your use of the VMT Calculator.

Before making decisions using the information provided in this application, contact City LADOT staff to confirm the validity of the data provided.

Print and sign below, and submit to LADOT along with the transportation assessment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

| You, the User | |
|----------------|--|
| Ву: | Jash |
| Print Name: | Jason Shender |
| Title: | Transportation Planner III |
| Company: | Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers |
| Address: | 20931 Burbank Boulevard, Suite C Woodland Hills, CA 91367 |
| Phone: | (818) 835-8648 |
| Email Address: | jshender@llgengineers.com |
| Date: | 4/27/2021 |
| | |

APPENDIX E

LADOT VMT CALCULATOR OUTPUT OPTION B

CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR Version 1.3



Project Screening Criteria: Is this project required to conduct a vehicle miles traveled analysis?

Existing Land Use

Project Information



Is the project replacing an existing number of residential units with a smaller number of residential units AND is located within one-half mile of a fixed-rail or fixed-guideway transit station?

O No

• Yes

| Land Use Type | | Value | Unit | | |
|-------------------------|---|---------|------|---|--|
| Retail General Retail | - | 100.781 | ksf | • | |
| Retail General Retail | | 100.781 | ksf | | |
| | | | | | |

Click here to add a single custom land use type (will be included in the above list)

Proposed Project Land Use

| Land Use Type | | Value | Unit | |
|--|---|-------|------|---|
| Office General Office | - | 90 | ksf | + |
| Housing Multi-Family | | 382 | DU | |
| Housing Affordable Housing - Family | | 43 | DU | |
| Retail High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant | t | 20 | ksf | |
| Retail General Retail | | 20 | ksf | |
| Office General Office | | 90 | ksf | |

Project Screening Summary

| Existing Land Use | Proposed Project | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 3,595 Daily Vehicle Trips | 5,574 Daily Vehicle Trips | | | |
| 29,609 Daily VMT | 45,178 Daily VMT | | | |
| Tier 1 Scree | ning Criteria | | | |
| Project will have less residential units compared to existing residential units & is within one-half mile of a fixed-rail station. | | | | |
| The net increase in daily trips < 250 trips | | | | |
| The net increase in daily VMT ≤ 0 15,569 Net Daily VMT | | | | |
| The proposed project consists of only retail40.000land uses ≤ 50,000 square feet total.ksf | | | | |
| The proposed project is required to perform VMT analysis. | | | | |

Click here to add a single custom land use type (will be included in the above list)

CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR Version 1.3



Project Information



| Proposed Project Land Use Type | Value | Unit |
|--|-------|------|
| Housing Multi-Family | 382 | DU |
| Housing Affordable Housing - Family | 43 | DU |
| Retail High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant | 20 | ksf |
| Retail General Retail | 20 | ksf |
| Office General Office | 90 | ksf |

TDM Strategies - Max Mitigation Reduction

Use 🗹 to denote if the TDM strategy is part of the proposed project or is a mitigation strategy

Select each section to show individual strategies

Analysis Results

| Max Home Based TDM Ac Max Work Based TDM Ac | chieve hieve | Prop ed? d? | osed Project No No | With Mitigation Yes Yes | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|--|--|
| A | | Parking | | | | |
| Reduce Parking Supply | 100 | city code parking | g provision for th | e project site | | |
| Proposed Prj Mitigation | 74 | actual parking p | | | | |
| Proposed Prj Mitigation | 175 | monthly parking site | g cost (dollar) for | the project | | |
| Parking Cash-Out | 100 | percent of emplo | oyees eligible | | | |
| Price Workplace Parking | 6.00 100 | daily parkir percent of emplo parking | ng charge (dollar) oyees subject to p | priced | | |
| Residential Area Parking Permits Proposed Prj Mitigation | 200 | cost (dollar |) of annual perm | it | | |
| B Transit | | | | | | |
| C Educa | C Education & Encouragement | | | | | |
| D Com | D Commute Trip Reductions | | | | | |
| E | E Shared Mobility | | | | | |
| F Bi | Bicycle Infrastructure | | | | | |
| G Neigh | G Neighborhood Enhancement | | | | | |

| Proposed Project | With Mitigation |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 5,574 | 4,459 |
| Daily Vehicle Trips | Daily Vehicle Trips |
| 45,178 | 36,142 |
| Daily VMT | Daily VMT |
| 6.8 | 5.4 |
| Houseshold VMT per Capita | Houseshold VMT per Capita |
| 14.5 | 11.6 |
| Work VMT | Work VMT |
| per Employee | per Employee |
| Significant | VMT Impact? |
| Household: No | Household: No |
| Threshold = 7.4 | Threshold = 7.4 |
| 1370 Delow AFC | 15% below Ar c |
| Work: Yes | Work: Yes |
| Threshold = 11.1 | Threshold = 11.1 |
| 15% Below APC | 15% Below APC |
| | |



Report 1: Project & Analysis Overview

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| Project Information | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|--------|----------|--|--|
| Land | Use Type | Value | Units | | |
| | Single Family | 0 | DU | | |
| | Multi Family | 382 | DU | | |
| Housing | Townhouse | 0 | DU | | |
| _ | Hotel | 0 | Rooms | | |
| | Motel | 0 | Rooms | | |
| | Family | 43 | DU | | |
| Affordable Housing | Senior | 0 | DU | | |
| Allordable Housing | Special Needs | 0 | DU | | |
| | Permanent Supportive | 0 | DU | | |
| | General Retail | 20.000 | ksf | | |
| | Furniture Store | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Pharmacy/Drugstore | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Supermarket | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Bank | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Health Club | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| Datall | High-Turnover Sit-Down | 20.000 | 1.0 | | |
| Retail | Restaurant | 20.000 | KST | | |
| | Fast-Food Restaurant | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Quality Restaurant | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Auto Repair | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Home Improvement | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Free-Standing Discount | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Movie Theater | 0 | Seats | | |
| Office | General Office | 90.000 | ksf | | |
| Office | Medical Office | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Light Industrial | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| Industrial | Manufacturing | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | Warehousing/Self-Storage | 0.000 | ksf | | |
| | University | 0 | Students | | |
| | High School | 0 | Students | | |
| School | Middle School | 0 | Students | | |
| | Elementary | 0 | Students | | |
| | Private School (K-12) | 0 | Students | | |
| Other | | 0 | Trips | | |

Project and Analysis Overview

Report 1: Project & Analysis Overview

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| Analysis Results | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| | Total Employees: 480 | | | | | |
| | Total Population: | 996 | | | | |
| Propose | ed Project | With Mitigation | | | | |
| 5,574 | Daily Vehicle Trips | 4,459 | Daily Vehicle Trips | | | |
| 45,178 | Daily VMT | 36,142 | Daily VMT | | | |
| 6.0 | Household VMT | 5.4 | Household VMT per | | | |
| 6.8 | per Capita | 5.4 | Capita | | | |
| | Work VMT | | Work VMT per | | | |
| 14.5 | per Employee | 11.6 | Employee | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Significant VMT Impact? | | | | | | |
| | APC: West Los A | Angeles | | | | |
| | Impact Threshold: 15% Belo | ow APC Average | | | | |
| | Household = 7 | 7.4 | | | | |
| | Work = 11.1 | L | | | | |
| Propose | ed Project | With Mi | tigation | | | |
| VMT Threshold | Impact | VMT Threshold | Impact | | | |
| Household > 7.4 | No | Household > 7.4 | No | | | |
| Work > 11.1 | Yes | Work > 11.1 | Yes | | | |

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



Report 2: TDM Inputs

| Reduce parking supply Unbundle parking | Description City code parking provision (spaces) Actual parking provision (spaces) Monthly cost for parking (\$) | Proposed Project 0 0 0 | Mitigation: 0 0 |
|---|--|--|--|
| Reduce parking supply Unbundle parking | City code parking provision (spaces) Actual parking provision (spaces) Monthly cost for parking (\$) | 0 0 | 0 |
| Unbundle parking | Actual parking provision (spaces) Monthly cost for parking (\$) | 0 | 0 |
| Unbundle parking | Monthly cost for parking (\$) | | |
| Parking cash-out | parting (9) | \$0 | \$0 |
| | Employees eligible (%) | 0% | 0% |
| Price workplace parking | Daily parking charge \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| | Employees subject to priced parking (%) | 0% | 0% |
| Residential area parking permits | Cost of annual permit (\$) | \$0 | \$0 |
| (| cont. on following page | :) | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | Price workplace parking Residential area parking permits | Price workplace parking (\$) Employees subject to priced parking (%) Residential area parking permits permit (\$) (cont. on following page | Price workplace parkingDaily parking charge (\$)\$0.00Employees subject to priced parking (%)0%Residential area parking permitsCost of annual permit (\$)\$0\$0\$0(cont. on following page) |

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| Strate | еду Туре | Description | Proposed Project | Mitigations |
|---|--|--|------------------|-------------|
| | | Reduction in headways (increase in frequency) (%) | 0% | 0% |
| Reduce transit headways Transit Implement neighborhood shutt | Reduce transit headways | Existing transit mode share (as a percent of total daily trips) (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | | Lines within project site improved (<50%, >=50%) | 0 | 0 |
| | Implement neighborhood shuttle | Degree of implementation (low, medium, high) | 0 | 0 |
| | | Employees and residents eligible (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | | Employees and residents eligible (%) | 0% | 100% |
| | Transit subsidies | Amount of transit subsidy per passenger (daily equivalent) (\$) | \$0.00 | \$2.98 |
| Education & | Voluntary travel behavior change program | Employees and residents participating (%) | 0% | 0% |
| Encouragement | Promotions and marketing | Employees and residents participating (%) | 0% | 100% |

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| TDM Strategy Inputs, Cont. | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|--|------------------|--|
| Strategy Type Description | | | Proposed Project | Mitigations |
| | Required commute trip reduction program | Employees participating (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | Alternative Work | Employees participating (%) | 0% | 5% |
| Commute Trip Reductions | Schedules and Telecommute Program | Type of program | 0 | 1.5 days of telecommuting per week |
| | | Degree of implementation (low, medium, high) | 0 | 0 |
| | Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle | Employees eligible (%) | 0% | 0% |
| | | Employer size (small, medium, large) | 0 | 0 |
| | Ride-share program | Employees eligible (%) | 0% | 0% |
| Shared Mobility | Car share | Car share project setting (Urban, Suburban, All Other) | 0 | 0 |
| | Bike share | Within 600 feet of existing bike share station - OR- implementing new bike share station (Yes/No) | 0 | 0 |
| | School carpool program | Level of implementation (Low, Medium, High) | 0 | 0 |
| | (1 | cont. on following page | :) | |

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



Report 2: TDM Inputs

| TDM Strategy Inputs, Cont. | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|------------------|--|--|
| Strate | еду Туре | Description | Proposed Project | Mitigations | |
| | Implement/Improve on-street bicycle facility | Provide bicycle facility along site (Yes/No) | 0 | 0 | |
| Bicycle | Include Bike parking per LAMC | Meets City Bike Parking Code (Yes/No) | 0 | Yes | |
| Infrastructure | Include secure bike parking and showers | Includes indoor bike parking/lockers, showers, & repair station (Yes/No) | 0 | Yes | |
| Neighborhood Enhancement | Traffic calming | Streets with traffic calming improvements (%) | 0% | 0% | |
| | improvements | Intersections with traffic calming improvements (%) | 0% | 0% | |
| | Pedestrian network improvements | Included (within project and connecting off- site/within project only) | 0 | within project and connecting off-site | |
CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR

Report 3: TDM Outputs

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| | TDM Adjustments by Trip Purpose & Strategy | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|----------|---------------------|----------|------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------|---------------------|---|
| | | | | | | Place type | : Suburban | Center | | | | | | |
| | | Ноте Ва | ased Work | Ноте Ва | ised Work | Home Based Other Home Based Other | | Non-Home Based Other | | Non-Home Based Other | | | | |
| | | Prod | uction Mitigated | Attro | Aitigated | Prod | uction Mitigated | Attro | action Mitigated | Proc | luction Mitigated | Attr | action Mitigated | Source |
| | | Proposed | wiitigateu | Proposed | wiitigated | Proposed | wiitigated | Proposed | wiitigateu | Proposed | wiitigated | Proposed | willigated | |
| | Reduce parking supply | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | _ |
| | Unbundle parking | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy |
| Parking | Parking cash-out | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | Appendix, Parking |
| | Price workplace parking | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1 - 5 |
| | Residential area parking permits | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |
| | Reduce transit headways | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Stratogy |
| Transit | Implement neighborhood shuttle | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | Appendix, Transit sections 1 - 3 |
| | Transit subsidies | 0% | 16% | 0% | 16% | 0% | 16% | 0% | 16% | 0% | 16% | 0% | 16% | |
| Education & | Voluntary travel behavior change program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, Education & |
| Encouragement | Promotions and marketing | 0% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | Encouragement sections 1 - 2 |
| | Required commute trip reduction program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| Commute Trip Reductions | Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommute Program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, Commute Trip |
| Reductions | Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | sections 1 - 4 |
| | Ride-share program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| | Car-share | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | TDM Strategy |
| Shared Mobility | Bike share | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | Appendix, Shared |
| Shared Mobility | School carpool program | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | Mobility sections 1 - 3 |

CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



Report 3: TDM Outputs

| | TDM Adjustments by Trip Purpose & Strategy, Cont. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|----------|-----------|-----------------|--|----------|--------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|
| Place type: Suburban Center | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Home Based Work Hom Production A | | | Home Bo Attr | e Based Work Home Based Other Attraction Production | | Home Based Other Attraction | | Non-Home Based Other Production | | Non-Home Based Other Attraction | | Source | |
| | | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | |
| Im on fa | Implement/ Improve on-street bicycle facility | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | TDM Strategy |
| Bicycle Infrastructure | Include Bike parking per LAMC | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | Appendix, Bicycle Infrastructure |
| Include parkin | Include secure bike parking and showers | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | sections 1 - 3 |
| Neighborhood Enhancement | Traffic calming improvements | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, |
| | Pedestrian network improvements | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 2.0% | Neighborhood Enhancement sections 1 - 2 |

| Final Combined & Maximum TDM Effect | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|-----------|------------------|---|----------|--------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| Home Based Work Production | | | Home Ba Attra | Home Based Work Home Based Other Attraction Production | | Home Based Other Attraction | | Non-Home Based Other Production | | Non-Home Based Other Attraction | | |
| | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated |
| COMBINED TOTAL | 0% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 0% | 19% |
| MAX. TDM EFFECT | 0% | 20% | 0% | 20% | 0% | 20% | 0% | 20% | 0% | 20% | 0% | 20% |

| = Minimum (X%, 1-[(1-A)*(1-B)]) | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| where X%= | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| PLACE | urban | 75% | | | | | |
| ТҮРЕ | compact infill | 40% | | | | | |
| MAX: | suburban center | 20% | | | | | |
| | suburban | 15% | | | | | |

Note: (1-[(1-A)*(1-B)...]) reflects the dampened combined effectiveness of TDM Strategies (e.g., A, B,...). See the TDM Strategy Appendix (*Transportation Assessment Guidelines Attachment G*) for further discussion of dampening.

> Report 3: TDM Outputs 10 of 13

CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR

Report 4: MXD Methodology

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| MXD Methodology - Project Without TDM | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--------|-------|------|--------|--------|--|--|--|
| Unadjusted Trips MXD Adjustment MXD Trips Average Trip Length Unadjusted VMT MXD VMT | | | | | | | | | |
| Home Based Work Production | 379 | -18.5% | 309 | 8.3 | 3,146 | 2,565 | | | |
| Home Based Other Production | 1,049 | -32.6% | 707 | 5.9 | 6,189 | 4,171 | | | |
| Non-Home Based Other Production | 1,358 | -6.1% | 1,275 | 7.4 | 10,049 | 9,435 | | | |
| Home-Based Work Attraction | 696 | -20.5% | 553 | 12.6 | 8,770 | 6,968 | | | |
| Home-Based Other Attraction | 2,457 | -26.3% | 1,810 | 7.5 | 18,428 | 13,575 | | | |
| Non-Home Based Other Attraction | 987 | -6.8% | 920 | 9.2 | 9,080 | 8,464 | | | |

MXD Methodology with TDM Measures

| | | Proposed Project | | Project with Mitigation Measures | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|--|--------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--|
| | TDM Adjustment | TDM Adjustment Project Trips Project VMT TDN | | TDM Adjustment | Mitigated Trips | Mitigated VMT | |
| Home Based Work Production | 0.0% | 309 | 2,565 | -20.0% | 247 | 2,052 | |
| Home Based Other Production | 0.0% | 707 | 4,171 | -20.0% | 566 | 3,337 | |
| Non-Home Based Other Production | 0.0% | 1,275 | 9,435 | -20.0% | 1,020 | 7,548 | |
| Home-Based Work Attraction | 0.0% | 553 | 6,968 | -20.0% | 442 | 5,574 | |
| Home-Based Other Attraction | 0.0% | 1,810 | 13,575 | -20.0% | 1,448 | 10,860 | |
| Non-Home Based Other Attraction | 0.0% | 920 | 8,464 | -20.0% | 736 | 6,771 | |

| MXD VMT Methodology Per Capita & Per Employee | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Total Population: 996 | | | | | | | | |
| | Total Employees: 480 | | | | | | | |
| | APC: West Los Angeles | | | | | | | |
| | Proposed Project | Project with Mitigation Measures | | | | | | |
| Total Home Based Production VMT | 6,736 | 5,389 | | | | | | |
| Total Home Based Work Attraction VMT | 6,968 | 5,574 | | | | | | |
| Total Home Based VMT Per Capita | sed VMT Per Capita 6.8 5.4 | | | | | | | |
| Total Work Based VMT Per Employee | tal Work Based VMT Per Employee 14.5 11.6 | | | | | | | |

VMT Calculator User Agreement

The Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), in partnership with the Department of City Planning and Fehr & Peers, has developed the City of Los Angeles Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Calculator to estimate project-specific daily household VMT per capita and daily work VMT per employee for land use development projects. This application, the VMT Calculator, has been provided to You, the User, to assess vehicle miles traveled (VMT) outcomes of land use projects within the City of Los Angeles. The term "City" as used below shall refer to the City of Los Angeles. The terms "City" and "Fehr & Peers" as used below shall include their respective affiliates, subconsultants, employees, and representatives.

The City is pleased to be able to provide this information to the public. The City believes that the public is most effectively served when they are provided access to the technical tools that inform the public review process of private and public land use investments. However, in using the VMT Calculator, You agree to be bound by this VMT Calculator User Agreement (this Agreement).

VMT Calculator Application for the City of Los Angeles. The City's consultant calibrated the VMT Calculator's parameters in 2018 to estimate travel patterns of locations in the City, and validated those outcomes against empirical data. However, this calibration process is limited to locations within the City, and practitioners applying the VMT Calculator outside of the City boundaries should not apply these estimates without further calibration and validation of travel patterns to verify the VMT Calculator's accuracy in estimating VMT in such other locations.

Limited License to Use. This Agreement gives You a limited, non-transferrable, non-assignable, and nonexclusive license to use and execute a copy of the VMT Calculator on a computer system owned, leased or otherwise controlled by You in Your own facilities, as set out below, provided You do not use the VMT Calculator in an unauthorized manner, and that You do not republish, copy, distribute, reverse-engineer, modify, decompile, disassemble, transfer, or sell any part of the VMT Calculator, and provided that You know and follow the terms of this Agreement. Your failure to follow the terms of this Agreement shall automatically terminate this license and Your right to use the VMT Calculator.

Ownership. You understand and acknowledge that the City owns the VMT Calculator, and shall continue to own it through Your use of it, and that no transfer of ownership of any kind is intended in allowing You to use the VMT Calculator.

Warranty Disclaimer. In spite of the efforts of the City and Fehr & Peers, some information on the VMT Calculator may not be accurate. The VMT Calculator, OUTPUTS AND ASSOCIATED DATA ARE PROVIDED "as is" WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, whether expressed, implied, statutory, or otherwise including but not limited to, the implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose.

Limitation of Liability. It is understood that the VMT Calculator is provided without charge. Neither the City nor Fehr & Peers can be responsible or liable for any information derived from its use, or for any delays, inaccuracies, incompleteness, errors or omissions arising out of your use of the VMT Calculator or with respect to the material contained in the VMT Calculator. You understand and agree that Your sole remedy against the City or Fehr & Peers for loss or damage caused by any defect or failure of the

VMT Calculator, regardless of the form of action, whether in contract, tort, including negligence, strict liability or otherwise, shall be the repair or replacement of the VMT Calculator to the extent feasible as determined solely by the City. In no event shall the City or Fehr & Peers be responsible to You or anyone else for, or have liability for any special, indirect, incidental or consequential damages (including, without limitation, damages for loss of business profits or changes to businesses costs) or lost data or downtime, however caused, and on any theory of liability from the use of, or the inability to use, the VMT Calculator, whether the data, and/or formulas contained in the VMT Calculator are provided by the City or Fehr & Peers, or another third party, even if the City or Fehr & Peers have been advised of the possibility of such damages.

This Agreement and License shall be governed by the laws of the State of California without regard to their conflicts of law provisions, and shall be effective as of the date set forth below and, unless terminated in accordance with the above or extended by written amendment to this Agreement, shall terminate on the earlier of the date that You are not making use of the VMT Calculator or one year after the beginning of Your use of the VMT Calculator.

By using the VMT Calculator, You hereby waive and release all claims, responsibilities, liabilities, actions, damages, costs, and losses, known and unknown, against the City and Fehr & Peers for Your use of the VMT Calculator.

Before making decisions using the information provided in this application, contact City LADOT staff to confirm the validity of the data provided.

Print and sign below, and submit to LADOT along with the transportation assessment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

| You, the User | |
|----------------|--|
| Ву: | Jash |
| Print Name: | Jason Shender, AICP |
| Title: | Transportation Planner III |
| Company: | Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers |
| Address: | 20931 Burbank Boulevard, Suite C Woodland Hills, CA 91367 |
| Phone: | (818) 835-8648 |
| Email Address: | jshender@llgengineers.com |
| Date: | 6/21/2021 |
| | |

APPENDIX F

MANUAL TRAFFIC COUNT DATA



| STREET: North/South | Walgrove | Ave/James | Import Dwy | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|------------|------------------------|-------|------------------------|-------|
| East/West | Washingt | on Blvd | | | | | | |
| Day: | Tuesday | Dat | te: | 08/29/2017 | Weather: | S | UNNY | |
| Hours: | | | | Chekr | s: <u>NDS</u> | | | |
| School Day: | | YES | | | I/S CO | DE | | |
| DUAL- WHEELED BIKES BUSES | <u>N/B</u> 0 0 0 | | <u>S/B</u> 12 9 0 | | E/B 115 59 33 | | W/B 101 82 41 | |
| | N/B | TIME | S/B | TIME | E/B | TIME | W/B | TIME |
| AM PK 15 MIN | 1 | 7.00 | 73 | 8.15 | 387 | 8.45 | 338 | 8.45 |
| PM PK 15 MIN | 4 | 16.30 | 108 | 17.30 | 361 | 15.00 | 330 | 17.45 |
| AM PK HOUR | 1 | 7.00 | 259 | 8.00 | 1431 | 8.00 | 1241 | 8.15 |
| PM PK HOUR | 10 | 16.00 | 377 | 16.45 | 1372 | 17.00 | 1207 | 17.00 |

NORTHBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|----|----|----|-------|
| 7-8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8-9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 9-10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 15-16 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| 16-17 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 10 |
| 17-18 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 3 | 0 | 17 | 20 |

EASTBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total | |
|-------|------|------|----|-------|--|
| 7-8 | 362 | 846 | 0 | 1208 | |
| 8-9 | 281 | 1148 | 2 | 1431 | |
| 9-10 | 249 | 1005 | 0 | 1254 | |
| 15-16 | 221 | 1052 | 2 | 1275 | |
| 16-17 | 218 | 1058 | 2 | 1278 | |
| 17-18 | 248 | 1123 | 1 | 1372 | |
| | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 1579 | 6232 | 7 | 7818 | |

SOUTHBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|-----|----|------|-------|
| 7-8 | 2 | 0 | 156 | 158 |
| 8-9 | 13 | 0 | 246 | 259 |
| 9-10 | 20 | 0 | 189 | 209 |
| 15-16 | 41 | 0 | 302 | 343 |
| 16-17 | 40 | 0 | 328 | 368 |
| 17-18 | 49 | 0 | 319 | 368 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 165 | 0 | 1540 | 1705 |

WESTBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|----|------|-----|-------|
| 7-8 | 5 | 843 | 145 | 993 |
| 8-9 | 13 | 1066 | 159 | 1238 |
| 9-10 | 7 | 1043 | 121 | 1171 |
| 15-16 | 3 | 1096 | 61 | 1160 |
| 16-17 | 4 | 1119 | 58 | 1181 |
| 17-18 | 2 | 1125 | 80 | 1207 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 34 | 6292 | 624 | 6950 |

TOTAL XING S/L

N-S

TOTAL

| Ped | Sch | Ped | Sch |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

XING N/L

| 159 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 11 |
|------|---|---|-----|-----|
| 260 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 32 |
| 210 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 37 |
| 348 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 39 |
| 378 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 34 |
| 370 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 25 |
| | | | | |
| 1725 | 0 | 0 | 157 | 178 |

XING W/L XING E/L

| E-W | Ped | Sch | Ped | Sch |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2201 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2669 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2425 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2435 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2459 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2579 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| 14768 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 |

Walgrove Ave/James Import Dwy & Washington Blvd

Peak Hour Turning Movement Count



National Data & Surveying Services Intersection Turning Movement Count

Location: Walgrove Ave/James Import Dwy & Washington Blvd City: Los Angeles Control: 1-Way Stop(SB)

Project ID: 17-05515-002 Date: 8/29/2017

| | | | | | | | | 10 | tai | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| NS/EW Streets: | Walgr | rove Ave/Ja | mes Import | Dwy | Walgro | ove Ave/Jar | nes Import | Dwy | | Washingt | on Blvd | | | Washingt | on Blvd | | |
| | | NORTH | IBOUND | | | SOUTH | BOUND | | | EASTB | OUND | | | WESTE | OUND | | |
| AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | |
| | NL | NT | NR | NU | SL | ST | SR | SU | EL | ET | ER | EU | WL | WT | WR | WU | TOTAL |
| 7:00 AM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 79 | 157 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 149 | 33 | 0 | 442 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 108 | 186 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 172 | 29 | 2 | 534 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 93 | 244 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 238 | 51 | 1 | 671 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 79 | 253 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 276 | 32 | 0 | 699 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 75 | 272 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 285 | 38 | 4 | 722 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 64 | 268 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 244 | 37 | 3 | 692 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 63 | 295 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 242 | 40 | 0 | 713 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 63 | 0 | /8 | 308 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 290 | 44 | 4 | 792 |
| 9:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 79 | 254 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 292 | 37 | 1 | /06 |
| 9:15 AIVI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 52 | 251 | 0 | | 0 | 244 | 30 | 3 | 0/1 |
| 9:30 AIVI | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 40 | 0 | 52 | 250 | 0 | | 1 | 242 | 27 | 2 | 620 |
| 9:40 AIVI | 1 | U | 0 | 0 | 9 | U | 51 | U | 39 | 244 | U | U | 1.1 | 257 | 22 | 0 | 024 |
| | NI | NT | NR | NH | SI | ST | SP | SU | FL | FT | FR | FU | WI | WT | WR | W/H | τοται |
| TOTAL VOLUMES . | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 591 | 0 | 886 | 2982 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 2931 | 425 | 20 | 7886 |
| APPROACH %'s : | 66.67% | 0.00% | 33.33% | 0.00% | 5.59% | 0.00% | 94.41% | 0.00% | 22.86% | 76.93% | 0.05% | 0.15% | 0.15% | 86.69% | 12.57% | 0.59% | ,000 |
| PEAK HR : | | 08:00 AM - | 09:00 AM | | 08:00 AM | 41 | 37 | 48 | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
| PEAK HR VOL : | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 246 | 0 | 280 | 1143 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1061 | 159 | 11 | 2919 |
| PEAK HR FACTOR | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.250 | 0.000 | 0.650 | 0.000 | 0.866 | 0.000 | 0.007 | 0 0 2 0 | 0 500 | 0.250 | 0.500 | 0.915 | 0.903 | 0.688 | |
| | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.230 | 0.000 | 0.030 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.097 | 0.920 | 0.500 | 0.230 | 0.000 | 0.715 | 0.705 | 0.000 | 0 0 2 1 |
| - Exact in the form | 0.000 | 0.000 | 150 | 0.000 | 0.050 | 0.000 | 37 | 0.000 | 0.897 | 0.928 | 24 | 0.230 | 0.500 | 0.713 | 12 | 0.000 | 0.921 |
| | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.250 250 | 0.000 | 0.030 | 0.000 | 37 | 0.000 | 0.897 | 0.928 | 24 | 0.230 | 0.300 | 0.91 | 12 | 0.000 | 0.921 |
| | 0.000 | 0.000 0.2 | 180UND | 0.000 | 0.030 | 0.88 SOUTH | BOUND | 0.000 | 0.097 | 0.928 0.92 EASTB | 0.500 24 OUND | 0.230 | 0.300 | 0.91 WESTE | I2 | 0.000 | 0.921 |
| PM | 0.000 | 0.000 0.2 NORTH 0 | IBOUND 0 | 0.000 | 0.030 | 0.88 0.88 SOUTH | BOUND 0 | 0.000 | 1 | 0.928 0.92 EASTB 2 | 0.500 24 OUND 0 | 0.230 | 0 | 0.91 0.91 WESTE | | 0 | 0.921 |
| PM | 0.000 NL | 0.000 0.2 NORTH 0 NT | 0.230 250 IBOUND 0 NR | 0 NU | 0 SL | 0.88 SOUTH 1 ST | BOUND 0 SR | 0 SU | 1 EL | 0.928 0.92 EASTB 2 ET | 0.300 24 OUND 0 ER | 0 EU | 0 WL | 0.91 WESTE 2 WT | BOUND 0 WR | 0 WU | 0.921 TOTAL |
| PM 3:00 PM | 0 NL 0 | 0.000 0.2 NORTH 0 NT 0 | 0.230 180UND 0 NR 1 | 0.000 NU 0 | 0.030 0 SL 10 | 0.88 SOUTH 1 ST 0 | BOUND 0 SR 65 | 0 SU 0 | 1 EL 63 | 0.928 0.92 EASTB 2 ET 296 | 0.300 0 0 ER 0 | 0 EU 1 | 0 WL 0 | 0.91 0.91 WESTE 2 WT 267 | 0.703 12 00UND 0 WR 20 | 0 WU 0 | 0.921 TOTAL 723 |
| PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM | 0 NL 0 | 0.000 0.2 NORTH 0 NT 0 0 | 0.230 180UND 0 NR 1 1 | 0 NU 0 | 0 SL 10 9 | 0.88 SOUTH 1 ST 0 0 | BOUND 0 SR 65 76 | 0 SU 0 | 1 EL 63 65 | 0.928 0.92 EASTB 2 ET 296 251 | 0.300 24 OUND 0 ER 0 0 | 0 EU 1 0 | 0.300 WL 0 1 | 0.91 0.91 WESTE 2 WT 267 287 | 80UND 0 WR 20 15 | 0 WU 0 | 0.921 TOTAL 723 705 |
| PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 3:45 PM | 0 NL 0 0 0 | 0.000 0.2 NORTH 0 NT 0 0 0 | 0.230 180UND 0 NR 1 1 1 | 0 NU 0 0 | 0 SL 10 9 | 0.88 0.88 SOUTH 1 ST 0 0 0 | 0.000 BOUND 0 SR 65 76 88 72 | 0 SU 0 0 | 1 EL 63 65 44 | 0.928 0.92 EASTB 2 ET 296 251 247 252 | 0.300 24 OUND 0 ER 0 0 1 | 0 EU 1 0 0 | 0 WL 0 1 0 | 0.91 0.91 WESTE 2 WT 267 287 264 270 | 0.303 12 0 0 WR 20 15 11 | 0 WU 0 0 | 0.921 TOTAL 723 705 665 474 |
| PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 3:45 PM | 0.000 NL 0 0 0 | 0.000 0.2 NORTH 0 NT 0 0 0 0 | 0.250 IBOUND 0 NR 1 1 1 2 1 | 0 NU 0 0 0 0 | 0 SL 10 9 9 13 | 0.000 0.88 SOUTHI 1 ST 0 0 0 0 | 0.000 37 BOUND 0 SR 65 76 88 73 79 | 0 SU 0 0 0 0 | 1 EL 63 65 44 47 | 0.928 0.92 EASTB 2 ET 296 251 247 252 252 | 0.300 24 0 0 ER 0 0 1 1 1 | 0 EU 1 0 1 | 0 WL 0 1 0 2 | 0.91 WESTE 2 WT 267 287 264 270 270 | 0.003 12 SOUND 0 WR 20 15 11 15 17 | 0 WU 0 0 0 0 | 0.921 TOTAL 723 705 665 676 697 |
| PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 3:30 PM 3:45 PM 4:00 PM 4:00 PM | 0.000 NL 0 0 0 0 | 0.000 0.2 0.2 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.250 1500 1800ND 0 NR 1 1 1 2 2 | 0 NU 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 SL 10 9 13 12 12 | 0.88 0.88 SOUTH 1 ST 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.000 37 BOUND 0 SR 65 76 88 73 78 79 | 0 SU 0 0 0 0 0 | 1 EL 63 65 44 47 49 53 | 0.928 0.92 EASTB 2 ET 296 251 247 252 269 259 | 0.300 24 00UND 0 ER 0 0 1 1 1 | 0 EU 1 0 1 1 | 0 WL 0 1 0 2 0 | 0.91 0.91 WESTE 2 WT 267 287 264 270 270 284 | 0.000 12 COUND 0 WR 20 15 11 15 17 17 12 | 0 WU 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.921 TOTAL 723 705 665 676 697 706 |
| PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 3:45 PM 4:00 PM 4:15 PM 4:15 PM | 0.000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.000 0.2 00000000000000000000000000000 | 0.230 100000 100000 11 1 1 2 1 2 4 | 0 NU 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 SL 10 9 9 13 12 13 6 | 0.88 0.88 SOUTH 1 ST 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.000 37 BOUND 0 SR 65 76 88 73 78 79 90 | 0 SU 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 1 EL 63 65 44 47 49 53 66 | 0.928 0.92 EASTB 2 ET 296 251 247 252 269 259 264 | 0.300 24 0 0 0 ER 0 0 1 1 0 1 1 | 0 EU 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 | 0 WL 0 1 0 2 0 1 | 0.91 0.91 0.91 0.91 0.91 0.91 0.91 0.91 | 0.000 12 000ND 0 WR 20 15 11 15 17 13 17 | 0 WU 0 0 0 0 0 1 | 0.921 TOTAL 723 705 665 676 697 706 723 |
| PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 4:00 PM 4:30 PM 4:30 PM 4:30 PM | 0.000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.000 0.2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.230 150 100 1 1 1 1 2 1 2 4 2 | 0 NU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 SL 10 9 13 12 13 6 9 | 0.88 0.88 SOUTH 1 ST 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.000 37 BOUND 0 SR 65 76 88 73 78 79 90 81 | 0 SU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 1 EL 63 65 44 47 49 53 66 49 | 0.928 0.92 EASTB 2 ET 296 251 247 252 269 259 264 261 | 0.300 24 OUND 0 ER 0 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 0 | 0.230 EU 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 1 0 2 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 | 0.91 0.91 WESTE 2 WT 267 287 264 270 270 284 270 284 274 284 | 0.000 000000 000000 000000 000000 000000 | 0 WU 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 | 0.921 TOTAL 723 705 665 676 697 706 723 699 |
| PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 3:345 PM 4:00 PM 4:15 PM 4:30 PM 4:32 PM | 0.000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.000 0.2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.230 50 IBOUND 0 NR 1 1 1 2 4 2 4 2 1 | 0 NU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 SL 10 9 9 13 12 13 6 9 9 | 0.88 0.88 SOUTH 1 ST 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.000 37 BOUND 0 SR 65 76 88 73 78 79 90 81 83 | 0 SU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 1 EL 63 65 44 47 49 53 66 49 67 | 0.928 0.92 EASTB 2 ET 296 251 247 252 269 259 264 269 259 264 261 278 | 0.300 24 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 0 0 0 | 0.230 EU 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 | 0 WL 0 1 0 2 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 | 0.91 0.91 WESTE 2 WT 267 287 264 270 270 284 270 284 274 284 288 | 0.000 12 000000 11 15 17 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 | 0 WU 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 | 0.921 TOTAL 723 705 665 676 697 706 723 699 744 |
| PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 3:35 PM 4:00 PM 4:15 PM 4:30 PM 4:30 PM 5:00 PM 5:15 PM | 0.000 0 NL 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.000 0.2 0.2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.230 50 IBOUND 0 NR 1 1 1 2 4 2 4 2 1 0 | 0 NU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 SL 10 9 9 13 12 13 6 9 13 | 0.88 0.88 SOUTH 1 ST 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | BOUND 0 SR 65 76 88 73 78 79 90 81 83 74 | 0 SU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 1 EL 63 65 44 47 53 66 49 67 54 | 0.928 0.92 EASTB 2 296 251 247 252 269 259 264 261 278 278 | 0.300 24 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 EU 1 0 1 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.300 WL 0 1 0 2 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.91 0.91 0.91 0.91 0.91 0.91 0.91 0.91 | 000000 000000 20 15 11 15 17 13 17 13 17 11 16 20 | 0 WU 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 0 | 0.921 TOTAL 723 705 665 676 697 706 723 699 744 710 |
| PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 4:00 PM 4:30 PM 4:30 PM 4:35 PM 5:00 PM 5:30 PM | 0.000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.000 0.2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.230 50 IBOUND 0 NR 1 1 2 1 2 4 2 1 0 1 1 1 2 4 2 1 1 1 2 4 2 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 0 NU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.550 0 SL 10 9 13 12 13 6 9 9 13 22 | 0.80 0.81 SOUTHI 1 ST 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | BOUND 0 SR 65 65 76 88 73 78 79 90 81 83 74 86 86 | 0 SU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 1 EL 63 65 44 47 49 53 66 49 67 54 71 | 0.928 0.92 EASTB 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | 0.500 24 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 1 | 0 EU 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 | 0.300 0 0 1 0 2 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.91 0.91 WESTE 2 WT 267 287 264 270 270 284 270 270 284 274 284 288 271 262 | COUND 0 WR 20 15 11 15 17 13 17 11 17 11 16 20 15 | 0 WU 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 | 0.921 TOTAL 723 705 665 676 723 699 744 710 731 |
| PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 3:345 PM 4:00 PM 4:30 PM 4:30 PM 4:32 PM 5:15 PM 5:30 PM 5:35 PM 5:34 PM | 0000 NL 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.000 0.2 NORTH 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | IBOUND 0 NR 1 1 1 2 2 4 2 2 1 0 1 0 | 0 NU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.000 SL 10 9 9 13 12 13 6 9 9 13 22 5 | 0.88 SOUTH 1 ST 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 87 80 80 65 76 88 73 78 79 90 81 83 74 83 74 86 76 | 0 SU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 1 EL 63 65 44 47 49 53 66 49 67 54 71 55 | 0.928 0.92 EASTB 2 296 251 247 252 269 259 264 261 278 278 273 289 | 0.500 24 00UND 0 ER 0 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 | 0 EU 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 | 0 WL 0 1 0 2 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | WESTE 2 WT 267 287 267 270 284 284 288 271 262 299 | 00000 00000 20 15 11 15 17 13 17 11 16 20 15 29 | 0 WU 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 | 0.921 TOTAL 723 705 665 697 706 723 699 706 729 744 710 731 754 |
| PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 3:35 PM 4:00 PM 4:15 PM 4:30 PM 4:30 PM 5:30 PM 5:30 PM 5:30 PM | 0 NL 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.2000 0.2 0.2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.200 50 IBOUND 0 NR 1 1 1 2 4 2 4 2 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 NU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 9 9 13 10 9 9 13 10 9 9 13 10 9 9 13 10 9 9 13 10 9 9 13 13 10 9 9 13 13 10 9 9 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 | 0.88 SOUTH 1 ST 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 87 BOUND 0 0 SR 65 76 88 73 78 79 90 81 83 74 86 76 | 0 SU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 1 EL 63 65 44 47 49 53 66 49 67 54 71 55 | EASTB 2 ET 296 251 247 252 269 264 269 264 269 264 269 278 278 278 278 278 273 289 | 0.500 24 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 | 0 EU 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 WL 0 1 0 2 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 2 1 0 1 0 2 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 0.91 WESTE 2 WT 267 287 264 270 284 274 284 271 262 299 | 2) SOUND 0 WR 20 15 11 15 17 13 17 11 16 20 15 29 | 0 WU 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 | 0.921 TOTAL 723 705 665 676 697 706 723 699 744 710 731 754 |
| PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 4:00 PM 4:30 PM 4:30 PM 5:00 PM 5:15 PM 5:30 PM 5:45 PM | 0.000 NL 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.000 0.2 NORTH 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.200 50 IBOUND 0 NR 1 1 1 2 2 1 2 4 4 2 0 1 0 0 NR | 0 NU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 SL 10 9 9 13 12 13 6 9 9 13 22 5 SL | 0.88 SOUTH 1 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 87 BOUND 0 5R 65 76 88 73 78 79 90 81 83 74 83 74 86 76 5R | 0 SU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 1 EL 63 65 44 47 53 66 65 49 67 54 71 55 EL | EASTB 2 ET 296 251 247 252 269 259 264 264 264 264 264 278 278 273 289 ET | 0.500 24 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 | 0 EU 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 WL 0 1 0 2 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 WL | 0.91 WESTE 2 WT 267 267 264 270 270 284 274 284 274 284 271 262 299 WT | WR 20 WR 20 15 17 13 17 12 20 15 17 13 17 11 16 20 15 29 WR | 0 WU 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 WU | 0.921 TOTAL 723 705 665 676 697 706 699 744 710 731 754 TOTAL |
| PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 3:34 FM 4:00 PM 4:30 PM 4:30 PM 5:15 PM 5:30 PM 5:35 PM 5:45 PM TOTAL VOLUMES : | 0 NL 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.000 0.2 NORTH 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.200 50 IBOUND 0 NR 1 1 1 2 4 2 1 0 1 0 NR 16 NR | 0 NU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 SL 10 9 9 13 12 13 6 9 13 22 5 SL 130 130 130 130 130 130 130 130 | SOUTH 1 ST 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 37 BOUND 0 0 SR 665 76 88 73 78 79 90 81 83 74 83 74 83 74 83 74 85 86 76 | 0 SU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 1 EL 63 65 44 47 53 66 49 67 54 54 71 55 EL 683 683 | EASTB 2 EASTB 2 251 247 259 269 259 264 261 278 278 278 278 278 278 278 273 289 ET 3217 | 0.500 24 0 0 ER 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 | 0 EU 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 WL 0 1 0 1 0 2 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.91 WESTE 2 WT 264 270 284 270 284 270 284 270 284 270 284 270 284 270 284 270 284 270 284 270 284 270 284 270 287 287 287 287 287 287 287 287 287 287 | 20 OUND 0 WR 20 15 11 15 17 13 17 13 17 16 20 15 29 WR 199 | 0 WU 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.921 TOTAL 723 705 665 667 706 723 699 744 710 731 754 TOTAL 8533 |
| PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 4:00 PM 4:15 PM 4:30 PM 4:35 PM 5:00 PM 5:15 PM 5:30 PM 5:30 PM 5:30 PM 5:30 PM 5:30 PM 5:30 PM | 0 NL 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.000 0.2 NORTH- 0 NT 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.230 50 180UND 0 NR 1 1 1 2 2 4 2 1 0 0 1 0 0 NR 16 94.12% | 0 NU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 SL 10 9 9 9 13 12 13 6 9 9 13 22 5 SL 130 12.05% | SOUTH 1 ST 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 37 BOUND 0 SR 65 76 88 73 78 79 90 81 83 74 83 74 86 76 83 78 79 90 81 83 74 83 74 86 76 83 83 74 83 84 949 87.95% | 0 SU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 1 EL 63 65 44 47 49 53 66 49 67 54 71 55 EL 683 17.47% | EASTB 2 2 EASTB 2 251 251 252 269 259 264 264 264 278 273 289 ET 3217 82.30% | 0.500 24 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 EU 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 WL 0 1 0 2 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.93 WESTE 2 WT 267 287 264 270 270 270 270 270 274 284 274 284 271 262 299 WT 3320 94.10% | 22 20 20 20 0 WR 20 15 11 15 17 17 13 17 17 11 16 20 15 29 WR WR 19 5.64% | 0 WU 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.921 TOTAL 723 705 665 676 706 723 699 744 710 731 754 TOTAL 8533 |
| PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 4:00 PM 4:30 PM 4:30 PM 4:30 PM 5:15 PM 5:30 PM 5:30 PM 5:345 PM TOTAL VOLUMES : APPROACH %'s : APPROACH %'s : | 0 NL 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.000 0.2 NORTHO 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 50 180UND 0 NR 1 1 1 2 4 4 2 1 0 1 0 NR 1 2 4 4 9 4 2 0 1 0 0 NR 1 1 2 2 4 0 0 0 0 0 NR 1 1 1 2 2 4 0 0 0 0 0 NR 1 1 1 2 2 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 NR 1 1 1 2 2 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 NU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 5L 10 9 13 12 13 6 9 9 13 22 5 5L 130 12.05% | SOUTH 1 ST 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | BOUND 0 SR 65 76 88 73 78 79 90 81 83 74 83 76 58 949 87.95% | 0 SU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 1 EL 63 65 44 47 49 53 66 67 54 49 67 54 67 55 EL 683 17.47% | EASTB 2 EASTB 2 ET 251 247 252 269 259 264 261 278 273 289 ET 3217 82.30% | 0.500 24 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 EU 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 EU 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 WL 0 1 0 2 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.91 WESTE 2 287 287 287 284 287 264 270 270 284 288 274 284 288 271 262 299 WT 3320 94.10% | 2/2 2/2 2/2 2/2 2/2 2/2 2/2 2/2 | 0 WU 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 | 0.921 TOTAL 723 705 665 676 697 706 723 699 744 731 754 TOTAL 8533 TOTAL |
| PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 3:30 PM 4:00 PM 4:30 PM 4:30 PM 4:30 PM 5:15 PM 5:30 PM 5:35 PM 5:45 PM TOTAL VOLUMES : APPROACH %'s : PEAK HR 'VOL : | 0.000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.20 NORTH- 0 NT 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.200 50 180UND 0 NR 1 1 1 2 2 4 4 2 1 0 1 0 1 0 NR 16 94.12% 0 100 0 NR 2 2 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 NR | 0 NU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 SL 10 9 9 13 12 13 6 9 13 22 5 SL 130 12.05% 49 | 0.000 SOUTH 1 ST 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 37 BOUND 0 SR 65 76 88 73 79 90 81 78 79 90 81 74 83 74 83 74 83 74 83 76 SR 949 87.95% | 0 SU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 1 EL 63 65 64 44 47 49 53 66 67 54 71 55 EL 683 17.47% 247 247 | EASTB 2 2 ET 251 252 269 259 264 264 264 278 278 278 278 278 278 278 278 278 278 | 0UND 0 0 <u>ER</u> 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 | 0 EU 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 WL 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 WL 5 0.14% 1 0 | 0.93 WESTE 2 WT 267 267 270 270 270 270 274 284 274 288 271 262 274 284 271 264 270 270 270 270 270 270 270 270 | 22 20 00UND 0 15 15 15 15 17 17 13 17 17 13 17 17 11 16 20 5.64% 80 0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 | 0 WU 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 0 | 0.921 TOTAL 723 705 665 676 697 706 697 706 697 723 699 744 710 731 754 TOTAL 8533 TOTAL 2939 |
| PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 4:00 PM 4:30 PM 4:30 PM 4:30 PM 5:15 PM 5:15 PM 5:30 PM 5:45 PM 5:345 PM TOTAL VOLUMES : APPROACH %'s : PEAK HR 2007 : PEAK HR FACTOR : | 0 NL 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.20 0.20 0.20 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 50 180UND 0 NR 1 1 1 2 2 4 2 1 0 1 0 16 94.12% 0.500 PM 2 0.500 | 0 NU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 SL 10 9 13 12 13 6 9 9 13 22 5 SL 130 12.05% 49 0.557 | 0.00% 0.88 0.00% 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 37 BOUND 0 SR 65 76 88 73 78 79 90 81 83 74 83 74 86 76 SR 949 87.95% 319 0.927 | 0 SU 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 1 EL 63 65 44 47 53 66 49 67 54 71 55 EL 683 17.47% 247 0.870 | EASTB 2 EASTB 296 251 247 252 269 264 259 264 261 278 278 278 278 273 289 ET 3217 82.30% | 0.300 24 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.230 0 EU 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 WL 0 1 0 2 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 WL 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0.93 WESTE 2 WT 267 264 270 270 270 284 284 284 284 284 284 284 284 | 22 20 00UND 20 15 11 15 17 13 17 11 16 20 15 15 29 WR 199 5.64% 80 0.690 | 0 WU 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 | 0.921 TOTAL 723 705 665 676 697 706 723 699 744 710 731 754 TOTAL 8533 TOTAL 2939 0.974 |



| STREET: North/South | Lincoln Blvo | 1 | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|------------|------------------|-------------|-------|-----------------|----------|-------|------------------------|-------|
| East/West | Marina Poin | te Dr_Maxe | ella Ave | | | | | | | |
| Day: | Tuesday | Da | te: A | pril 26, 20 | 016 | Weather: | <u>_</u> | SUNNY | _ | |
| Hours: 7-10 & | 2 3-6 | | | Ch | ekrs: | NDS | | | | |
| School Day: | YES | Dis | strict: | | | I/S CO | DE _ | | | |
| DUAL- WHEELED BIKES BUSES | N/B 223 31 72 | | S/B 174 19 | | | E/B 16 48 | | W | / <u>B</u> 41 54 | |
| DUSES | N/B | TIME | S/B | TIME | | E/B | TIME | W | /B | TIME |
| AM PK 15 MIN | 644 | 8.45 | 517 | 8.00 | | 107 | 7.30 | 1 | 04 | 9.30 |
| PM PK 15 MIN | 598 | 17.45 | 600 | 16.15 | | 81 | 15.45 | 1 | 60 | 16.30 |
| AM PK HOUR | 2481 | 7.00 | 1966 | 7.45 | | 353 | 7.30 | 3 | 62 | 9.00 |
| PM PK HOUR | 2243 | 17.00 | 2195 | 16.15 | | 260 | 16.45 | 5 | 93 | 16.30 |

NORTHBOUND Approach

EASTBOUND Approach

Lt

74 73

81

81

72

83

464

Hours

7-8

8-9

9-10

15-16

16-17

17-18

TOTAL

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|-----|-------|------|-------|
| 7-8 | 73 | 2187 | 221 | 2481 |
| 8-9 | 112 | 1991 | 266 | 2369 |
| 9-10 | 110 | 1985 | 278 | 2373 |
| 15-16 | 143 | 1527 | 244 | 1914 |
| 16-17 | 155 | 1578 | 287 | 2020 |
| 17-18 | 186 | 1725 | 332 | 2243 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 779 | 10993 | 1628 | 13400 |

Th

SOUTHBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|
| 7-8 | 67 | 1391 | 48 | 1506 |
| 8-9 | 117 | 1756 | 57 | 1930 |
| 9-10 | 113 | 1514 | 69 | 1696 |
| 15-16 | 101 | 1861 | 74 | 2036 |
| 16-17 | 113 | 1943 | 103 | 2159 |
| 17-18 | 100 | 1980 | 113 | 2193 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 611 | 10445 | 464 | 11520 |

WESTBOUND Approach

| | Rt | Total | Hours | Lt |
|-----|-----|-------|-------|------|
| 75 | 152 | 301 | 7-8 | 126 |
| 77 | 188 | 338 | 8-9 | 176 |
| 72 | 150 | 303 | 9-10 | 177 |
| 63 | 105 | 249 | 15-16 | 302 |
| 74 | 92 | 238 | 16-17 | 295 |
| 62 | 99 | 244 | 17-18 | 308 |
| | | | | |
| 423 | 786 | 1673 | TOTAL | 1384 |
| | | | | |

| Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|------|-----|-----|-------|
| 126 | 33 | 87 | 246 |
| 176 | 37 | 117 | 330 |
| 177 | 37 | 148 | 362 |
| 302 | 99 | 160 | 561 |
| 295 | 98 | 169 | 562 |
| 308 | 94 | 184 | 586 |
| | | | |
| 1384 | 398 | 865 | 2647 |

547 668 665 810 800 830

4320

E-W

| Ped | Sch | Ped | Sch |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 17 | 0 | 17 | 0 |
| 25 | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| 35 | 0 | 28 | 0 |
| 42 | 0 | 42 | 0 |
| 62 | 0 | 22 | 0 |
| 62 | 0 | 32 | 1 |
| | | | |
| 243 | 0 | 157 | 1 |

TOTAL XING S/L

XING N/L

| N-S | Ped | Sch | | Ped | Sch |
|-------|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|
| 3987 | 0 | 0 | | 58 | 1 |
| 4299 | 1 | 0 | | 61 | 0 |
| 4069 | 0 | 0 | | 93 | 1 |
| 3950 | 0 | 0 | | 103 | 0 |
| 4179 | 0 | 0 | | 77 | 0 |
| 4436 | 2 | 0 | [| 103 | 2 |
| 24920 | 3 | 0 | ſ | 495 | 4 |

TOTAL XING W/L

XING E/L

Ped Sch

ITM Peak Hour Summary

National Data & Surveying Services

Lincoln Blvd and Marina Pointe Dr_Maxella Ave , Los Angeles







Total Volume Per Leg



| Project ID: | roject ID: 16-5257-007 | | | | τοται s | | | | | | Day: Tuesday | | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|------------|-----------|--------------|------------|------------|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|--|
| City: I | Los Angeles | | | | | TOT. AI | ALS VI | | | Date: 4/26/2016 | | | | |
| NS/EW Streets: | Li | ncoln Blvd | | Lincoln Blvd | | | Marina Pointe Dr_Maxella Ave | | | Marina Poi | inte Dr_Max | ella Ave | | |
| | NO | ORTHBOUN | D | S | DUTHBOUNI |) | EASTBOUND | | | WESTBOUND | | | | |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL | |
| LANES: | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 1 | | |
| 7:00 AM | 17 | 566 | 50 | 12 | 233 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 22 | 24 | 11 | 11 | 971 | |
| 7:15 AM | 9 | 581 | 39 | 14 | 330 | 21 | 20 | 16 | 42 | 25 | 7 | 25 | 1129 | |
| 7:30 AM | 28 | 516 | 61 | 20 | 380 | 12 | 28 | 26 | 53 | 34 | 6 | 27 | 1191 | |
| 7:45 AM | 19 | 524 | 71 | 21 | 448 | 6 | 17 | 26 | 35 | 43 | 9 | 24 | 1243 | |
| 8:00 AM | 16 | 438 | 67 | 34 | 467 | 16 | 20 | 21 | 46 | 37 | 11 | 28 | 1201 | |
| 8:15 AM | 33 | 506 | 78 | 30 | 420 | 14 | 14 | 25 | 42 | 47 | 8 | 27 | 1244 | |
| 8:30 AM | 24 | 497 | 66 | 33 | 463 | 14 | 23 | 17 | 53 | 42 | 9 | 30 | 1271 | |
| 8:45 AM | 39 | 550 | 55 | 20 | 406 | 13 | 16 | 14 | 47 | 50 | 9 | 32 | 1251 | |
| 9:00 AM | 21 | 487 | 70 | 19 | 381 | 17 | 25 | 25 | 38 | 37 | 7 | 36 | 1163 | |
| 9:15 AM | 15 | 497 | 69 | 35 | 417 | 14 | 16 | 10 | 36 | 46 | 8 | 31 | 1194 | |
| 9:30 AM | 47 | 476 | 65 | 34 | 358 | 13 | 22 | 19 | 41 | 47 | 12 | 45 | 1179 | |
| 9:45 AM | 27 | 525 | 74 | 25 | 358 | 25 | 18 | 18 | 35 | 47 | 10 | 36 | 1198 | |
| TOTAL VOLUMES : | NL 295 | NT 6163 | NR 765 | SL 297 | ST 4661 | SR 174 | EL 228 | ET 224 | ER 490 | WL 479 | WT 107 | WR 352 | TOTAL 14235 | |
| APPROACH %'s : | 4.08% | 85.32% | 10.59% | 5.79% | 90.82% | 3.39% | 24.20% | 23.78% | 52.02% | 51.07% | 11.41% | 37.53% | | |
| PEAK HR START TIME : | 800 A | M | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| PEAK HR VOL : | 112 | 1991 | 266 | 117 | 1756 | 57 | 73 | 77 | 188 | 176 | 37 | 117 | 4967 | |
| PEAK HR FACTOR : | | 0.920 | | | 0.933 | | | 0.909 | | | 0.907 | | 0.977 | |

| Project ID: 7 | Project ID: 16-5257-007 | | | | τοται s | | | | | | Day: Tuesday | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|------------|--------|--------------|----------|-------|------------------------------|----------|--------|-----------------|--------------|----------|-------|--|
| City: I | Los Angeles | | | | | PI | ALS M | | | Date: 4/26/2016 | | | | |
| NS/EW Streets: | Li | ncoln Blvd | | Lincoln Blvd | | | Marina Pointe Dr_Maxella Ave | | | Marina Poi | inte Dr_Max | ella Ave | | |
| | N | DRTHBOUN | D | SC | DUTHBOUN | D | E | ASTBOUND | | V | VESTBOUNE |) | | |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL | |
| LANES: | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 1 | | |
| 3:00 PM | 37 | 392 | 68 | 24 | 465 | 18 | 18 | 12 | 36 | 79 | 24 | 37 | 1210 | |
| 3:15 PM | 31 | 359 | 65 | 30 | 485 | 13 | 17 | 14 | 20 | 73 | 24 | 52 | 1183 | |
| 3:30 PM | 33 | 390 | 49 | 29 | 463 | 14 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 75 | 25 | 34 | 1163 | |
| 3:45 PM | 42 | 386 | 62 | 18 | 448 | 29 | 29 | 20 | 32 | 75 | 26 | 37 | 1204 | |
| 4:00 PM | 30 | 374 | 66 | 29 | 473 | 23 | 16 | 16 | 30 | 78 | 20 | 50 | 1205 | |
| 4:15 PM | 46 | 414 | 81 | 40 | 536 | 24 | 10 | 14 | 14 | 64 | 14 | 32 | 1289 | |
| 4:30 PM | 35 | 383 | 65 | 25 | 475 | 32 | 23 | 24 | 24 | 78 | 35 | 47 | 1246 | |
| 4:45 PM | 44 | 407 | 75 | 19 | 459 | 24 | 23 | 20 | 24 | 75 | 29 | 40 | 1239 | |
| 5:00 PM | 45 | 421 | 79 | 20 | 514 | 27 | 20 | 14 | 26 | 88 | 15 | 48 | 1317 | |
| 5:15 PM | 43 | 412 | 81 | 21 | 494 | 26 | 16 | 16 | 27 | 65 | 20 | 53 | 1274 | |
| 5:30 PM | 48 | 436 | 80 | 23 | 478 | 29 | 29 | 20 | 25 | 88 | 31 | 40 | 1327 | |
| 5:45 PM | 50 | 456 | 92 | 36 | 494 | 31 | 18 | 12 | 21 | 67 | 28 | 43 | 1348 | |
| · | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL | |
| TOTAL VOLUMES : | 484 | 4830 | 863 | 314 | 5784 | 290 | 236 | 199 | 296 | 905 | 291 | 513 | 15005 | |
| APPROACH %'s : | 7.84% | 78.19% | 13.97% | 4.92% | 90.54% | 4.54% | 32.28% | 27.22% | 40.49% | 52.95% | 17.03% | 30.02% | | |
| PEAK HR START TIME : | 500 F | M | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| PEAK HR VOL : | 186 | 1725 | 332 | 100 | 1980 | 113 | 83 | 62 | 99 | 308 | 94 | 184 | 5266 | |
| PEAK HR FACTOR : | | 0.938 | | | 0.977 | | | 0.824 | | | 0.921 | | 0.977 | |



| STREET: North/South | Del Rey Ave | e | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------|------|---------|---------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| East/West | Maxella Ave | e | | | | | | |
| Day: | Tuesday | Da | ite: A | pril 26, 2016 | Weather: | 5 | SUNNY | |
| Hours: 7-10 & | 3-6 | | | Chekrs: | NDS | | | |
| School Day: | YES | Di | strict: | | I/S CO | DE _ | | |
| DUAL- | N/B | | S/B | | E/B | | W/B | |
| WHEELED | 0 | | 25 | | 35 | | 38 | |
| BIKES | 0 | | 19 | | 53 | | 58 | |
| BUSES | 0 | | 0 | | 23 | | 12 | |
| | N/B | TIME | S/B | TIME | E/B | TIME | W/B | TIME |
| AM PK 15 MIN | 0 | 0.00 | 34 | 9.45 | 141 | 8.15 | 99 | 8.45 |
| PM PK 15 MIN | 0 | 0.00 | 74 | 17.30 | 150 | 17.45 | 144 | 16.30 |
| AM PK HOUR | 0 | 0.00 | 107 | 9.00 | 510 | 7.45 | 361 | 8.45 |
| PM PK HOUR | 0 | 0.00 | 274 | 16.45 | 536 | 17.00 | 504 | 16.30 |

NORTHBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|----|----|----|-------|
| 7-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8-9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9-10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15-16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16-17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17-18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

EASTBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|-----|------|----|-------|
| 7-8 | 133 | 232 | 0 | 365 |
| 8-9 | 152 | 318 | 0 | 470 |
| 9-10 | 140 | 347 | 0 | 487 |
| 15-16 | 65 | 358 | 0 | 423 |
| 16-17 | 95 | 409 | 0 | 504 |
| 17-18 | 78 | 458 | 0 | 536 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 663 | 2122 | 0 | 2785 |

SOUTHBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|-----|----|-----|-------|
| 7-8 | 24 | 0 | 41 | 65 |
| 8-9 | 38 | 0 | 63 | 101 |
| 9-10 | 34 | 0 | 73 | 107 |
| 15-16 | 78 | 0 | 147 | 225 |
| 16-17 | 63 | 0 | 163 | 226 |
| 17-18 | 85 | 0 | 182 | 267 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 322 | 0 | 669 | 991 |

WESTBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|----|------|-----|-------|
| 7-8 | 0 | 186 | 39 | 225 |
| 8-9 | 2 | 274 | 73 | 349 |
| 9-10 | 0 | 266 | 79 | 345 |
| 15-16 | 0 | 378 | 90 | 468 |
| 16-17 | 1 | 381 | 91 | 473 |
| 17-18 | 2 | 409 | 78 | 489 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 5 | 1894 | 450 | 2349 |

TOTAL XIN

XING S/L

XING N/L

| N-S | Ped | Sch | Ped | Sch |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 65 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 7 |
| 101 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 10 |
| 107 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 17 |
| 225 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 21 |
| 226 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 21 |
| 267 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 15 |
| | | | | |
| 991 | 0 | 0 | 485 | 91 |

TOTAL XING W/L

XING E/L

| E-W | Ped | Sch | Ped | Sch |
|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 590 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 819 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| 832 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 891 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 977 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| 1025 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| 5134 | 23 | 5 | 16 | 2 |

ITM Peak Hour Summary Prepared by:



National Data & Surveying Services

Del Rey Ave and Maxella Ave , Los Angeles







Total Volume Per Leg



| Project ID: | 16-5257-01 | 13 | | TOTALS | | | | | | Day: Tuesday | | | |
|----------------------|------------|-------------|---------|-------------|-------|--------|-------------|-----------|-------|-----------------|--------|--------|-------|
| City: | Los Angele | s | | | | AN | ALS A | | | Date: 4/26/2016 | | | |
| NS/EW Streets: | | Del Rey Ave | • | Del Rey Ave | | | Maxella Ave | | | Maxella Ave | | | |
| | ١ | NORTHBOUI | ND | SOUTHBOUND | | D | EASTBOUND | | | WESTBOUND | | | |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WТ | WR | TOTAL |
| LANES: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 11 | 31 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 10 | 131 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 26 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 6 | 130 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 32 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 10 | 172 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 15 | 44 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 13 | 222 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 14 | 34 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 19 | 227 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 19 | 47 | 94 | 0 | 2 | 69 | 12 | 254 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 15 | 45 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 12 | 231 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 15 | 26 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 30 | 208 |
| 9:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 18 | 40 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 18 | 224 |
| 9:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 12 | 33 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 21 | 233 |
| 9:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 16 | 33 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 18 | 238 |
| 9:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 27 | 34 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 22 | 244 |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL |
| TOTAL VOLUMES : | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 177 | 425 | 897 | 0 | 2 | 726 | 191 | 2514 |
| APPROACH %'s : | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | 35.16% | 0.00% | 64.84% | 32.15% | 67.85% | 0.00% | 0.22% | 79.00% | 20.78% | |
| PEAK HR START TIME : | 900 | AM | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
| PEAK HR VOL : | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 73 | 140 | 347 | 0 | 0 | 266 | 79 | 939 |
| PEAK HR FACTOR : | | 0.000 | | | 0.787 | | | 0.959 | | | 0.918 | | 0.962 |

CONTROL : 1-Way Stop (SB)

| Project ID: 16-5257-013 | | | | | | | | | | Day: Tuesday | | | |
|-------------------------|------------|-------------|---------|--------|------------|--------|-------------|----------------|-------|-----------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| City: | Los Angele | S | | | | TOTA | ALS A | | | Date: 4/26/2016 | | | |
| NS/EW Streets: | | Del Rey Ave | ġ | D | el Rey Ave | | Maxella Ave | | | N | laxella Ave | | |
| | ١ | NORTHBOUI | ND | SC | DUTHBOUN | D | E | EASTBOUND | | V | VESTBOUNE |) | |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WΤ | WR | TOTAL |
| LANES: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| 3:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 40 | 16 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 19 | 268 |
| 3:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 41 | 18 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 25 | 304 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 28 | 21 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 23 | 267 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 38 | 10 | 9 5 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 23 | 277 |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 39 | 22 | 92 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 21 | 290 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 32 | 23 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 18 | 275 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 44 | 29 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 25 | 335 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 48 | 21 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 27 | 303 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 48 | 24 | 96 | 0 | 1 | 115 | 19 | 322 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 33 | 17 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 20 | 298 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 53 | 21 | 122 | 0 | 1 | 106 | 23 | 347 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 48 | 16 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 16 | 325 |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL |
| TOTAL VOLUMES : | 0 | 0 | 0 | 226 | 0 | 492 | 238 | 1225 | 0 | 3 | 1168 | 259 | 3611 |
| APPROACH %'s : | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | 31.48% | 0.00% | 68.52% | 16.27% | 83.73% | 0.00% | 0.21% | 81.68% | 18.11% | |
| PEAK HR START TIME : | 500 | PM | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
| PEAK HR VOL : | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 182 | 78 | 458 | 0 | 2 | 409 | 78 | 1292 |
| PEAK HR FACTOR : | | 0.000 | | | 0.902 | | | 0.893 | | | 0.906 | | 0.931 |

CONTROL : 1-Way Stop (SB)



| STREET: North/South | Hotel Dwy | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------|-------|--------|----------------|----------|-------|----------|-------|
| East/West | Maxella Ave | e | | | | | | |
| Day: | Tuesday | Dat | e:A | April 26, 2016 | | 2 | SUNNY | |
| Hours: 7-10 | & 3-6 | | | Chekrs: | NDS | | | |
| School Day: | YES | Dist | rict: | | I/S CO | DE _ | | |
| DUAT | N/B | | S/B | | E/B | | W/B | |
| DUAL- WHEELED | 12 | | 0 | | 27 | | 36 | |
| BIKES BUSES | 7 0 | | 0 0 | | 46 23 | | 50 12 | |
| | N/B | TIME | S/B | TIME | E/B | TIME | W/B | TIME |
| AM PK 15 MIN | 34 | 8.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 100 | 8.15 | 85 | 8.45 |
| PM PK 15 MIN | 31 | 16.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 137 | 17.45 | 124 | 16.30 |
| AM PK HOUR | 113 | 7.45 | 0 | 0.00 | 354 | 7.45 | 301 | 8.45 |
| PM PK HOUR | 108 | 17.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 510 | 17.00 | 452 | 16.30 |

NORTHBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|-----|----|-----|-------|
| 7-8 | 40 | 0 | 44 | 84 |
| 8-9 | 48 | 0 | 60 | 108 |
| 9-10 | 46 | 0 | 48 | 94 |
| 15-16 | 56 | 0 | 34 | 90 |
| 16-17 | 52 | 0 | 50 | 102 |
| 17-18 | 61 | 0 | 47 | 108 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 303 | 0 | 283 | 586 |

SOUTHBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|----|----|----|-------|
| 7-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8-9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9-10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15-16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16-17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17-18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

WESTBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|-----|------|----|-------|
| 7-8 | 12 | 160 | 0 | 172 |
| 8-9 | 32 | 267 | 0 | 299 |
| 9-10 | 31 | 260 | 0 | 291 |
| 15-16 | 36 | 359 | 0 | 395 |
| 16-17 | 47 | 382 | 0 | 429 |
| 17-18 | 47 | 377 | 0 | 424 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 205 | 1805 | 0 | 2010 |

TOTAL XING S/L

TOTAL

XING N/L

| N-S | Ped | Sch | | Ped | Sch |
|-----|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|
| 84 | 10 | 1 | [| 0 | 0 |
| 108 | 30 | 2 | | 0 | 0 |
| 94 | 38 | 2 | | 0 | 0 |
| 90 | 36 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| 102 | 26 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| 108 | 43 | 2 | | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | |
| 586 | 183 | 7 | | 0 | 0 |

XING W/L

XING E/L

| E-W | Ped | Sch | Ped | Sch |
|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 402 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| 633 | 4 | 0 | 55 | 3 |
| 636 | 3 | 0 | 67 | 3 |
| 825 | 3 | 0 | 131 | 2 |
| 902 | 4 | 0 | 110 | 0 |
| 934 | 2 | 0 | 144 | 3 |
| | | | | |
| 4332 | 17 | 0 | 527 | 11 |

EASTBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|----|------|-----|-------|
| 7-8 | 0 | 202 | 28 | 230 |
| 8-9 | 0 | 293 | 41 | 334 |
| 9-10 | 0 | 294 | 51 | 345 |
| 15-16 | 0 | 366 | 64 | 430 |
| 16-17 | 0 | 394 | 79 | 473 |
| 17-18 | 2 | 422 | 86 | 510 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 2 | 1971 | 349 | 2322 |

ITM Peak Hour Summary Prepared by:



National Data & Surveying Services

Hotel Dwy and Maxella Ave , Los Angeles







Total Volume Per Leg



| Project ID: | 16-5257-014 | | | | | | | | | Day: Tuesday | | | |
|----------------------|-------------|-----------|--------|---------|-----------|---------|-------|-------------|--------|-----------------|-------------|-------|-------|
| City: | Los Angeles | | | AM | | | | | | Date: 4/26/2016 | | | |
| NS/EW Streets: | F | lotel Dwy | | | Hotel Dwy | | N | Aaxella Ave | | N | laxella Ave | | |
| | NC | DRTHBOUN | D | | Southbour | ND | E | EASTBOUND |) | V | VESTBOUND |) | |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL |
| LANES: | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| 7:00 AM | 5 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 8 | 3 | 37 | 0 | 95 |
| 7:15 AM | 7 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 3 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 98 |
| 7:30 AM | 14 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 13 | 4 | 42 | 0 | 131 |
| 7:45 AM | 14 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 4 | 5 | 49 | 0 | 162 |
| 8:00 AM | 16 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 17 | 9 | 62 | 0 | 195 |
| 8:15 AM | 14 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 9 | 8 | 63 | 0 | 198 |
| 8:30 AM | 8 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 9 | 8 | 64 | 0 | 180 |
| 8:45 AM | 10 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 6 | 7 | 78 | 0 | 168 |
| 9:00 AM | 14 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 12 | 5 | 58 | 0 | 169 |
| 9:15 AM | 14 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 10 | 9 | 70 | 0 | 191 |
| 9:30 AM | 8 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 7 | 6 | 68 | 0 | 178 |
| 9:45 AM | 10 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 22 | 11 | 64 | 0 | 192 |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL |
| TOTAL VOLUMES : | 134 | 0 | 152 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 789 | 120 | 75 | 687 | 0 | 1957 |
| APPROACH %'s : | 46.85% | 0.00% | 53.15% | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | 0.00% | 86.80% | 13.20% | 9.84% | 90.16% | 0.00% | |
| PEAK HR START TIME : | 800 A | M | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
| PEAK HR VOL : | 48 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 293 | 41 | 32 | 267 | 0 | 741 |
| PEAK HR FACTOR : | | 0.794 | | | 0.000 | | | 0.835 | | | 0.879 | | 0.936 |

CONTROL : 1-Way Stop (NB)

| Project ID: | 16-5257-014 | | | 707110 | | | | | | | Day: ⊺ | uesday | |
|----------------------|-------------|-----------|--------|---------|-----------|---------|-------|----------------|-----------------|--------|--------------|--------|-------|
| City: | Los Angeles | | | PM | | | | | Date: 4/26/2016 | | | | |
| NS/EW Streets: | F | lotel Dwy | | | Hotel Dwy | | Ν | laxella Ave | | N | /laxella Ave | | |
| | NC | ORTHBOUN | D | | SOUTHBOU | ND | E | ASTBOUND | | V | VESTBOUND |) | |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL |
| LANES: | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| 3:00 PM | 15 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 17 | 7 | 82 | 0 | 224 |
| 3:15 PM | 17 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 0 | 17 | 14 | 99 | 0 | 244 |
| 3:30 PM | 14 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 11 | 9 | 9 5 | 0 | 216 |
| 3:45 PM | 10 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 19 | 6 | 83 | 0 | 231 |
| 4:00 PM | 13 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 23 | 7 | 94 | 0 | 240 |
| 4:15 PM | 8 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 21 | 15 | 74 | 0 | 230 |
| 4:30 PM | 14 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 14 | 11 | 113 | 0 | 268 |
| 4:45 PM | 17 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 21 | 14 | 101 | 0 | 266 |
| 5:00 PM | 14 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 93 | 14 | 8 | 109 | 0 | 254 |
| 5:15 PM | 15 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 25 | 11 | 85 | 0 | 248 |
| 5:30 PM | 18 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 25 | 11 | 96 | 0 | 272 |
| 5:45 PM | 14 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 114 | 22 | 17 | 87 | 0 | 268 |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL |
| TOTAL VOLUMES : | 169 | 0 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1182 | 229 | 130 | 1118 | 0 | 2961 |
| APPROACH %'s : | 56.33% | 0.00% | 43.67% | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | 0.14% | 83.65% | 16.21% | 10.42% | 89.58% | 0.00% | |
| PEAK HR START TIME : | 500 P | M | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
| PEAK HR VOL : | 61 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 422 | 86 | 47 | 377 | 0 | 1042 |
| PEAK HR FACTOR : | | 0.931 | | | 0.000 | | | 0.931 | | | 0.906 | | 0.958 |

CONTROL : 1-Way Stop (NB)



| STREET: North/South | Glencoe Ave | 2 | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------|-----------|-----|---------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| East/West | Maxella Ave | 2 | | | | | | |
| Day: | Tuesday | Date: | А | pril 26, 2016 | Weather: | | SUNNY | |
| Hours: 7-10 |) & 3-6 | | | Chekrs: | NDS | | | |
| School Day: | YES | District: | - | | I/S CO | DE | | |
| DUAL- | N/B | | S/B | | E/B | | W/B | |
| WHEELED | 57 | | 57 | | 26 | | 19 | |
| BIKES | 45 | | 36 | | 38 | | 56 | |
| BUSES | 12 | | 9 | | 23 | | 0 | |
| | N/B | TIME | S/B | TIME | E/B | TIME | W/B | TIME |
| AM PK 15 MIN | 225 | 7.30 | 182 | 8.30 | 94 | 8.30 | 72 | 9.45 |
| PM PK 15 MIN | 147 | 15.15 | 237 | 17.30 | 116 | 16.30 | 94 | 16.30 |
| AM PK HOUR | 796 | 7.30 | 663 | 8.15 | 354 | 7.45 | 257 | 9.00 |
| PM PK HOUR | 538 | 16.30 | 859 | 15.15 | 452 | 16.30 | 343 | 16.30 |

NORTHBOUND Approach

EASTBOUND Approach

Lt

86

108

103

129

129

132

687

Hours

7-8

8-9

9-10

15-16

16-17

17-18

TOTAL

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|-----|------|-----|-------|
| 7-8 | 62 | 668 | 46 | 776 |
| 8-9 | 103 | 542 | 54 | 699 |
| 9-10 | 101 | 550 | 54 | 705 |
| 15-16 | 101 | 390 | 42 | 533 |
| 16-17 | 116 | 338 | 62 | 516 |
| 17-18 | 112 | 340 | 66 | 518 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 595 | 2828 | 324 | 3747 |

Th

66

95

89

96

127

140

613

Rt

86

127

130

186

186

178

893

Total

238

330

322

411

442

450

2193

SOUTHBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|-----|------|-----|-------|
| 7-8 | 10 | 276 | 30 | 316 |
| 8-9 | 54 | 506 | 78 | 638 |
| 9-10 | 68 | 417 | 86 | 571 |
| 15-16 | 46 | 676 | 133 | 855 |
| 16-17 | 33 | 678 | 115 | 826 |
| 17-18 | 45 | 659 | 121 | 825 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 256 | 3212 | 563 | 4031 |

WESTBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| 7-8 | 48 | 65 | 55 | 168 |
| 8-9 | 56 | 88 | 71 | 215 |
| 9-10 | 55 | 81 | 121 | 257 |
| 15-16 | 85 | 110 | 54 | 249 |
| 16-17 | 104 | 145 | 64 | 313 |
| 17-18 | 87 | 143 | 103 | 333 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 435 | 632 | 468 | 1535 |

TOTAL XING S/L XING N/L

| N-S | Ped | Sch | Ped | Sch |
|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1092 | 16 | 4 | 26 | 2 |
| 1337 | 22 | 3 | 39 | 3 |
| 1276 | 28 | 2 | 87 | 1 |
| 1388 | 32 | 2 | 37 | 8 |
| 1342 | 27 | 2 | 52 | 0 |
| 1343 | 91 | 1 | 35 | 6 |
| | | | | |
| 7778 | 216 | 14 | 276 | 20 |
| | | | | |

TOTAL XING W/L XING E/L

| E-W | Ped | Sch | Ped | Sch |
|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 406 | 16 | 8 | 20 | 1 |
| 545 | 42 | 6 | 11 | 1 |
| 579 | 48 | 9 | 33 | 2 |
| 660 | 46 | 12 | 21 | 0 |
| 755 | 53 | 16 | 16 | 0 |
| 783 | 69 | 20 | 25 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| 3728 | 274 | 71 | 126 | 4 |

ITM Peak Hour Summary Prepared by:



National Data & Surveying Services

Glencoe Ave and Maxella Ave , Los Angeles







Total Volume Per Leg



| Project ID: | 16-5257-016 |) | | | | | | | | | Day: 1 | Fuesday | |
|----------------------|-------------|------------|-------|-------|------------|--------|--------|-------------|--------|-----------------|-------------|---------|-------|
| City: | Los Angeles | | | AM | | | | | | Date: 4/26/2016 | | | |
| NS/EW Streets: | G | lencoe Ave | | G | lencoe Ave | | N | Aaxella Ave | | Ν | laxella Ave | | |
| | NO | DRTHBOUN | D | S | OUTHBOUN | D | E | EASTBOUND |) | V | VESTBOUNE |) | |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL |
| LANES: | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | |
| 7:00 AM | 16 | 129 | 7 | 1 | 49 | 5 | 13 | 11 | 14 | 5 | 18 | 2 | 270 |
| 7:15 AM | 13 | 156 | 9 | 0 | 55 | 7 | 17 | 11 | 23 | 11 | 10 | 17 | 329 |
| 7:30 AM | 15 | 193 | 17 | 4 | 78 | 7 | 21 | 19 | 20 | 16 | 18 | 16 | 424 |
| 7:45 AM | 18 | 190 | 13 | 5 | 94 | 11 | 35 | 25 | 29 | 16 | 19 | 20 | 475 |
| 8:00 AM | 23 | 133 | 12 | 9 | 120 | 13 | 29 | 24 | 30 | 8 | 26 | 18 | 445 |
| 8:15 AM | 22 | 150 | 10 | 9 | 119 | 26 | 33 | 26 | 29 | 13 | 20 | 18 | 475 |
| 8:30 AM | 26 | 132 | 16 | 24 | 136 | 22 | 25 | 25 | 44 | 21 | 11 | 18 | 500 |
| 8:45 AM | 32 | 127 | 16 | 12 | 131 | 17 | 21 | 20 | 24 | 14 | 31 | 17 | 462 |
| 9:00 AM | 31 | 138 | 12 | 25 | 126 | 16 | 25 | 25 | 33 | 14 | 18 | 27 | 490 |
| 9:15 AM | 26 | 117 | 5 | 12 | 95 | 26 | 17 | 26 | 37 | 10 | 21 | 39 | 431 |
| 9:30 AM | 18 | 127 | 16 | 20 | 95 | 21 | 31 | 18 | 31 | 16 | 22 | 18 | 433 |
| 9:45 AM | 26 | 168 | 21 | 11 | 101 | 23 | 30 | 20 | 29 | 15 | 20 | 37 | 501 |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL |
| TOTAL VOLUMES : | 266 | 1760 | 154 | 132 | 1199 | 194 | 297 | 250 | 343 | 159 | 234 | 247 | 5235 |
| APPROACH %'s : | 12.20% | 80.73% | 7.06% | 8.66% | 78.62% | 12.72% | 33.37% | 28.09% | 38.54% | 24.84% | 36.56% | 38.59% | |
| PEAK HR START TIME : | 815 A | M | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
| PEAK HR VOL : | 111 | 547 | 54 | 70 | 512 | 81 | 104 | 96 | 130 | 62 | 80 | 80 | 1927 |
| PEAK HR FACTOR : | | 0.978 | | | 0.911 | | | 0.878 | | | 0.895 | | 0.964 |

| Project ID: | 16-5257-016 | b | | | | | | | | | Day: 1 | ſuesday | |
|----------------------|-------------|------------|--------|-------|------------|--------|----------|-------------|--------|--------|-------------|-----------|-------|
| City: | Los Angeles | | | | | TOTA | ALS A | | | | Date: 4 | 1/26/2016 | _ |
| NS/EW Streets: | G | lencoe Ave | | G | lencoe Ave | | Ν | Aaxella Ave | | N | laxella Ave | | |
| | NO | DRTHBOUN | D | SC | DUTHBOUN | D | E | EASTBOUND | | V | /ESTBOUNE |) | |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL |
| LANES: | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | |
| 3:00 PM | 20 | 93 | 8 | 12 | 165 | 32 | 32 | 28 | 54 | 26 | 25 | 17 | 512 |
| 3:15 PM | 27 | 109 | 11 | 11 | 168 | 32 | 29 | 15 | 43 | 20 | 43 | 14 | 522 |
| 3:30 PM | 22 | 92 | 12 | 8 | 177 | 39 | 33 | 26 | 43 | 18 | 26 | 13 | 509 |
| 3:45 PM | 32 | 96 | 11 | 15 | 166 | 30 | 35 | 27 | 46 | 21 | 16 | 10 | 505 |
| 4:00 PM | 24 | 85 | 16 | 5 | 179 | 29 | 33 | 31 | 45 | 16 | 31 | 9 | 503 |
| 4:15 PM | 23 | 83 | 14 | 11 | 166 | 23 | 27 | 21 | 53 | 31 | 34 | 12 | 498 |
| 4:30 PM | 36 | 86 | 17 | 7 | 168 | 34 | 31 | 37 | 48 | 30 | 43 | 21 | 558 |
| 4:45 PM | 33 | 84 | 15 | 10 | 165 | 29 | 38 | 38 | 40 | 27 | 37 | 22 | 538 |
| 5:00 PM | 32 | 82 | 13 | 10 | 160 | 32 | 29 | 35 | 40 | 19 | 43 | 19 | 514 |
| 5:15 PM | 29 | 91 | 20 | 13 | 147 | 20 | 34 | 30 | 52 | 24 | 33 | 25 | 518 |
| 5:30 PM | 26 | 83 | 21 | 12 | 194 | 31 | 37 | 32 | 46 | 22 | 33 | 30 | 567 |
| 5:45 PM | 25 | 84 | 12 | 10 | 158 | 38 | 32 | 43 | 40 | 22 | 34 | 29 | 527 |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL |
| TOTAL VOLUMES : | 329 | 1068 | 170 | 124 | 2013 | 369 | 390 | 363 | 550 | 276 | 398 | 221 | 6271 |
| APPROACH %'s : | 21.00% | 68.16% | 10.85% | 4.95% | 80.33% | 14.72% | 29.93% | 27.86% | 42.21% | 30.84% | 44.47% | 24.69% | |
| PEAK HR START TIME : | 445 F | M | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
| PEAK HR VOL : | 120 | 340 | 69 | 45 | 666 | 112 | 138 | 135 | 178 | 92 | 146 | 96 | 2137 |
| PEAK HR FACTOR : | | 0.945 | | | 0.868 | | | 0.972 | | | 0.971 | | 0.942 |



| STREET: North/South | Glencoe Ave | 2 | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------|----------------|----------|---------------|----------|-------|----------|-------|
| East/West | Mindanao W | ⁷ y | | | | | | |
| Day: | Tuesday | Date: | А | pril 26, 2016 | Weather: | - | SUNNY | |
| Hours: 7-10 & | 2 3-6 | | | Chekrs: | NDS | | | |
| School Day: | YES | District | : _ | | I/S CO | DE | | |
| DUAL- | N/B | | S/B | | E/B | | W/B | |
| WHEELED | 27 | | 48 | | 56 | | 15 | |
| BIKES BUSES | 23 0 | | 24 23 | | 29 15 | | 39 26 | |
| | N/B | TIME | S/B | TIME | E/B | TIME | W/B | TIME |
| AM PK 15 MIN | 75 | 8.00 | 202 | 8.30 | 299 | 7.45 | 142 | 8.00 |
| PM PK 15 MIN | 113 | 17.00 | 262 | 17.30 | 161 | 16.15 | 162 | 17.30 |
| AM PK HOUR | 261 | 7.30 | 685 | 8.15 | 1081 | 7.30 | 478 | 7.45 |
| PM PK HOUR | 350 | 17.00 | 932 | 15.30 | 610 | 16.15 | 596 | 17.00 |

NORTHBOUND Approach

EASTBOUND Approach

Lt

Hours

7-8

8-9

9-10

15-16

16-17

17-18

TOTAL

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|-----|------|----|-------|
| 7-8 | 21 | 177 | 10 | 208 |
| 8-9 | 57 | 179 | 13 | 249 |
| 9-10 | 37 | 187 | 14 | 238 |
| 15-16 | 50 | 149 | 12 | 211 |
| 16-17 | 87 | 169 | 12 | 268 |
| 17-18 | 117 | 207 | 26 | 350 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 369 | 1068 | 87 | 1524 |

Th

292

Rt

Total

SOUTHBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|-----|-----|------|-------|
| 7-8 | 41 | 79 | 259 | 379 |
| 8-9 | 74 | 133 | 458 | 665 |
| 9-10 | 73 | 117 | 373 | 563 |
| 15-16 | 113 | 203 | 607 | 923 |
| 16-17 | 123 | 192 | 607 | 922 |
| 17-18 | 128 | 205 | 592 | 925 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 552 | 929 | 2896 | 4377 |

WESTBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total | |
|-------|----|------|-----|-------|--|
| 7-8 | 6 | 283 | 77 | 366 | |
| 8-9 | 11 | 335 | 96 | 442 | |
| 9-10 | 17 | 251 | 84 | 352 | |
| 15-16 | 11 | 331 | 94 | 436 | |
| 16-17 | 8 | 402 | 89 | 499 | |
| 17-18 | 10 | 494 | 92 | 596 | |
| | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 63 | 2096 | 532 | 2691 | |

TOTAL XING

N-S

TOTAL

E-W

| S/L | XING N/L |
|-----|----------|
| | |

| Ped | Sch | Ped | Sch |
|-----|-----|------|-----|
| 12 | 0 | 28 | 1 |
| 27 | 1 | 9 | 0 |
| 29 | 2 | 15 | 0 |
| 25 | 1 | 17 | 0 |
| 47 | 4 | 15 | 0 |
| 25 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | | | |
| 165 | 8 | 99 | 1 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| ING | W/L | XING | E/L |

XING W/L

Ped Sch Ped Sch

| 0 | 11 |
|---|----|
| 0 | 16 |
| | |
| 4 | 62 |

ITM Peak Hour Summary



National Data & Surveying Services

Glencoe Ave and Mindanao Wy , Los Angeles







Total Volume Per Leg



| Project ID: | 16-5257-017 | ' | | | | | | | | | Day: | Fuesday | |
|----------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|-------|
| City: | Los Angeles | | | | | TOT AN | ALS A | | | Date: 4/26/2016 | | | |
| NS/EW Streets: | G | lencoe Ave | | G | lencoe Ave | | M | indanao Wy | | Mi | ndanao Wy | | |
| | NO | ORTHBOUNI |) | S | OUTHBOUN | D | E | ASTBOUND | | V | VESTBOUNE |) | |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL |
| LANES: | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | |
| 7:00 AM | 4 | 37 | 2 | 7 | 19 | 45 | 87 | 52 | 8 | 0 | 59 | 14 | 334 |
| 7:15 AM | 7 | 34 | 0 | 13 | 14 | 55 | 116 | 78 | 11 | 1 | 65 | 16 | 410 |
| 7:30 AM | 7 | 54 | 6 | 10 | 20 | 71 | 135 | 115 | 12 | 3 | 61 | 17 | 511 |
| 7:45 AM | 3 | 52 | 2 | 11 | 26 | 88 | 116 | 164 | 19 | 2 | 9 8 | 30 | 611 |
| 8:00 AM | 11 | 60 | 4 | 19 | 39 | 102 | 9 0 | 146 | 20 | 2 | 111 | 29 | 633 |
| 8:15 AM | 15 | 42 | 5 | 22 | 29 | 101 | 108 | 133 | 23 | 1 | 88 | 18 | 585 |
| 8:30 AM | 14 | 41 | 2 | 18 | 39 | 145 | 98 | 119 | 19 | 3 | 72 | 24 | 594 |
| 8:45 AM | 17 | 36 | 2 | 15 | 26 | 110 | 101 | 117 | 22 | 5 | 64 | 25 | 540 |
| 9:00 AM | 11 | 58 | 2 | 25 | 39 | 116 | 9 8 | 106 | 29 | 5 | 62 | 19 | 570 |
| 9:15 AM | 8 | 39 | 3 | 20 | 27 | 77 | 83 | 79 | 15 | 7 | 69 | 23 | 450 |
| 9:30 AM | 11 | 42 | 6 | 13 | 26 | 101 | 9 8 | 73 | 19 | 2 | 64 | 17 | 472 |
| 9:45 AM | 7 | 48 | 3 | 15 | 25 | 79 | 126 | 84 | 11 | 3 | 56 | 25 | 482 |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL 105 (| ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL |
| APPROACH %'s : | 115 16 55% | 543 78 13% | 37 5.32% | 188 | 329 20.47% | 1090 67 83% | 1256 46.01% | 1266 46.37% | 208 | 34 2.93% | 869 74 91% | 257 22.16% | 6192 |
| | 1010070 | /0110/0 | 0.0270 | 1111070 | 2011770 | 0710070 | 1010170 | 1010770 | 1.0270 | 2.7070 | / 11/1/0 | 22.1070 | |
| PEAK HR START TIME : | 745 A | M | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
| PEAK HR VOL : | 43 | 195 | 13 | 70 | 133 | 436 | 412 | 562 | 81 | 8 | 369 | 101 | 2423 |
| PEAK HR FACTOR : | | 0.837 | | | 0.791 | | | 0.882 | | | 0.842 | | 0.957 |

| Project ID: | 16-5257-017 | 1 | | | | | | | | | Day: | Fuesday | |
|----------------------|-------------|------------|-------|--------|------------|--------|--------|------------|-------|-----------------|------------|---------|-------|
| City: | Los Angeles | | | PM | | | | | | Date: 4/26/2016 | | | |
| NS/EW Streets: | G | lencoe Ave | | G | lencoe Ave | | М | indanao Wy | | Mi | indanao Wy | | |
| | NO | ORTHBOUN | D | SC | DUTHBOUN | D | E | EASTBOUND | | V | VESTBOUNE |) | |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL |
| LANES: | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | |
| 3:00 PM | 16 | 30 | 5 | 22 | 55 | 149 | 65 | 59 | 11 | 4 | 69 | 20 | 505 |
| 3:15 PM | 6 | 38 | 3 | 29 | 45 | 152 | 78 | 57 | 9 | 2 | 85 | 25 | 529 |
| 3:30 PM | 12 | 37 | 3 | 34 | 52 | 163 | 53 | 5 9 | 10 | 4 | 96 | 27 | 550 |
| 3:45 PM | 16 | 44 | 1 | 28 | 51 | 143 | 76 | 75 | 9 | 1 | 81 | 22 | 547 |
| 4:00 PM | 20 | 36 | 8 | 27 | 45 | 153 | 58 | 60 | 10 | 1 | 99 | 23 | 540 |
| 4:15 PM | 21 | 39 | 1 | 35 | 45 | 156 | 68 | 82 | 11 | 1 | 100 | 22 | 581 |
| 4:30 PM | 27 | 51 | 2 | 27 | 56 | 150 | 58 | 86 | 12 | 5 | 103 | 25 | 602 |
| 4:45 PM | 19 | 43 | 1 | 34 | 46 | 148 | 68 | 64 | 5 | 1 | 100 | 19 | 548 |
| 5:00 PM | 54 | 52 | 7 | 32 | 50 | 133 | 54 | 87 | 15 | 1 | 112 | 30 | 627 |
| 5:15 PM | 27 | 56 | 5 | 28 | 55 | 127 | 59 | 77 | 7 | 3 | 130 | 18 | 592 |
| 5:30 PM | 18 | 53 | 7 | 30 | 54 | 178 | 45 | 94 | 11 | 4 | 134 | 24 | 652 |
| 5:45 PM | 18 | 46 | 7 | 38 | 46 | 154 | 58 | 74 | 10 | 2 | 118 | 20 | 591 |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL |
| TOTAL VOLUMES : | 254 | 525 | 50 | 364 | 600 | 1806 | 740 | 874 | 120 | 29 | 1227 | 275 | 6864 |
| APPROACH %'s : | 30.64% | 63.33% | 6.03% | 13.14% | 21.66% | 65.20% | 42.68% | 50.40% | 6.92% | 1.89% | 80.14% | 17.96% | |
| PEAK HR START TIME : | 500 F | M | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
| PEAK HR VOL : | 117 | 207 | 26 | 128 | 205 | 592 | 216 | 332 | 43 | 10 | 494 | 92 | 2462 |
| PEAK HR FACTOR : | | 0.774 | | | 0.883 | | | 0.947 | | | 0.920 | | 0.944 |



| STREET: North/South | SR-90 WB F | Ramps | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------|-------|--------|---------------|----------|-------|----------|-------|
| East/West | Mindanao W | /y | | | | | | |
| Day: | Tuesday | Date: | A | pril 26, 2016 | Weather: | 5 | SUNNY | |
| Hours: 7-3 | 10 & 3-6 | | | Chekrs: | NDS | | | |
| School Day: | YES | Distr | ict: | | I/S CO | DE _ | | |
| DUAL | N/B | | S/B | | E/B | | W/B | |
| WHEELED BIKES | 182 2 | | 0 1 | | 32 27 | | 53 28 | |
| BUSES | 4 | | 0 | | 14 | | 23 | |
| | N/B | TIME | S/B | TIME | E/B | TIME | W/B | TIME |
| AM PK 15 MIN | 715 | 8.45 | 0 | 0.00 | 145 | 7.45 | 228 | 8.30 |
| PM PK 15 MIN | 474 | 17.15 | 0 | 0.00 | 131 | 17.00 | 355 | 17.30 |
| AM PK HOUR | 2547 | 8.30 | 0 | 0.00 | 546 | 7.30 | 851 | 8.00 |
| PM PK HOUR | 1813 | 17.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 479 | 16.15 | 1380 | 17.00 |

NORTHBOUND Approach

EASTBOUND Approach

Lt

7

12

16 32

16

87

Hours

7-8

8-9

9-10

15-16

16-17

17-18

TOTAL

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|------|------|------|-------|
| 7-8 | 479 | 1190 | 649 | 2318 |
| 8-9 | 639 | 1218 | 681 | 2538 |
| 9-10 | 521 | 1230 | 601 | 2352 |
| 15-16 | 481 | 856 | 347 | 1684 |
| 16-17 | 468 | 921 | 332 | 1721 |
| 17-18 | 530 | 951 | 332 | 1813 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 3118 | 6366 | 2942 | 12426 |

Th

434

526

414

386

402

431

2593

Rt

0

0

0

0

0

0

0 2680

Total

438

533

426

402

434

447

SOUTHBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|----|----|----|-------|
| 7-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8-9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9-10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15-16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16-17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17-18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

WESTBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|----|------|-----|-------|
| 7-8 | 0 | 566 | 12 | 578 |
| 8-9 | 0 | 829 | 22 | 851 |
| 9-10 | 0 | 674 | 20 | 694 |
| 15-16 | 0 | 1054 | 29 | 1083 |
| 16-17 | 0 | 1240 | 38 | 1278 |
| 17-18 | 0 | 1340 | 40 | 1380 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 0 | 5703 | 161 | 5864 |

TOTAL XING S/L

N-S

2318

2538 2352

1684

1721 1813

12426

XING N/L

| Ped | Sch | _ | Ped | Sch |
|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|
| 0 | 0 | Γ | 3 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | | 8 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | | 2 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | | 7 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | | 23 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | | 12 | 0 |
| | | _ | | |
| 0 | 0 | | 55 | 0 |
| | | _ | | |
| | | | | |
| | | _ | | |

TOTAL XING W/L

XING E/L

| E-W | Ped | Sch | Ped | Sch |
|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1016 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 1384 | 21 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 1120 | 21 | 1 | 15 | 0 |
| 1485 | 22 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| 1712 | 18 | 2 | 13 | 0 |
| 1827 | 21 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| 8544 | 111 | 3 | 65 | 0 |

ITM Peak Hour Summary

National Data & Surveying Services

SR-90 WB Ramps and Mindanao Wy , Los Angeles







Total Volume Per Leg



| Project ID: | 16-5257-018 | 3 | | | | | | | | | Day: T | uesday | |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------|------------|---------|------------|---------|----------|------------|---------|---------|-----------------|--------|-------|
| City: | City: Los Angeles | | | | | | | | | | Date: 4/26/2016 | | |
| NS/EW Streets: | SR-9 | 90 WB Ram | ps | SR | -90 WB Rar | nps | М | indanao Wy | | M | indanao Wy | | |
| | NO | ORTHBOUN | D | | Southboui | ND | E | ASTBOUND | | V | VESTBOUND | i | - |
| LANES: | NL 1.5 | NT 1.5 | NR 1 | SL 0 | ST 0 | SR 0 | EL 1 | ET 2 | ER 0 | WL 0 | WT 3 | WR | TOTAL |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| 7:00 AM | 118 | 249 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 117 | 4 | 679 |
| 7:15 AM | 86 | 295 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 1 | 753 |
| 7:30 AM | 118 | 323 | 175 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 128 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 5 | 890 |
| 7:45 AM | 157 | 323 | 206 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 2 | 1012 |
| 8:00 AM | 144 | 264 | 175 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 207 | 6 | 923 |
| 8:15 AM | 150 | 278 | 172 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 203 | 6 | 954 |
| 8:30 AM | 170 | 321 | 149 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 225 | 3 | 994 |
| 8:45 AM | 175 | 355 | 185 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 194 | 7 | 1051 |
| 9:00 AM | 126 | 291 | 166 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 188 | 10 | 897 |
| 9:15 AM | 154 | 320 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 148 | 2 | 858 |
| 9:30 AM | 111 | 287 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 189 | 2 | 826 |
| 9:45 AM | 130 | 332 | 159 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 6 | 891 |
| TOTAL VOLUMES : | NL 1639 | NT 3638 | NR 1031 | SL | ST | SR | EL 23 | ET 1374 | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL |
| APPROACH %'s : | 22.74% | 50.47% | 26.79% | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | 1.65% | 98.35% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 97.46% | 2.54% | 10720 |
| PEAK HR START TIME : | 800 A | M | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
| PEAK HR VOL : | 639 | 1218 | 681 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 526 | 0 | 0 | 829 | 22 | 3922 |
| PEAK HR FACTOR : | | 0.887 | | | 0.000 | | | 0.919 | | | 0.933 | | 0.933 |

| Project ID: | 16-5257-018 | 3 | | | | | | | | | Day: ⊺ | uesday | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| City: | Los Angeles | | | PM | | | | | | Date: 4/26/2016 | | | |
| NS/EW Streets: | SR-9 | 0 WB Ram | ps | SR | -90 WB Rar | nps | Mi | indanao Wy | | Mi | indanao Wy | | |
| | NO | DRTHBOUN | D | | SOUTHBOU | ND | E | EASTBOUND | - | V | VESTBOUND | | |
| LANES: | NL 1.5 | NT 1.5 | NR 1 | SL 0 | ST 0 | SR 0 | EL 1 | ET 2 | ER 0 | WL 0 | WT 3 | WR 0 | TOTAL |
| 3:00 PM | 115 | 208 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 239 | 6 | 755 |
| 3:15 PM 3:30 PM | 124 124 | 189 231 | 83 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 1 | 99 86 | 0 | 0 | 251 293 | 7 9 | 758 832 |
| 3:45 PM | 118 | 228 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 271 | 7 | 824 |
| 4:00 PM 4:15 PM | 117 107 | 206 230 | 73 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 10 | 81 117 | 0 | 0 | 321 317 | 9 5 | 812 864 |
| 4:30 PM 4:45 PM | 124 120 | 241 244 | 100 81 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 5 12 | 99 105 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 312 290 | 9 15 | 890 867 |
| 5:00 PM | 113 140 | 205 256 | 83 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 127 94 | 0 | 0 | 331 318 | 14 10 | 877 899 |
| 5:30 PM | 142 | 239 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 116 94 | 0 | 0 | 346 345 | 9 7 | 946 918 |
| | 133 | 231 | 05 | U | 0 | U | 5 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 545 | ' | 910 |
| TOTAL VOLUMES : APPROACH %'s : | NL 1479 28.34% | NT 2728 52.28% | NR 1011 19.38% | SL 0 #DIV/0! | ST 0 #DIV/0! | SR 0 #DIV/0! | EL 64 4.99% | ET 1219 95.01% | ER 0 0.00% | WL 0 0.00% | WT 3634 97.14% | WR 107 2.86% | TOTAL 10242 |
| PEAK HR START TIME : | 500 F | M | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
| PEAK HR VOL : | 530 | 951 | 332 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 431 | 0 | 0 | 1340 | 40 | 3640 |
| PEAK HR FACTOR : | | 0.956 | | | 0.000 | | | 0.853 | | | 0.972 | | 0.962 |



| STREET: North/South | SR-90 EB R | amps | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------|------|-----------|---------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| East/West | Mindanao W | /y | | | | | | |
| Day: | Tuesday | E | Date: A | pril 26, 2016 | Weather: | 5 | SUNNY | |
| Hours: 7-10 | & 3-6 | | | Chekrs | NDS | | | |
| School Day: | YES | D | District: | | I/S CO | DE _ | | |
| DUAL- | N/B | | S/B | | E/B | | W/B | |
| WHEELED | 0 | | 126 | | 49 | | 73 | |
| BIKES | 0 | | 0 | | 28 | | 31 | |
| BUSES | 0 | | 1 | | 14 | | 20 | |
| | N/B | TIME | S/B | TIME | E/B | TIME | W/B | TIME |
| AM PK 15 MIN | 0 | 0.00 | 314 | 8.45 | 329 | 8.15 | 387 | 8.30 |
| PM PK 15 MIN | 0 | 0.00 | 314 | 17.15 | 298 | 17.00 | 502 | 17.30 |
| AM PK HOUR | 0 | 0.00 | 1226 | 8.00 | 1241 | 7.45 | 1470 | 8.00 |
| PM PK HOUR | 0 | 0.00 | 1168 | 16.30 | 1111 | 16.45 | 1858 | 17.00 |

NORTHBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|----|----|----|-------|
| 7-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8-9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9-10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15-16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16-17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17-18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

EASTBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|----|------|------|-------|
| 7-8 | 0 | 437 | 568 | 1005 |
| 8-9 | 0 | 506 | 723 | 1229 |
| 9-10 | 0 | 386 | 616 | 1002 |
| 15-16 | 0 | 386 | 614 | 1000 |
| 16-17 | 0 | 437 | 634 | 1071 |
| 17-18 | 0 | 415 | 636 | 1051 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 0 | 2567 | 3791 | 6358 |

SOUTHBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|-----|------|----|-------|
| 7-8 | 18 | 879 | 7 | 904 |
| 8-9 | 29 | 1178 | 19 | 1226 |
| 9-10 | 26 | 971 | 15 | 1012 |
| 15-16 | 18 | 1090 | 17 | 1125 |
| 16-17 | 20 | 1108 | 12 | 1140 |
| 17-18 | 14 | 1119 | 20 | 1153 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 125 | 6345 | 90 | 6560 |

WESTBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|------|------|----|-------|
| 7-8 | 298 | 733 | 0 | 1031 |
| 8-9 | 468 | 1002 | 0 | 1470 |
| 9-10 | 382 | 816 | 0 | 1198 |
| 15-16 | 567 | 960 | 0 | 1527 |
| 16-17 | 678 | 1048 | 0 | 1726 |
| 17-18 | 733 | 1125 | 0 | 1858 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 3126 | 5684 | 0 | 8810 |

TOTAL

XING S/L XING N/L

| N-S | Ped | Sch | Ped | Sch |
|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 904 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1226 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1012 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1125 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1140 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1153 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| 6560 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

TOTAL XING W/L XING E/L

| E-W | Ped | Sch | Ped | Sch |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2036 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 2699 | 17 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 2200 | 17 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| 2527 | 23 | 2 | 14 | 1 |
| 2797 | 14 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| 2909 | 18 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| 15168 | 95 | 2 | 53 | 1 |

ITM Peak Hour Summary Prepared by:

National Data & Surveying Services

SR-90 EB Ramps and Mindanao Wy , Los Angeles







Total Volume Per Leg



| Project ID: | 16-5257-01 | 19 | | | | | | | | | Day: ⊺ | uesday | |
|----------------------|------------|------------|--------------|----------------------------|-----------|-------|-----------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| City: | | TOTALS | | | | | Date: 4/26/2016 | | | | | | |
| NS/EW Streets: | SR | -90 EB Ran | nps | SR-90 EB Ramps Mindanao Wy | | | | Mindanao Wy | | | | | |
| | NORTHBOUND | | D SOUTHBOUND | | EASTBOUND | | WESTBOUND | | | | | | |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL |
| LANES: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 140 | 1 | 0 | 68 | 119 | 78 | 159 | 0 | 567 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 218 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 119 | 52 | 155 | 0 | 641 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 247 | 4 | 0 | 134 | 150 | 66 | 197 | 0 | 801 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 274 | 2 | 0 | 144 | 180 | 102 | 222 | 0 | 931 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 292 | 5 | 0 | 111 | 172 | 124 | 240 | 0 | 949 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 292 | 1 | 0 | 129 | 200 | 119 | 245 | 0 | 994 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 294 | 8 | 0 | 126 | 179 | 119 | 268 | 0 | 1001 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 300 | 5 | 0 | 140 | 172 | 106 | 249 | 0 | 981 |
| 9:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 249 | 1 | 0 | 9 5 | 160 | 121 | 204 | 0 | 839 |
| 9:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 241 | 2 | 0 | 94 | 159 | 71 | 223 | 0 | 795 |
| 9:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 254 | 7 | 0 | 93 | 153 | 98 | 210 | 0 | 821 |
| 9:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 227 | 5 | 0 | 104 | 144 | 92 | 179 | 0 | 757 |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL |
| TOTAL VOLUMES : | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 3028 | 41 | 0 | 1329 | 1907 | 1148 | 2551 | 0 | 10077 |
| APPROACH %'s : | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | 2.32% | 96.37% | 1.30% | 0.00% | 41.07% | 58.93% | 31.04% | 68.96% | 0.00% | |
| PEAK HR START TIME : | 800 | AM | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
| PEAK HR VOL : | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 1178 | 19 | 0 | 506 | 723 | 468 | 1002 | 0 | 3925 |
| PEAK HR FACTOR : | | 0.000 | | | 0.976 | | | 0.934 | | | 0.950 | | 0.980 |
Intersection Turning Movement Prepared by: National Data & Surveying Services

| Project ID: | 16-5257-01 | 19 | | | | | | | | | Day: ⊺ | uesday | | |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------|---------|-------|------------|-------|-------|------------|--------|--------|-----------------|--------|-------|--|
| City: | City: Los Angeles | | | | PM | | | | | | Date: 4/26/2016 | | | |
| NS/EW Streets: | SR | -90 EB Ram | nps | SR- | 90 EB Ramp | os | М | indanao Wy | | Mi | ndanao Wy | | | |
| | ١ | NORTHBOUI | ND | SC | DUTHBOUNI | D | E | EASTBOUND | | V | VESTBOUND | | | |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL | |
| LANES: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | | |
| 3:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 267 | 3 | 0 | 107 | 167 | 146 | 217 | 0 | 911 | |
| 3:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 276 | 3 | 0 | 89 | 131 | 139 | 223 | 0 | 868 | |
| 3:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 271 | 7 | 0 | 83 | 181 | 155 | 275 | 0 | 976 | |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 276 | 4 | 0 | 107 | 135 | 127 | 245 | 0 | 897 | |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 276 | 5 | 0 | 86 | 174 | 190 | 260 | 0 | 994 | |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 293 | 1 | 0 | 121 | 157 | 165 | 243 | 0 | 990 | |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 274 | 4 | 0 | 99 | 162 | 167 | 281 | 0 | 990 | |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 265 | 2 | 0 | 131 | 141 | 156 | 264 | 0 | 963 | |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 294 | 6 | 0 | 108 | 190 | 178 | 256 | 0 | 1034 | |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 305 | 4 | 0 | 99 | 179 | 179 | 273 | 0 | 1044 | |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 267 | 5 | 0 | 119 | 144 | 186 | 316 | 0 | 1043 | |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 253 | 5 | 0 | 89 | 123 | 190 | 280 | 0 | 941 | |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL | |
| TOTAL VOLUMES : | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 3317 | 49 | 0 | 1238 | 1884 | 1978 | 3133 | 0 | 11651 | |
| APPROACH %'s : | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | 1.52% | 97.05% | 1.43% | 0.00% | 39.65% | 60.35% | 38.70% | 61.30% | 0.00% | | |
| PEAK HR START TIME : | 445 | PM | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| PEAK HR VOL : | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 1131 | 17 | 0 | 457 | 654 | 699 | 1109 | 0 | 4084 | |
| PEAK HR FACTOR : | | 0.000 | | | 0.928 | | | 0.932 | | | 0.900 | | 0.978 | |

CONTROL : Signalized



City Of Los Angeles Department Of Transportation MANUAL TRAFFIC COUNT SUMMARY

| STREET: North/South | Mindanao W | ⁄ay | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|--------------|-----|----------|-------|-------|---------|-------|--|--|--|
| East/West | La Villa Ma | La Villa Marina | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Day: | Wednesday | I | Date: Fe | bruary 1, 20 | 17 | Weather: | - | SUNNY | | | | | |
| Hours: 7-10 |) & 3-6 | | | Chekı | rs: | NDS | | | | | | | |
| School Day: | YES | Ι | District: | | | I/S CO | DE _ | | | | | | |
| DUAL- | N/B | | <u>S/B</u> | | | E/B | | _ | W/B | | | | |
| WHEELED BIKES | 47 20 | | 49 32 | | | 11 | | | 8 10 | | | | |
| BUSES | 15 | | 27 | | | 1 | | | 0 | | | | |
| | N/B | TIME | S/B | TIME | | E/B | TIME | | W/B | TIME | | | |
| AM PK 15 MIN | 298 | 8.15 | 259 | 8.15 | | 20 | 7.15 | | 66 | 8.30 | | | |
| PM PK 15 MIN | 275 | 17.00 | 305 | 17.15 | | 20 | 17.15 | | 37 | 16.30 | | | |
| AM PK HOUR | 1121 | 7.45 | 1022 | 7.45 | | 47 | 7.00 | | 219 | 8.00 | | | |
| PM PK HOUR | 1035 | 17.00 | 1194 | 16.45 | | 56 | 16.30 | | 127 | 16.15 | | | |

NORTHBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|-----|------|-----|-------|
| 7-8 | 26 | 756 | 41 | 823 |
| 8-9 | 15 | 1026 | 52 | 1093 |
| 9-10 | 19 | 841 | 58 | 918 |
| 15-16 | 21 | 896 | 71 | 988 |
| 16-17 | 16 | 870 | 63 | 949 |
| 17-18 | 23 | 940 | 72 | 1035 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 120 | 5329 | 357 | 5806 |

SOUTHBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|-----|------|----|-------|
| 7-8 | 30 | 756 | 23 | 809 |
| 8-9 | 62 | 931 | 25 | 1018 |
| 9-10 | 49 | 831 | 13 | 893 |
| 15-16 | 76 | 749 | 6 | 831 |
| 16-17 | 89 | 825 | 8 | 922 |
| 17-18 | 123 | 1052 | 12 | 1187 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 429 | 5144 | 87 | 5660 |

WESTBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|-----|----|-----|-------|
| 7-8 | 41 | 2 | 113 | 156 |
| 8-9 | 69 | 0 | 150 | 219 |
| 9-10 | 48 | 1 | 130 | 179 |
| 15-16 | 42 | 0 | 77 | 119 |
| 16-17 | 51 | 2 | 61 | 114 |
| 17-18 | 49 | 1 | 65 | 115 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 300 | 6 | 596 | 902 |

TOTAL XINO

N-S

1632

2111

1811

1819 1871 2222

11466

| G S/L | XING N/L |
|-------|----------|
| | |

| Ped | Sch | Ped | Sch |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 11 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| 14 | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| 17 | 0 | 27 | 2 |
| 20 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| | | | |
| 76 | 0 | 98 | 2 |
| | | | |

TOTAL XING W/L XING E/L

| E-W | Ped | Sch | Ped | Sch |
|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 203 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 244 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 196 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 170 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 157 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 161 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| 1131 | 64 | 0 | 2 | 0 |

EASTBOUND Approach

| Hours | Lt | Th | Rt | Total |
|-------|-----|----|-----|-------|
| 7-8 | 27 | 2 | 18 | 47 |
| 8-9 | 13 | 1 | 11 | 25 |
| 9-10 | 6 | 0 | 11 | 17 |
| 15-16 | 26 | 1 | 24 | 51 |
| 16-17 | 15 | 1 | 27 | 43 |
| 17-18 | 20 | 0 | 26 | 46 |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | 107 | 5 | 117 | 229 |

ITM Peak Hour Summary

National Data & Surveying Services

<u> Mindanao Way and La Villa Marina , Marina Del Rey</u>







Total Volume Per Leg



Intersection Turning Movement Prepared by: National Data & Surveying Services

| Project ID: | 17-5060-006 | 5 | | | | тот | u.e | | | | Day: V | Vednesday | 1 | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|--|
| City: 1 | Marina Del F | ley | | TOTALS | | | | | | | Date: 2/1/2017 | | | |
| - | | | | | | AN | 1 | | | | | | 1 | |
| NS/EW Streets: | Mir | ndanao Way | | Mir | ndanao Way | , | La | Villa Marina | a La Villa Marina | | | | | |
| | NO | ORTHBOUNI | | SC | DUTHBOUNI | | E | ASTBOUND | | V | VESTBOUND |) | | |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL | |
| LANES: | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | |
| 7:00 AM | 6 | 142 | 12 | 3 | 144 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 0 | 25 | 365 | |
| 7:15 AM | 3 | 165 | 9 | 3 | 174 | 2 | 13 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 19 | 405 | |
| 7:30 AM | 6 | 189 | 6 | 10 | 205 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 30 | 467 | |
| 7:45 AM | 11 | 260 | 14 | 14 | 233 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 39 | 598 | |
| 8:00 AM | 1 | 234 | 13 | 17 | 229 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 0 | 41 | 563 | |
| 8:15 AM | 8 | 282 | 8 | 15 | 238 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 27 | 601 | |
| 8:30 AM | 2 | 271 | 17 | 13 | 237 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 22 | 0 | 44 | 621 | |
| 8:45 AM | 4 | 239 | 14 | 17 | 227 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 19 | 0 | 38 | 570 | |
| 9:00 AM | 3 | 213 | 18 | 12 | 221 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 44 | 529 | |
| 9:15 AM | 6 | 218 | 14 | 13 | 210 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 27 | 504 | |
| 9:30 AM | 4 | 180 | 13 | 13 | 190 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 29 | 443 | |
| 9:45 AM | 6 | 230 | 13 | 11 | 210 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 0 | 30 | 531 | |
| TOTAL VOLUMES: APPROACH %'s: | NL 60 2.12% | NT 2623 92.55% | NR 151 5.33% | SL 141 5.18% | ST 2518 92.57% | SR 61 2.24% | EL 46 51.69% | ET 3 3.37% | ER 40 44.94% | WL 158 28.52% | WT 3 0.54% | WR 393 70.94% | TOTAL 6197 | |
| PEAK HR START TIME : | 745 A | M | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| PEAK HR VOL : | 22 | 1047 | 52 | 59 | 937 | 26 | 16 | 1 | 10 | 62 | 0 | 151 | 2383 | |
| PEAK HR FACTOR : | | 0.940 | | | 0.986 | | | 0.750 | | | 0.807 | | 0.959 | |

CONTROL : Signalized

Intersection Turning Movement Prepared by: National Data & Surveying Services

| Project ID: | 17-5060-006 | 5 | | TOTALS | | | | | | | Day: Wednesday | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|------------|-------|--------|------------|-------|--------|--------------|--------|--------|----------------|----------|-------|--|
| City: 1 | Marina Del F | Rey | | | | | ALS | | | | Date: 2 | 2/1/2017 | | |
| NS/EW Streets: | Mi | ndanao Way | / | Mi | ndanao Way | , FI | La | Villa Marina | 1 | La | Villa Marina | 1 | | |
| | N | ORTHBOUN | D | S | OUTHBOUN |) | E | ASTBOUND | | V | VESTBOUND |) | | |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | wт | WR | TOTAL | |
| LANES: | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | |
| 3:00 PM | 6 | 201 | 21 | 22 | 184 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 19 | 476 | |
| 3:15 PM | 4 | 222 | 21 | 15 | 200 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 15 | 0 | 14 | 501 | |
| 3:30 PM | 5 | 248 | 11 | 21 | 169 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 18 | 504 | |
| 3:45 PM | 6 | 225 | 18 | 18 | 196 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 26 | 508 | |
| 4:00 PM | 3 | 224 | 15 | 22 | 205 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 11 | 498 | |
| 4:15 PM | 3 | 210 | 14 | 23 | 178 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 16 | 462 | |
| 4:30 PM | 4 | 211 | 16 | 17 | 174 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 19 | 1 | 17 | 472 | |
| 4:45 PM | 6 | 225 | 18 | 27 | 268 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 11 | 13 | 1 | 17 | 596 | |
| 5:00 PM | 6 | 254 | 15 | 35 | 250 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 1 | 16 | 604 | |
| 5:15 PM | 11 | 214 | 13 | 23 | 278 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 13 | 8 | 0 | 15 | 586 | |
| 5:30 PM | 3 | 236 | 16 | 40 | 260 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 0 | 22 | 600 | |
| 5:45 PM | 3 | 236 | 28 | 25 | 264 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 12 | 593 | |
| | NL | NT | NR | SL | ST | SR | EL | ET | ER | WL | WT | WR | TOTAL | |
| TOTAL VOLUMES : | 60 | 2706 | 206 | 288 | 2626 | 26 | 61 | 2 | 77 | 142 | 3 | 203 | 6400 | |
| APPROACH %'s : | 2.02% | 91.05% | 6.93% | 9.80% | 89.32% | 0.88% | 43.57% | 1.43% | 55.00% | 40.80% | 0.86% | 58.33% | | |
| PEAK HR START TIME : | 445 F | РМ | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| PEAK HR VOL : | 26 | 929 | 62 | 125 | 1056 | 13 | 19 | 1 | 35 | 48 | 2 | 70 | 2386 | |
| | | 525 | | | 1000 | | | - | | | | . 5 | 2000 | |
| PEAK HR FACTOR : | | 0.925 | | | 0.979 | | | 0.688 | | | 0.909 | | 0.988 | |

CONTROL : Signalized

APPENDIX G

DETAILED PLANS, PROGRAMS, ORDINANCES, AND POLICIES REVIEW OPTION A

The worksheet provides a structured approach to evaluate the threshold T-1 question below, that asks whether a project conflicts with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system. The intention of the worksheet is to streamline the project review by highlighting the most relevant plans, policies and programs when assessing potential impacts to the City's circulation system.

Threshold T-1: Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?

This worksheet does not include an exhaustive list of City policies, and does not include community plans, specific plans, or any area-specific regulatory overlays. The Department of City Planning project planner will need to be consulted to determine if the project would obstruct the City from carrying out a policy or program in a community plan, specific plan, streetscape plan, or regulatory overlay that was adopted to support multimodal transportation options or public safety. LADOT staff should be consulted if a project would lead to a conflict with a mobility investment in the Public Right of Way (PROW) that is currently undergoing planning, design, or delivery. This worksheet must be completed for all projects that meet the Section I. Screening Criteria. For description of the relevant planning documents, **see Attachment D.1**.

For any response to the following questions that checks the box in bold text ((i.e. Yes or No), further analysis is needed to demonstrate that the project does not conflict with a plan, policy, or program.

I. SCREENING CRITERIA FOR POLICY ANALYSIS

If the answer is 'yes' to any of the following questions, further analysis will be required:

Does the project require a discretionary action that requires the decision maker to find that the project would substantially conform to the purpose, intent and provisions of the General Plan?

× Yes No

Is the project known to directly conflict with a transportation plan, policy, or program adopted to support multimodal transportation options or public safety?

Yes X No

Is the project required to or proposing to make any voluntary modifications to the public right-of-way (i.e., dedications and/or improvements in the right-of-way, reconfigurations of curb line, etc.)?

× Yes 📃 No

II. PLAN CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

A. Mobility Plan 2035 PROW Classification Standards for Dedications and Improvements

These questions address potential conflict with:



Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 2.1 – Adaptive Reuse of Streets. Design, plan, and operate streets to serve multiple purposes and provide flexibility in design to adapt to future demands.

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 2.3 – Pedestrian Infrastructure. Recognize walking as a component of every trip, and ensure high quality pedestrian access in all site planning and public right-of-way modifications to provide a safe and comfortable walking environment.

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 3.2 – *People with Disabilities. Accommodate the needs of people with disabilities when modifying or installing infrastructure in the public right-of-way.*

Mobility Plan 2035 Street Designations and Standard Roadway Dimensions

A.1 Does the project include additions or new construction along a street designated as a Boulevard I, and II, and/or Avenue I, II, or III on property zoned for R3 or less restrictive zone? Yes No

A.2 If **A.1 is yes**, is the project required to make additional dedications or improvements to the Public Right of Way as demonstrated by the street designation.

A.3 If **A.2** is yes, is the project making the dedications and improvements as necessary to meet the designated dimensions of the fronting street (Boulevard I, and II, or Avenue I, II, or III)?

× Yes No N/A

If the answer is to **A.1 or A.2 is NO, or to A.1, A.2 and A.3. is YES**, then the project does not conflict with the dedication and improvement requirements that are needed to comply with the Mobility Plan 2035 Street Designations and Standard Roadway Dimensions.

A.4 If the answer to **A.3. is NO**, is the project applicant asking to waive from the dedication standards?

Lists any streets subject to dedications or voluntary dedications and include existing roadway and sidewalk widths, required roadway and sidewalk widths, and proposed roadway and sidewalk width or waivers.

| Frontage 1 Existing PROW'/Curb' : Existing _ | 70'/54' | _Required | 72'/46' | _Proposed | 73'/54' |
|--|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|
| Maxella Avenue: Avenue III | | | | | |
| Frontage 2 Existing PROW'/Curb' : Existing _ | 90'/70' | _Required | 66'/40' | _Proposed | 93'/70' |
| Glencoe Avenue: Collector | | | | | |
| Frontage 3 Existing PROW'/Curb' : Existing _ | | _Required | | _Proposed | |
| | | | | | |
| Frontage 4 Existing PROW'/Curb' : Existing _ | | _Required | | _Proposed | |



If the answer to **A.4 is NO**, the project is inconsistent with Mobility Plan 2035 street designations and must file for a waiver of street dedication and improvement.

If the answer to **A.4 is YES**, additional analysis is necessary to determine if the dedication and/or improvements are necessary to meet the City's mobility needs for the next 20 years. The following factors may contribute to determine if the dedication or improvement is necessary:

Is the project site along any of the following networks identified in the City's Mobility Plan?

- Transit Enhanced Network
- Bicycle Enhanced Network
- Bicycle Lane Network
- Pedestrian Enhanced District
- Neighborhood Enhanced Network

To see the location of the above networks, see Transportation Assessment Support Map.¹

Is the project within the service area of Metro Bike Share, or is there demonstrated demand for micromobility services?

If the project dedications and improvements asking to be waived are necessary to meet the City's mobility needs, the project may be found to conflict with a plan that is adopted to protect the environment.

B. Mobility Plan 2035 PROW Policy Alignment with Project-Initiated Changes

B.1 Project-Initiated Changes to the PROW Dimensions

These questions address potential conflict with:

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 2.1 – Adaptive Reuse of Streets. Design, plan, and operate streets to serve multiple purposes and provide flexibility in design to adapt to future demands.

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 2.3 – Pedestrian Infrastructure. Recognize walking as a component of every trip, and ensure high quality pedestrian access in all site planning and public right-of-way modifications to provide a safe and comfortable walking environment.

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 3.2 – *People with Disabilities. Accommodate the needs of people with disabilities when modifying or installing infrastructure in the public right-of-way.*

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 2.10 – *Loading Areas. Facilitate the provision of adequate on and offsite street loading areas.*

Mobility Plan 2035 Street Designations and Standard Roadway Dimensions

¹ LADOT Transportation Assessment Support Map <u>https://arcg.is/fubbD</u>



B.1 Does the project physically modify the curb placement or turning radius and/or physically alter the sidewalk and parkways space that changes how people access a property?

Examples of physical changes to the public right-of-way include:

- widening the roadway,
- narrowing the sidewalk,
- adding space for vehicle turn outs or loading areas,
- removing bicycle lanes, bike share stations, or bicycle parking
- modifying existing bus stop, transit shelter, or other street furniture
- paving, narrowing, shifting or removing an existing parkway or tree well

Yes X No

B.2 Driveway Access

These questions address potential conflict with:

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 2.10 – *Loading Areas. Facilitate the provision of adequate on and offsite street loading areas.*

Mobility Plan 2035 Program PL.1. Driveway Access. Require driveway access to buildings from non-arterial streets or alleys (where feasible) in order to minimize interference with pedestrian access and vehicular movement.

Citywide Design Guidelines - Guideline 2: Carefully incorporate vehicular access such that it does not degrade the pedestrian experience.

Site Planning Best Practices:

- Prioritize pedestrian access first and automobile access second. Orient parking and driveways toward the rear or side of buildings and away from the public right-of-way. On corner lots, parking should be oriented as far from the corner as possible.
- Minimize both the number of driveway entrances and overall driveway widths.
- Do not locate drop-off/pick-up areas between principal building entrances and the adjoining sidewalks.
- Orient vehicular access as far from street intersections as possible.
- Place drive-thru elements away from intersections and avoid placing them so that they create a barrier between the sidewalk and building entrance(s).
- Ensure that loading areas do not interfere with on-site pedestrian and vehicular circulation by separating loading areas and larger commercial vehicles from areas that are used for public parking and public entrances.

B.2 Does the project add new driveways along a street designated as an Avenue or a Boulevard that conflict with LADOT's Driveway Design Guidelines (See Sec. 321 in the Manual of Policies and Procedures) by any of the following:

- locating new driveways for residential properties on an Avenue or Boulevard, and access is otherwise possible using an alley or a collector/local street, or
- locating new driveways for industrial or commercial properties on an Avenue or Boulevard and access is possible along a collector/local street, or



- the total number of new driveways exceeds 1 driveway per every 200 feet² along on the Avenue or Boulevard frontage, or
- locating new driveways on an Avenue or Boulevard within 150 feet from the intersecting street, or
- locating new driveways on a collector or local street within 75 feet from the intersecting street, or
- locating new driveways near mid-block crosswalks, requiring relocation of the mid-block crosswalk

| Yes | х | No |
|-----|---|----|
|-----|---|----|

If the answer to **B.1 and B.2 are both NO**, then the project would not conflict with a plan or policies that govern the PROW as a result of the project-initiated changes to the PROW.

Impact Analysis

If the answer to either **B.1 or B.2 are YES**, City plans and policies should be reviewed in light of the proposed physical changes to determine if the City would be obstructed from carrying out the plans and policies. The analysis should pay special consideration to substantial changes to the Public Right of Way that may either degrade existing facilities for people walking and bicycling (e.g., removing a bicycle lane), or preclude the City from completing complete street infrastructure as identified in the Mobility Plan 2035, especially if the physical changes are along streets that are on the High Injury Network (HIN). The analysis should also consider if the project is in a Transit Oriented Community (TOC) area, and would degrade or inhibit trips made by biking, walking and/ or transit ridership. The streets that need special consideration are those that are included on the following networks identified in the Mobility Plan 2035, or the HIN:

- Transit Enhanced Network
- Bicycle Enhanced Network
- Bicycle Lane Network
- Pedestrian Enhanced District
- Neighborhood Enhanced Network
- High Injury Network

To see the location of the above networks, see Transportation Assessment Support Map.³

Once the project is reviewed relevant to plans and policies, and existing facilities that may be impacted by the project, the analysis will need to answer the following two questions in concluding if there is an impact due to plan inconsistency.

B.2.1 Would the physical changes in the public right of way or new driveways that conflict with LADOT's Driveway Design Guidelines degrade the experience of vulnerable roadway users such as modify, remove, or otherwise negatively impact existing bicycle, transit, and/or pedestrian infrastructure?



² for a project frontage that exceeds 400 feet along an Avenue or Boulevard, the incremental additional driveway above 2 is more than 1 driveway for every 400 additional feet.

³ LADOT Transportation Assessment Support Map <u>https://arcg.is/fubbD</u>



B.2.2 Would the physical modifications or new driveways that conflict with LADOT's Driveway Design Guidelines preclude the City from advancing the safety of vulnerable roadway users?

Yes No X N/A

If either of the answers to either **B.2.1 or B.2.2 are YES**, the project may conflict with the Mobility Plan 2035, and therefore conflict with a plan that is adopted to protect the environment. If either of the answers to both **B.2.1. or B.2.2. are NO**, then the project would not be shown to conflict with plans or policies that govern the Public Right-of-Way.

C. Network Access

C. 1 Alley, Street and Stairway Access

These questions address potential conflict with:

Mobility Plan Policy 3.9 Increased Network Access: Discourage the vacation of public rights-ofway.

C.1.1 Does the project propose to vacate or otherwise restrict public access to a street, alley, or public stairway?

Yes × No

C.1.2 If the answer to C.1.1 is Yes, will the project provide or maintain public access to people walking and biking on the street, alley or stairway?

Yes No X N/A

C.2 New Cul-de-sacs

These questions address potential conflict with:

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 3.10 Cul-de-sacs: Discourage the use of cul-de-sacs that do not provide access for active transportation options.

C.2.1 Does the project create a cul-de-sac or is the project located adjacent to an existing cul-de-sac? Yes X No

C.2.2 If yes, will the cul-de-sac maintain convenient and direct public access to people walking and biking to the adjoining street network?

Yes No X N/A

If the answers to either C.1.2 or C.2.2 are YES, then the project would not conflict with a plan or policies that ensures access for all modes of travel. If the answer to either C.1.2 or C.2.2 are NO, the project may conflict with a plan or policies that governs multimodal access to a property. Further analysis must assess to the degree that pedestrians and bicyclists have sufficient public access to the transportation network.



D. Parking Supply and Transportation Demand Management

These questions address potential conflict with:

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 3.8 – Bicycle Parking, Provide bicyclists with convenient, secure and well maintained bicycle parking facilities.

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 4.8 – Transportation Demand Management Strategies. Encourage greater utilization of Transportation Demand Management Strategies to reduce dependence on single-occupancy vehicles.

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 4.13 – Parking and Land Use Management: Balance on-street and offstreet parking supply with other transportation and land use objectives.

D.1 Would the project propose a supply of onsite parking that exceeds the baseline amount⁴ as required in the Los Angeles Municipal Code or a Specific plan, whichever requirement prevails?

Yes X No

D.2 If the answer to D.1. is YES, would the project propose to actively manage the demand of parking by independently pricing the supply to all users (e.g. parking cash-out), or for residential properties, unbundle the supply from the lease or sale of residential units?

Yes No X N/A

If the answer to **D.2.** is **NO** the project may conflict with parking management policies. Further analysis is needed to demonstrate how the supply of parking above city requirements will not result in additional (induced) drive-alone trips as compared to an alternative that provided no more parking than the baseline required by the LAMC or Specific Plan. If there is potential for the supply of parking to result in induced demand for drive-alone trips, the project should further explore transportation demand management (TDM) measures to further off-set the induced demands of driving and vehicle miles travelled (VMT) that may result from higher amounts of on-site parking. The TDM measures should specifically focus on strategies that encourage dynamic and context-sensitive pricing solutions and ensure the parking is efficiently allocated, such as providing real time information. Research has demonstrated that charging a user cost for parking or providing a 'cash-out' option in return for not using it is the most effective strategy to reduce the instances of drive-alone trips and increase non-auto mode share to further reduce VMT. To ensure the parking is efficiently managed and reduce the need to build parking for future uses, further strategies should include sharing parking with other properties and/or the general public.

D.3. Would the project provide the minimum on and off-site bicycle parking spaces as required by Section 12.21 A.16 of the LAMC?

× Yes No

⁴ The baseline parking is defined here as the default parking requirements in section 12.21 A.4 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code or any applicable Specific Plan, whichever prevails, for each applicable use not taking into consideration other parking incentives to reduce the amount of required parking.



D.4. Does the Project include more than 25,000 square feet of gross floor area construction of new non-residential gross floor?

x Yes No

D.5 If the answer to D.4. is YES, does the project comply with the City's TDM Ordinance in Section 12.26 J of the LAMC?

× Yes No N/A

If the answer to **D.3. or D.5. is NO** the project conflicts with LAMC code requirements of bicycle parking and TDM measures. If the project includes uses that require bicycle parking (Section 12.21 A.16) or TDM (Section 12.26 J), and the project does not comply with those Sections of the LAMC, further analysis is required to ensure that the project supports the intent of the two LAMC sections. To meet the intent of bicycle parking requirements, the analysis should identify how the project commits to providing safe access to those traveling by bicycle and accommodates storing their bicycle in locations that demonstrates priority over vehicle access.

Similarly, to meet the intent of the TDM requirements of Section 12.26 J of the LAMC, the analysis should identify how the project commits to providing effective strategies in either physical facilities or programs that encourage non-drive alone trips to and from the project site and changes in work schedule that move trips out of the peak period or eliminate them altogether (as in the case in telecommuting or compressed work weeks).

E. Consistency with Regional Plans

This section addresses potential inconsistencies with greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets forecasted in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) / Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).

E.1 Does the Project or Plan apply one the City's efficiency-based impact thresholds (i.e. VMT per capita, VMT per employee, or VMT per service population) as discussed in Section 2.2.3 of the TAG?

× Yes No

E.2 If the Answer to E.1 is YES, does the Project or Plan result in a significant VMT impact? Yes X No N/A

E.3 If the Answer to E.1 is NO, does the Project result in a net increase in VMT?

Yes No X N/A

If the Answer to E.2 or E.3 is NO, then the Project or Plan is shown to align with the long-term VMT and GHG reduction goals of SCAG's RTP/SCS.

E.4 If the Answer to E.2 or E.3 is YES, then further evaluation would be necessary to determine whether such a project or land use plan would be shown to be consistent with VMT and GHG reduction goals of the SCAG RTP/SCS. For the purpose of making a finding that a project is consistent with the GHG reduction targets forecasted in the SCAG RTP/SCS, the project analyst should consult Section 2.2.4 of the Transportation Assessment Guidelines (TAG). Section 2.2.4 provides the methodology for evaluating a land use project's cumulative impacts to VMT, and the appropriate reliance on SCAG's most recently adopted RTP/SCS in reaching that conclusion.



The analysis methods therein can further support findings that the project is consistent with the general use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in either a sustainable communities strategy or an alternative planning strategy for which the State Air Resources Board, pursuant to Section 65080(b)(2)(H) of the Government Code, has accepted a metropolitan planning organization's determination that the sustainable communities strategy or the alternative planning strategy would, if implemented, achieve the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.

References

BOE Street Standard Dimensions S-470-1 http://eng2.lacity.org/techdocs/stdplans/s-400/S-470-1 20151021 150849.pdf

LADCP <u>Citywide Design Guidelines</u>. <u>https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/f6608be7-d5fe-4187-bea6-</u>20618eec5049/Citywide Design Guidelines.pdf

LADOT Transportation Assessment Support Map https://arcg.is/fubbD

Mobility Plan 2035 <u>https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/523f2a95-9d72-41d7-aba5-1972f84c1d36/Mobility_Plan_2035.pdf</u>

SCAG. Connect SoCal, 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, https://www.connectsocal.org/Pages/default.aspx

ATTACHMENT D.1: CITY PLAN, POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

<u>The Transportation Element of the City's General Plan, Mobility Plan 2035</u>, established the "Complete Streets Design Guide" as the City's document to guide the operations and design of streets and other public rights-of-way. It lays out a vision for designing safer, more vibrant streets that are accessible to people, no matter what their mode choice. As a living document, it is intended to be frequently updated as City departments identify and implement street standards and experiment with different configurations to promote complete streets. The guide is meant to be a toolkit that provides numerous examples of what is possible in the public right-of-way and that provides guidance on context-sensitive design.

The <u>Plan for A Healthy Los Angeles</u> (March 2015) includes policies directing several City departments to develop plans that promote active transportation and safety.

The <u>City of Los Angeles Community Plans, which make up the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan</u>, guide the physical development of neighborhoods by establishing the goals and policies for land use. The 35 Community Plans provide specific, neighborhood-level detail for land uses and the transportation network, relevant policies, and implementation strategies necessary to achieve General Plan and community-specific objectives.

The stated goal of <u>Vision Zero</u> is to eliminate traffic-related deaths in Los Angeles by 2025 through a number of strategies, including modifying the design of streets to increase the safety of vulnerable road users. Extensive crash data analysis is conducted on an ongoing basis to prioritize intersections and corridors for implementation of projects that will have the greatest effect on overall fatality reduction. The City designs and deploys <u>Vision Zero Corridor Plans</u> as part of the implementation of Vision Zero. If a project is proposed whose site lies on the High Injury Network (HIN), the applicant should consult with LADOT to inform the project's site plan and to determine appropriate improvements, whether by funding their implementation in full or by making a contribution toward their implementation.

The <u>Citywide Design Guidelines</u> (October 24, 2019) includes sections relevant to development projects where improvements are proposed within the public realm. Specifically, Guidelines one through three provide building design strategies that support the pedestrian experience. The Guidelines provide best practices in designing that apply in three spatial categories of site planning, building design and public right of way. The Guidelines should be followed to ensure that the project design supports pedestrian safety, access and comfort as they access to and from the building and the immediate public right of way.

The City's <u>Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance (LA Municipal Code 12.26.J)</u> requires certain projects to incorporate strategies that reduce drive-alone vehicle trips and improve access to destinations and services. The ordinance is revised and updated periodically and should be reviewed for application to specific projects as they are reviewed.

The City's <u>LAMC Section 12.37 (Waivers of Dedication and Improvement)</u> requires certain projects to dedicate and/or implement improvements within the public right-of-way to meet the street designation standards of the Mobility Plan 2035.

The Bureau of Engineering (BOE) <u>Street Standard Dimensions S-470-1</u> provides the specific street widths and public right of way dimensions associated with the City's street standards.

Detailed Responses in Support of General Consistency with Transportation-Related Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies (Adapted from Attachment D in *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2020)

The items below correspond with the TAG Attachment D: Plan, Policy, and Program Consistency Worksheet. Defined terms below have the same meanings as in the Transportation Assessment.

A. MOBILITY PLAN 2035 (MP 2035) PROW CLASSIFICATION STANDARDS FOR DEDICATIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS

MP 2035 Policy 2.1 – Adaptive Reuse of Streets. Design, plan, and operate streets to serve multiple purposes and provide flexibility in design to adapt to future demands.

• Option A is required to make dedications or improvements to the public right-of way. Specifically, a three-foot street dedication is required for Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue along the Project Site. Option A will not alter adjacent streets or the right-of-way in a manner that would preclude or conflict future changes by various City Departments.

MP 2035 Policy 2.3 – Pedestrian Infrastructure. Recognize walking as a component of every trip and ensure high quality pedestrian access in all site planning and public right-of-way modifications to provide a safe and comfortable walking environment.

• Option A will not alter pedestrian infrastructure or the right-of-way in a manner that would preclude or conflict future changes by various City Departments. Option A prioritizes pedestrian access and connectivity, consistent with Maxella Avenue's designation as a Pedestrian Enhanced District (PED). Option A will make a three-foot street dedication on Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue along the Project Site. Once the dedications are provided, the City will be free to install modifications along Maxella Avenue as part of the PED network. Option A includes a paved pedestrian paseo internal to the Project Site, which provides safe connections to the various buildings on the Project Site. Additionally, the pedestrian paseo will provide connections to the sidewalk along the Project Site's Glencoe Avenue frontage, as well as the Project Site's Ocean Way frontage.

MP 2035 Policy 3.2 – People with Disabilities. Accommodate the needs of people with disabilities when modifying of installing infrastructure within the public right-of-way.

• Option A will not alter existing ADA infrastructure or the right-of-way in a manner that would preclude or conflict future changes by various City Departments.

MP 2035 Street Designations and Standard Roadway Dimensions

• Option A proposes new construction along a street designated as a Boulevard I and II, and/or Avenue I, II, or III on property zoned for R3 or less restrictive zone. Maxella Avenue is designated as an Avenue III under the MP 2035 Street Standards Plan. Glencoe

Avenue is designated as a Collector under the MP 2035 Street Standards Plan. The Project Site is zoned [Q]M1-1 per LAMC.

MP 2035 Networks

- The Project Site has frontage along the following networks in MP 2035:
 - Pedestrian Enhanced District: Maxella Avenue (See analysis of MP Policy 2.3 above).
 - Neighborhood Enhanced Network: Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue

MP 2035 Policy 2.4 – Neighborhood Enhanced Network. Provide a slow speed network of locally serving streets.

• Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue have been designated within the City's Neighborhood Enhanced Netowork (NEN). Option A will make the required three-foot street dedication along Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue to comply with MP 2035. Once the dedication is provided, the City will be free to install modifications such as shared laned markings as part of the NEN. Option A will not modify Maxella Avenue or Glencoe Avenue in a way that would substantially increase travel speed.

B. MOBILITY PLAN 2035 (MP 2035) PROW POLICY ALIGNMENT WITH PROJECT-INITIATED CHANGES

B.1. Project-Initiated Changes to the PROW Dimensions

MP 2035 Policy 2.1 – Adaptive Reuse of Streets. Design, plan, and operate streets to serve multiple purposes and provide flexibility in design to adapt to future demands.

• Option A is required to make dedications or improvements to the public right-of way. Specifically, a three-foot street dedication is required for Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue along the Project Site. Option A is not proposing any additional dedications or improvements to the public right-of-way. Option A will not alter adjacent streets or the right-of-way in a manner that would preclude or conflict future changes by various City Departments.

MP 2035 Policy 2.3 – Pedestrian Infrastructure. Recognize walking as a component of every trip and ensure high quality pedestrian access in all site planning and public right-of-way modifications to provide a safe and comfortable walking environment.

• Option A will not alter pedestrian infrastructure or the right-of-way in a manner that would preclude or conflict future changes by various City Departments. Option A prioritizes pedestrian access and connectivity, consistent with Maxella Avenue's designation as a Pedestrian Enhanced District (PED). Option A will make a three-foot street dedication on Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue along the Project Site. Once the dedications are provided, the City will be free to install modifications along Maxella Avenue as part of the

PED network. Option A includes a paved pedestrian paseo internal to the Project Site, which provides safe connections to the various buildings on the Project Site. Additionally, the pedestrian paseo will provide connections to the sidewalk along the Project Site's Glencoe Avenue frontage, as well as the Project Site's Ocean Way frontage.

MP 2035 *Policy* 3.2 – *People with Disabilities. Accommodate the needs of people with disabilities when modifying of installing infrastructure within the public right-of-way.*

• Option A will not alter existing ADA infrastructure or the right-of-way in a manner that would preclude or conflict future changes by various City Departments.

MP 2035 *Policy* 2.10 – *Loading Areas. Facilitate the provision of on and off-site street loading areas.*

• All loading activities will occur off-street and internal to the Project Site. Loading activities associated with service and delivery operations, trash collection and Waste Management for Option A will occur along the south side of the westerly residential building and the south side of the southerly residential building (i.e., at the westerly and southeasterly portions of the Project Site). Service and delivery vehicles will utilize the northerly and southerly Glencoe Avenue driveways to access Option A's service areas.

MP 2035 Street Designations and Standard Roadway Dimensions

• Option A does include additions or new construction along a street designated as a Boulevard I and II, and/or Avenue I, II, or III on property zoned for R3 or less restrictive zone. Maxella Avenue is designated as an Avenue III under the MP 2035 Street Standards Plan. Glencoe Avenue is designated as a Collector under the MP 2035 Street Standards Plan. The Project Site is zoned [Q]M1-1 per LAMC.

B.2. Driveway Access

MP 2035 *Policy* 2.10 – *Loading Areas. Facilitate the provision of on and off-site street loading areas.*

• All loading activities will occur off-street and internal to the Project Site. Loading activities associated with service and delivery operations, trash collection and Waste Management for Option A will occur along the south side of the westerly residential building and the south side of the southerly residential building (i.e., at the westerly and southeasterly portions of the Project Site). Service and delivery vehicles will utilize the northerly and southerly Glencoe Avenue driveways to access Option A's service areas.

MP 2035 Program PL.1. Driveway Access. Require driveway access to buildings from nonarterial streets or alleys (where feasible) in order to minimize interference with pedestrian access and vehicular movement.

• Driveway access to the Project Site will be provided via Ocean Way, a private driveway, Maxella Avenue, an Avenue III, and Glencoe Avenue, a Collector. While the existing Maxella Avenue driveway will be shifted approximately 101 feet to the east, the overall number of curb cuts on Maxella Avenue adjacent to the Project Site will not change. The number of driveways on Glencoe Avenue adjacent to the Project Site will be reduced from two to one, and the northerly Glencoe Avenue driveway will be shifted approximately 113 feet south of the existing driveway, further south from the Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue intersection. Option A has been designed to minimize interference with pedestrian access and vehicular movement.

Citywide Design Guidelines – Guideline 2. Carefully incorporate vehicular access such that it does not degrade the pedestrian experience.

- Prioritize pedestrian access first and automobile access second. Orient parking and driveways toward the rear or side of buildings and away from the public right-of-way. On corner lots, parking should be oriented as far from the corner as possible.
 - Option A prioritizes pedestrian access first. Option A will reduce the number of curb cuts along Glencoe Avenue from three to two. Vehicular access to the Project Site's parking garages from the Ocean Way and Glencoe Avenue access points will be provided on the sides of buildings, away from the public-right-of-way. While vehicular access to one of the onsite parking garages will be provided along Maxella Avenue, Option A will not add additional curb cuts to the Maxella Avenue public right-of-way. The Maxella Avenue driveway will be located approximately 154 feet west of the Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue intersection. The northerly Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue intersection.
- Minimize both the number of driveway entrances and overall driveway widths.
 - Option A proposes driveway entrances from the public right-of-way at the Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue intersection, along Maxella Avenue approximately 154 feet west of the Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue intersection, along Glencoe Avenue approximately 272 feet south of the Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue intersection, and at the existing southerly Glencoe Avenue driveway. Option A will reduce the number of curb cuts along the Project Site's frontage from two to one. All driveways will be constructed in accordance with City Standards.

- Do not locate drop-off/pick-up areas between principal building entrances and the adjoining sidewalks.
 - A passenger loading area is proposed internal to the Project Site with the westerly residential building's parking garage.
- Orient vehicular access as far from street intersections as possible.
 - The Maxella Avenue driveway will be located approximately 154 feet west of the Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue intersection. The northerly Glencoe Avenue driveway will be located approximately 272 feet south of the Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue intersection.
- Place drive-through elements away from intersections and avoid placing them so that they create a barrier between the sidewalk and building entrance(s).
 - Option A does not propose any drive-through elements.
- Ensure that loading areas do not interfere with onsite pedestrian and vehicular circulation by separating loading areas and larger commercial vehicles from areas that are used for public parking and public entrances.
 - All loading activities will occur off-street and internal to the Project Site. Loading activities associated with service and delivery operations, trash collection and Waste Management for Option A will occur along the south side of the westerly residential building and the south side of the southerly residential building (i.e., at the westerly and southeasterly portions of the Project Site), away from access points to parking and public entrances. Service and delivery vehicles will utilize the northerly and southerly Glencoe Avenue driveways to access Option A's service areas.

C. NETWORK ACCESS

C.1. Alley, Street and Stairway Access

MP 2035 Policy 3.9 – Increased Network Access. Discourage the vacation of public rights-ofway.

• Option A will not vacate any public rights-of-way.

C.2. New Cul-de-sacs

 $MP \ 2035 \ Policy \ 3.10 - Cul-de-sacs$. Discourage the use of cul-de-sacs that do not provide access for active transportation options.

• The Project Site is not located on a cul-de-sac.

D. PARKING SUPPLY AND TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

MP 2035 Policy 3.8 – Bicycle Parking. Provide bicyclists with convenient, secure, and wellmaintained bicycle parking facilities.

• Option A is required to provide 79 short-term and 672 long-term bicycle parking spaces in accordance with LAMC. Option A will provide the LAMC-required number of short-term and long-term bicycle parking spaces. Secure bicycle parking will be provided on all levels of the onsite parking garages.

MP 2035 Policy 4.8 – Transportation Demand Management Strategies. Encourage greater utilization of Transportation Demand Management Strategies to reduce dependance on single-occupancy vehicles.

• The Applicant will comply with existing applicable City ordinances (e.g., the City's existing TDM Ordinance, referred to in the LAMC Section 12.26.J) and the other requirements per the City's Municipal Code, as well as the TDM requirements of the Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan.

MP 2035 Policy 4.13 – Parking and Land Use Management. Balance on-street and off-street parking supply with other transportation and land use objectives.

• Option A will provide a total of 1,217 vehicle parking spaces will be provided onsite upon completion. The Project Site will provide vehicle parking spaces in accordance with LAMC. Additionally, the Project will provide the LAMC-required number of short-term and long-term bicycle parking spaces. Additionally, Option A is within convenient walking distance to public transit routes along Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue.

E. CONSISTENCY WITH REGIONAL PLANS

Option A applies one of the City's efficiency-based impact thresholds (i.e., VMT per Capita and VMT per Employee) as discussed in Section 4.2 of the Transportation Assessment. The VMT analysis concludes that Option A will not result in a significant VMT impact. As Option A will not result in a significant VMT impact. As Option A will greenhouse gas (GHG) goals of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS).

Additional Review

The following provides a review of the transportation-related goals listed in the Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles (Healthy LA).

• Option A supports the transportation-related goals listed in Healthy LA. Option A is designed in a manner that facilitates travel on foot between the Project Site and nearby transit facilities and commercial destination. Option A will provide the LAMC-required

number of bicycle parking spaces. Option A would not conflict with, limit, or preclude the City's ability to implement programs and policies in furtherance of Healthy LA.

The following provides a review of the transportation-related goals listed in the Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey Community Plan. The Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey Community Plan was adopted in 1997. While an updated Community Plan is currently under development, the plan from 1997 is currently in effect and forms the basis for this review of conflicts relating to the transportation system.

From a transportation perspective, the Community Plan offers the following goals and objectives related to Option A.

Objective 10-2: To increase the work trips and non-work trips made on public transit.

• Option A is located within convenient walking distance to many public transit lines along Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue.

Objective 11-1: To pursue transportation management strategies that can maximize vehicle occupancy, minimize average trip length, and reduce the number of vehicle trips.

Policy 11-1.1: Encourage non-residential development to provide employee incentives for utilizing alternatives to the automobile, such as carpools, vanpools, buses, flex time, bicycles, and walking.

Policy 11-1.2: Encourage the use of multiple-occupancy vehicle programs for shopping and other activities to reduce midday traffic.

• The Applicant will comply with existing applicable City ordinances (e.g., the City's existing TDM Ordinance, referred to in the LAMC Section 12.26.J) and the other requirements per the City's Municipal Code, as well as the TDM requirements of the Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan.

Objective 12-1: To promote an adequate system of bikeways for commuter, school, and recreational use.

Policy 12-1.4: Encourage the provision of changing rooms, showers, and bicycle storage at new and existing non-residential developments and public places.

• Option A is required to provide 79 short-term and 672 long-term bicycle parking spaces in accordance with LAMC. Option A will provide the LAMC-required number of short-term and long-term bicycle parking spaces. Secure bicycle parking will be provided on all levels of the onsite parking garages.

Objective 12-2: To promote pedestrian oriented mobility and utilization of the bicycle for commuter, school, recreational use, economic activity, and access to transit facilities.

• Option A includes a paved pedestrian paseo internal to the Project Site, which provides safe connections to the various buildings on the Project Site. Additionally, the pedestrian paseo will provide connections to the sidewalk along the Project Site's Glencoe Avenue frontage, as well as the Project Site's Ocean Way frontage. Option A is required to provide 79 short-term and 672 long-term bicycle parking spaces in accordance with the LAMC. Option A will provide the LAMC-required number of short-term and long-term bicycle parking spaces. Secure bicycle parking will be provided on all levels of the onsite parking garages.

Objective 13-1: To provide parking in appropriate locations in accordance with Citywide standards and community needs.

Policy 13-1.1: *Consolidate parking where appropriate, to minimize the number of ingress and egress points onto arterials.*

Policy 13-1.2: New parking lots and garages shall be developed in accordance with design standards.

• Parking will be provided onsite in accordance with LAMC. Vehicular access to the Project Site's Ocean Way access points from Maxella Avenue will be maintained. The existing Maxella Avenue driveway will be shifted approximately 101 feet east of the existing driveway location. Option A will reduce the number of curb cuts along the Project Site's Glencoe Avenue frontage from two to one and will shift the existing northerly Glencoe Avenue driveway approximately 113 feet to the south to provide a greater distance between the driveway and the Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue intersection to the north. The onsite parking garages will be developed in accordance with City standards.

APPENDIX H

DETAILED PLANS, PROGRAMS, ORDINANCES, AND POLICIES REVIEW OPTION B

The worksheet provides a structured approach to evaluate the threshold T-1 question below, that asks whether a project conflicts with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system. The intention of the worksheet is to streamline the project review by highlighting the most relevant plans, policies and programs when assessing potential impacts to the City's circulation system.

Threshold T-1: Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?

This worksheet does not include an exhaustive list of City policies, and does not include community plans, specific plans, or any area-specific regulatory overlays. The Department of City Planning project planner will need to be consulted to determine if the project would obstruct the City from carrying out a policy or program in a community plan, specific plan, streetscape plan, or regulatory overlay that was adopted to support multimodal transportation options or public safety. LADOT staff should be consulted if a project would lead to a conflict with a mobility investment in the Public Right of Way (PROW) that is currently undergoing planning, design, or delivery. This worksheet must be completed for all projects that meet the Section I. Screening Criteria. For description of the relevant planning documents, **see Attachment D.1**.

For any response to the following questions that checks the box in bold text ((i.e. Yes or No), further analysis is needed to demonstrate that the project does not conflict with a plan, policy, or program.

I. SCREENING CRITERIA FOR POLICY ANALYSIS

If the answer is 'yes' to any of the following questions, further analysis will be required:

Does the project require a discretionary action that requires the decision maker to find that the project would substantially conform to the purpose, intent and provisions of the General Plan?

× Yes No

Is the project known to directly conflict with a transportation plan, policy, or program adopted to support multimodal transportation options or public safety?

Yes X No

Is the project required to or proposing to make any voluntary modifications to the public right-of-way (i.e., dedications and/or improvements in the right-of-way, reconfigurations of curb line, etc.)?

× Yes 📃 No

II. PLAN CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

A. Mobility Plan 2035 PROW Classification Standards for Dedications and Improvements

These questions address potential conflict with:



Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 2.1 – Adaptive Reuse of Streets. Design, plan, and operate streets to serve multiple purposes and provide flexibility in design to adapt to future demands.

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 2.3 – Pedestrian Infrastructure. Recognize walking as a component of every trip, and ensure high quality pedestrian access in all site planning and public right-of-way modifications to provide a safe and comfortable walking environment.

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 3.2 – *People with Disabilities. Accommodate the needs of people with disabilities when modifying or installing infrastructure in the public right-of-way.*

Mobility Plan 2035 Street Designations and Standard Roadway Dimensions

A.1 Does the project include additions or new construction along a street designated as a Boulevard I, and II, and/or Avenue I, II, or III on property zoned for R3 or less restrictive zone? X Yes No

A.2 If **A.1 is yes**, is the project required to make additional dedications or improvements to the Public Right of Way as demonstrated by the street designation.

A.3 If **A.2** is yes, is the project making the dedications and improvements as necessary to meet the designated dimensions of the fronting street (Boulevard I, and II, or Avenue I, II, or III)?

× Yes No N/A

If the answer is to **A.1 or A.2 is NO, or to A.1, A.2 and A.3. is YES**, then the project does not conflict with the dedication and improvement requirements that are needed to comply with the Mobility Plan 2035 Street Designations and Standard Roadway Dimensions.

A.4 If the answer to **A.3. is NO**, is the project applicant asking to waive from the dedication standards?

Lists any streets subject to dedications or voluntary dedications and include existing roadway and sidewalk widths, required roadway and sidewalk widths, and proposed roadway and sidewalk width or waivers.

| Frontage 1 Existing PROW'/Curb' : Existing _ | 70'/54' | _Required | 72'/46' | Proposed | 73'/54' |
|--|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|
| Maxella Avenue: Avenue III | | | | | |
| Frontage 2 Existing PROW'/Curb' : Existing _ | 90'/70' | _Required | 66'/40' | Proposed | 93'/70' |
| Glencoe Avenue: Collector | | | | | |
| Frontage 3 Existing PROW'/Curb' : Existing _ | | _Required | | _Proposed | |
| | | | | | |
| Frontage 4 Existing PROW'/Curb' : Existing _ | | _Required | | _Proposed | |



If the answer to **A.4 is NO**, the project is inconsistent with Mobility Plan 2035 street designations and must file for a waiver of street dedication and improvement.

If the answer to **A.4 is YES**, additional analysis is necessary to determine if the dedication and/or improvements are necessary to meet the City's mobility needs for the next 20 years. The following factors may contribute to determine if the dedication or improvement is necessary:

Is the project site along any of the following networks identified in the City's Mobility Plan?

- Transit Enhanced Network
- Bicycle Enhanced Network
- Bicycle Lane Network
- Pedestrian Enhanced District
- Neighborhood Enhanced Network

To see the location of the above networks, see Transportation Assessment Support Map.¹

Is the project within the service area of Metro Bike Share, or is there demonstrated demand for micromobility services?

If the project dedications and improvements asking to be waived are necessary to meet the City's mobility needs, the project may be found to conflict with a plan that is adopted to protect the environment.

B. Mobility Plan 2035 PROW Policy Alignment with Project-Initiated Changes

B.1 Project-Initiated Changes to the PROW Dimensions

These questions address potential conflict with:

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 2.1 – Adaptive Reuse of Streets. Design, plan, and operate streets to serve multiple purposes and provide flexibility in design to adapt to future demands.

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 2.3 – Pedestrian Infrastructure. Recognize walking as a component of every trip, and ensure high quality pedestrian access in all site planning and public right-of-way modifications to provide a safe and comfortable walking environment.

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 3.2 – *People with Disabilities. Accommodate the needs of people with disabilities when modifying or installing infrastructure in the public right-of-way.*

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 2.10 – *Loading Areas. Facilitate the provision of adequate on and offsite street loading areas.*

Mobility Plan 2035 Street Designations and Standard Roadway Dimensions

¹ LADOT Transportation Assessment Support Map <u>https://arcg.is/fubbD</u>



B.1 Does the project physically modify the curb placement or turning radius and/or physically alter the sidewalk and parkways space that changes how people access a property?

Examples of physical changes to the public right-of-way include:

- widening the roadway,
- narrowing the sidewalk,
- adding space for vehicle turn outs or loading areas,
- removing bicycle lanes, bike share stations, or bicycle parking
- modifying existing bus stop, transit shelter, or other street furniture
- paving, narrowing, shifting or removing an existing parkway or tree well

Yes X No

B.2 Driveway Access

These questions address potential conflict with:

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 2.10 – *Loading Areas. Facilitate the provision of adequate on and offsite street loading areas.*

Mobility Plan 2035 Program PL.1. Driveway Access. Require driveway access to buildings from non-arterial streets or alleys (where feasible) in order to minimize interference with pedestrian access and vehicular movement.

Citywide Design Guidelines - Guideline 2: Carefully incorporate vehicular access such that it does not degrade the pedestrian experience.

Site Planning Best Practices:

- Prioritize pedestrian access first and automobile access second. Orient parking and driveways toward the rear or side of buildings and away from the public right-of-way. On corner lots, parking should be oriented as far from the corner as possible.
- Minimize both the number of driveway entrances and overall driveway widths.
- Do not locate drop-off/pick-up areas between principal building entrances and the adjoining sidewalks.
- Orient vehicular access as far from street intersections as possible.
- Place drive-thru elements away from intersections and avoid placing them so that they create a barrier between the sidewalk and building entrance(s).
- Ensure that loading areas do not interfere with on-site pedestrian and vehicular circulation by separating loading areas and larger commercial vehicles from areas that are used for public parking and public entrances.

B.2 Does the project add new driveways along a street designated as an Avenue or a Boulevard that conflict with LADOT's Driveway Design Guidelines (See Sec. 321 in the Manual of Policies and Procedures) by any of the following:

- locating new driveways for residential properties on an Avenue or Boulevard, and access is otherwise possible using an alley or a collector/local street, or
- locating new driveways for industrial or commercial properties on an Avenue or Boulevard and access is possible along a collector/local street, or



- the total number of new driveways exceeds 1 driveway per every 200 feet² along on the Avenue or Boulevard frontage, or
- locating new driveways on an Avenue or Boulevard within 150 feet from the intersecting street, or
- locating new driveways on a collector or local street within 75 feet from the intersecting street, or
- locating new driveways near mid-block crosswalks, requiring relocation of the mid-block crosswalk

| Yes | х | No |
|-----|---|----|
|-----|---|----|

If the answer to **B.1 and B.2 are both NO**, then the project would not conflict with a plan or policies that govern the PROW as a result of the project-initiated changes to the PROW.

Impact Analysis

If the answer to either **B.1 or B.2 are YES**, City plans and policies should be reviewed in light of the proposed physical changes to determine if the City would be obstructed from carrying out the plans and policies. The analysis should pay special consideration to substantial changes to the Public Right of Way that may either degrade existing facilities for people walking and bicycling (e.g., removing a bicycle lane), or preclude the City from completing complete street infrastructure as identified in the Mobility Plan 2035, especially if the physical changes are along streets that are on the High Injury Network (HIN). The analysis should also consider if the project is in a Transit Oriented Community (TOC) area, and would degrade or inhibit trips made by biking, walking and/ or transit ridership. The streets that need special consideration are those that are included on the following networks identified in the Mobility Plan 2035, or the HIN:

- Transit Enhanced Network
- Bicycle Enhanced Network
- Bicycle Lane Network
- Pedestrian Enhanced District
- Neighborhood Enhanced Network
- High Injury Network

To see the location of the above networks, see Transportation Assessment Support Map.³

Once the project is reviewed relevant to plans and policies, and existing facilities that may be impacted by the project, the analysis will need to answer the following two questions in concluding if there is an impact due to plan inconsistency.

B.2.1 Would the physical changes in the public right of way or new driveways that conflict with LADOT's Driveway Design Guidelines degrade the experience of vulnerable roadway users such as modify, remove, or otherwise negatively impact existing bicycle, transit, and/or pedestrian infrastructure?



² for a project frontage that exceeds 400 feet along an Avenue or Boulevard, the incremental additional driveway above 2 is more than 1 driveway for every 400 additional feet.

³ LADOT Transportation Assessment Support Map <u>https://arcg.is/fubbD</u>



B.2.2 Would the physical modifications or new driveways that conflict with LADOT's Driveway Design Guidelines preclude the City from advancing the safety of vulnerable roadway users?

Yes No X N/A

If either of the answers to either **B.2.1 or B.2.2 are YES**, the project may conflict with the Mobility Plan 2035, and therefore conflict with a plan that is adopted to protect the environment. If either of the answers to both **B.2.1. or B.2.2. are NO**, then the project would not be shown to conflict with plans or policies that govern the Public Right-of-Way.

C. Network Access

C. 1 Alley, Street and Stairway Access

These questions address potential conflict with:

Mobility Plan Policy 3.9 Increased Network Access: Discourage the vacation of public rights-ofway.

C.1.1 Does the project propose to vacate or otherwise restrict public access to a street, alley, or public stairway?

Yes × No

C.1.2 If the answer to C.1.1 is Yes, will the project provide or maintain public access to people walking and biking on the street, alley or stairway?

Yes No X N/A

C.2 New Cul-de-sacs

These questions address potential conflict with:

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 3.10 Cul-de-sacs: Discourage the use of cul-de-sacs that do not provide access for active transportation options.

C.2.1 Does the project create a cul-de-sac or is the project located adjacent to an existing cul-de-sac? Yes X No

C.2.2 If yes, will the cul-de-sac maintain convenient and direct public access to people walking and biking to the adjoining street network?

Yes No X N/A

If the answers to either C.1.2 or C.2.2 are YES, then the project would not conflict with a plan or policies that ensures access for all modes of travel. If the answer to either C.1.2 or C.2.2 are NO, the project may conflict with a plan or policies that governs multimodal access to a property. Further analysis must assess to the degree that pedestrians and bicyclists have sufficient public access to the transportation network.



D. Parking Supply and Transportation Demand Management

These questions address potential conflict with:

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 3.8 – Bicycle Parking, Provide bicyclists with convenient, secure and well maintained bicycle parking facilities.

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 4.8 – Transportation Demand Management Strategies. Encourage greater utilization of Transportation Demand Management Strategies to reduce dependence on single-occupancy vehicles.

Mobility Plan 2035 Policy 4.13 – Parking and Land Use Management: Balance on-street and offstreet parking supply with other transportation and land use objectives.

D.1 Would the project propose a supply of onsite parking that exceeds the baseline amount⁴ as required in the Los Angeles Municipal Code or a Specific plan, whichever requirement prevails?

× Yes No

D.2 If the answer to D.1. is YES, would the project propose to actively manage the demand of parking by independently pricing the supply to all users (e.g. parking cash-out), or for residential properties, unbundle the supply from the lease or sale of residential units?

🛛 Yes 🗴 No 📃 N/A

If the answer to **D.2.** is **NO** the project may conflict with parking management policies. Further analysis is needed to demonstrate how the supply of parking above city requirements will not result in additional (induced) drive-alone trips as compared to an alternative that provided no more parking than the baseline required by the LAMC or Specific Plan. If there is potential for the supply of parking to result in induced demand for drive-alone trips, the project should further explore transportation demand management (TDM) measures to further off-set the induced demands of driving and vehicle miles travelled (VMT) that may result from higher amounts of on-site parking. The TDM measures should specifically focus on strategies that encourage dynamic and context-sensitive pricing solutions and ensure the parking is efficiently allocated, such as providing real time information. Research has demonstrated that charging a user cost for parking or providing a 'cash-out' option in return for not using it is the most effective strategy to reduce the instances of drive-alone trips and increase non-auto mode share to further reduce VMT. To ensure the parking is efficiently managed and reduce the need to build parking for future uses, further strategies should include sharing parking with other properties and/or the general public.

D.3. Would the project provide the minimum on and off-site bicycle parking spaces as required by Section 12.21 A.16 of the LAMC?

× Yes No

⁴ The baseline parking is defined here as the default parking requirements in section 12.21 A.4 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code or any applicable Specific Plan, whichever prevails, for each applicable use not taking into consideration other parking incentives to reduce the amount of required parking.



D.4. Does the Project include more than 25,000 square feet of gross floor area construction of new non-residential gross floor?

x Yes No

D.5 If the answer to D.4. is YES, does the project comply with the City's TDM Ordinance in Section 12.26 J of the LAMC?

× Yes No N/A

If the answer to **D.3. or D.5. is NO** the project conflicts with LAMC code requirements of bicycle parking and TDM measures. If the project includes uses that require bicycle parking (Section 12.21 A.16) or TDM (Section 12.26 J), and the project does not comply with those Sections of the LAMC, further analysis is required to ensure that the project supports the intent of the two LAMC sections. To meet the intent of bicycle parking requirements, the analysis should identify how the project commits to providing safe access to those traveling by bicycle and accommodates storing their bicycle in locations that demonstrates priority over vehicle access.

Similarly, to meet the intent of the TDM requirements of Section 12.26 J of the LAMC, the analysis should identify how the project commits to providing effective strategies in either physical facilities or programs that encourage non-drive alone trips to and from the project site and changes in work schedule that move trips out of the peak period or eliminate them altogether (as in the case in telecommuting or compressed work weeks).

E. Consistency with Regional Plans

This section addresses potential inconsistencies with greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets forecasted in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) / Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).

E.1 Does the Project or Plan apply one the City's efficiency-based impact thresholds (i.e. VMT per capita, VMT per employee, or VMT per service population) as discussed in Section 2.2.3 of the TAG?

× Yes No

E.2 If the Answer to E.1 is YES, does the Project or Plan result in a significant VMT impact? Yes X No N/A

E.3 If the Answer to E.1 is NO, does the Project result in a net increase in VMT?

Yes No X N/A

If the Answer to E.2 or E.3 is NO, then the Project or Plan is shown to align with the long-term VMT and GHG reduction goals of SCAG's RTP/SCS.

E.4 If the Answer to E.2 or E.3 is YES, then further evaluation would be necessary to determine whether such a project or land use plan would be shown to be consistent with VMT and GHG reduction goals of the SCAG RTP/SCS. For the purpose of making a finding that a project is consistent with the GHG reduction targets forecasted in the SCAG RTP/SCS, the project analyst should consult Section 2.2.4 of the Transportation Assessment Guidelines (TAG). Section 2.2.4 provides the methodology for evaluating a land use project's cumulative impacts to VMT, and the appropriate reliance on SCAG's most recently adopted RTP/SCS in reaching that conclusion.



The analysis methods therein can further support findings that the project is consistent with the general use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in either a sustainable communities strategy or an alternative planning strategy for which the State Air Resources Board, pursuant to Section 65080(b)(2)(H) of the Government Code, has accepted a metropolitan planning organization's determination that the sustainable communities strategy or the alternative planning strategy would, if implemented, achieve the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.

References

BOE Street Standard Dimensions S-470-1 http://eng2.lacity.org/techdocs/stdplans/s-400/S-470-1 20151021 150849.pdf

LADCP <u>Citywide Design Guidelines</u>. <u>https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/f6608be7-d5fe-4187-bea6-</u>20618eec5049/Citywide Design Guidelines.pdf

LADOT Transportation Assessment Support Map https://arcg.is/fubbD

Mobility Plan 2035 <u>https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/523f2a95-9d72-41d7-aba5-1972f84c1d36/Mobility_Plan_2035.pdf</u>

SCAG. Connect SoCal, 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, https://www.connectsocal.org/Pages/default.aspx

ATTACHMENT D.1: CITY PLAN, POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

<u>The Transportation Element of the City's General Plan, Mobility Plan 2035</u>, established the "Complete Streets Design Guide" as the City's document to guide the operations and design of streets and other public rights-of-way. It lays out a vision for designing safer, more vibrant streets that are accessible to people, no matter what their mode choice. As a living document, it is intended to be frequently updated as City departments identify and implement street standards and experiment with different configurations to promote complete streets. The guide is meant to be a toolkit that provides numerous examples of what is possible in the public right-of-way and that provides guidance on context-sensitive design.

The <u>Plan for A Healthy Los Angeles</u> (March 2015) includes policies directing several City departments to develop plans that promote active transportation and safety.

The <u>City of Los Angeles Community Plans, which make up the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan</u>, guide the physical development of neighborhoods by establishing the goals and policies for land use. The 35 Community Plans provide specific, neighborhood-level detail for land uses and the transportation network, relevant policies, and implementation strategies necessary to achieve General Plan and community-specific objectives.

The stated goal of <u>Vision Zero</u> is to eliminate traffic-related deaths in Los Angeles by 2025 through a number of strategies, including modifying the design of streets to increase the safety of vulnerable road users. Extensive crash data analysis is conducted on an ongoing basis to prioritize intersections and corridors for implementation of projects that will have the greatest effect on overall fatality reduction. The City designs and deploys <u>Vision Zero Corridor Plans</u> as part of the implementation of Vision Zero. If a project is proposed whose site lies on the High Injury Network (HIN), the applicant should consult with LADOT to inform the project's site plan and to determine appropriate improvements, whether by funding their implementation in full or by making a contribution toward their implementation.

The <u>Citywide Design Guidelines</u> (October 24, 2019) includes sections relevant to development projects where improvements are proposed within the public realm. Specifically, Guidelines one through three provide building design strategies that support the pedestrian experience. The Guidelines provide best practices in designing that apply in three spatial categories of site planning, building design and public right of way. The Guidelines should be followed to ensure that the project design supports pedestrian safety, access and comfort as they access to and from the building and the immediate public right of way.

The City's <u>Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance (LA Municipal Code 12.26.J)</u> requires certain projects to incorporate strategies that reduce drive-alone vehicle trips and improve access to destinations and services. The ordinance is revised and updated periodically and should be reviewed for application to specific projects as they are reviewed.

The City's <u>LAMC Section 12.37 (Waivers of Dedication and Improvement)</u> requires certain projects to dedicate and/or implement improvements within the public right-of-way to meet the street designation standards of the Mobility Plan 2035.

The Bureau of Engineering (BOE) <u>Street Standard Dimensions S-470-1</u> provides the specific street widths and public right of way dimensions associated with the City's street standards.

Detailed Responses in Support of General Consistency with Transportation-Related Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies (Adapted from Attachment D in *LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines*, July 2020)

The items below correspond with the TAG Attachment D: Plan, Policy, and Program Consistency Worksheet. Defined terms below have the same meanings as in the Transportation Assessment.

A. MOBILITY PLAN 2035 (MP 2035) PROW CLASSIFICATION STANDARDS FOR DEDICATIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS

MP 2035 Policy 2.1 – Adaptive Reuse of Streets. Design, plan, and operate streets to serve multiple purposes and provide flexibility in design to adapt to future demands.

• Option B is required to make dedications or improvements to the public right-of way. Specifically, a three-foot street dedication is required for Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue along the Project Site. Option B will not alter adjacent streets or the right-of-way in a manner that would preclude or conflict future changes by various City Departments.

MP 2035 Policy 2.3 – Pedestrian Infrastructure. Recognize walking as a component of every trip and ensure high quality pedestrian access in all site planning and public right-of-way modifications to provide a safe and comfortable walking environment.

• Option B will not alter pedestrian infrastructure or the right-of-way in a manner that would preclude or conflict future changes by various City Departments. Option B prioritizes pedestrian access and connectivity, consistent with Maxella Avenue's designation as a Pedestrian Enhanced District (PED). Option B will make a three-foot street dedication on Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue along the Project Site. Once the dedications are provided, the City will be free to install modifications along Maxella Avenue as part of the PED network.

MP 2035 Policy 3.2 – People with Disabilities. Accommodate the needs of people with disabilities when modifying of installing infrastructure within the public right-of-way.

• Option B will not alter existing ADA infrastructure or the right-of-way in a manner that would preclude or conflict future changes by various City Departments.

MP 2035 Street Designations and Standard Roadway Dimensions

• Option B proposes new construction along a street designated as a Boulevard I and II, and/or Avenue I, II, or III on property zoned for R3 or less restrictive zone. Maxella Avenue is designated as an Avenue III under the MP 2035 Street Standards Plan. Glencoe Avenue is designated as a Collector under the MP 2035 Street Standards Plan. The Project Site is zoned [Q]M1-1 per LAMC.
MP 2035 Networks

- The Project Site has frontage along the following networks in MP 2035:
 - Pedestrian Enhanced District: Maxella Avenue (See analysis of MP Policy 2.3 above).
 - Neighborhood Enhanced Network: Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue

MP 2035 Policy 2.4 – Neighborhood Enhanced Network. Provide a slow speed network of locally serving streets.

• Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue have been designated within the City's Neighborhood Enhanced Network (NEN). Option B will make the required three-foot dedication along Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue to comply with MP 2035. Once the dedication is provided, the City will be free to install modifications such as shared laned markings as part of the NEN. Option B will not modify Maxella Avenue or Glencoe Avenue in a way that would substantially increase travel speed.

B. MOBILITY PLAN 2035 (MP 2035) PROW POLICY ALIGNMENT WITH PROJECT-INITIATED CHANGES

B.1. Project-Initiated Changes to the PROW Dimensions

MP 2035 Policy 2.1 – Adaptive Reuse of Streets. Design, plan, and operate streets to serve multiple purposes and provide flexibility in design to adapt to future demands.

• Option B is required to make dedications or improvements to the public right-of way. Specifically, a three-foot street dedication is required for Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue along the Project Site. Option B is not proposing any additional dedications or improvements to the public right-of-way. Option B will not alter adjacent streets or the right-of-way in a manner that would preclude or conflict future changes by various City Departments.

MP 2035 Policy 2.3 – Pedestrian Infrastructure. Recognize walking as a component of every trip and ensure high quality pedestrian access in all site planning and public right-of-way modifications to provide a safe and comfortable walking environment.

• Option B will not alter pedestrian infrastructure or the right-of-way in a manner that would preclude or conflict future changes by various City Departments. Option B prioritizes pedestrian access and connectivity, consistent with Maxella Avenue's designation as a Pedestrian Enhanced District (PED). Option B will make a three-foot dedication on Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue along the Project Site. Once the dedications are provided, the City will be free to install modifications along Maxella Avenue as part of the PED network.

MP 2035 *Policy* 3.2 – *People with Disabilities. Accommodate the needs of people with disabilities* when modifying of installing infrastructure within the public right-of-way.

• Option B will not alter existing ADA infrastructure or the right-of-way in a manner that would preclude or conflict future changes by various City Departments.

MP 2035 *Policy* 2.10 – *Loading Areas. Facilitate the provision of on and off-site street loading areas.*

• All loading activities will occur off-street and internal to the Project Site. Loading activities associated with service and delivery operations, trash collection and Waste Management for the Project will occur along the northwest and south-central portions of the Project Site. Service and delivery vehicles will utilize the northerly Ocean Way access points, Maxella Avenue driveway, and Glencoe Avenue driveway to access the loading zones and trash/recycling areas located within the at-grade level of the onsite parking garage. Additionally, a passenger drop-off/pick-up area is provided along east side of Ocean Way, internal to the Project Site.

MP 2035 Street Designations and Standard Roadway Dimensions

 Option B does include additions or new construction along a street designated as a Boulevard I and II, and/or Avenue I, II, or III on property zoned for R3 or less restrictive zone. Maxella Avenue is designated as an Avenue III under the MP 2035 Street Standards Plan. Glencoe Avenue is designated as a Collector under the MP 2035 Street Standards Plan. The Project Site is zoned [Q]M1-1 per LAMC.

B.2. Driveway Access

MP 2035 *Policy* 2.10 – *Loading Areas. Facilitate the provision of on and off-site street loading areas.*

• All loading activities will occur off-street and internal to the Project Site. Loading activities associated with service and delivery operations, trash collection and Waste Management for the Project will occur along the northwest and south-central portions of the Project Site. Service and delivery vehicles will utilize the northerly Ocean Way access points, Maxella Avenue driveway, and Glencoe Avenue driveway to access the loading zones and trash/recycling areas located within the at-grade level of the onsite parking garage. Additionally, a passenger drop-off/pick-up area is provided along east side of Ocean Way, internal to the Project Site.

MP 2035 Program PL.1. Driveway Access. Require driveway access to buildings from nonarterial streets or alleys (where feasible) in order to minimize interference with pedestrian access and vehicular movement.

• Driveway access to the Project Site will be provided via Ocean Way, a private driveway, Maxella Avenue, an Avenue III, and Glencoe Avenue, a Collector. While the existing Maxella Avenue driveway will be shifted two feet to the west, the overall number of curb cuts on Maxella Avenue adjacent to the Project Site will not change. The Glencoe Avenue driveway providing access to the Project Site is located adjacent to the Project Site, and the existing driveways along the Project Site's Glencoe Avenue frontage will be removed. Option B has been designed to minimize interference with pedestrian access and vehicular movement.

Citywide Design Guidelines – Guideline 2. Carefully incorporate vehicular access such that it does not degrade the pedestrian experience.

- Prioritize pedestrian access first and automobile access second. Orient parking and driveways toward the rear or side of buildings and away from the public right-of-way. On corner lots, parking should be oriented as far from the corner as possible.
 - Option B prioritizes pedestrian access first. Option B will reduce the number of curb cuts along the Project Site's Glencoe Avenue frontage from two to zero. Vehicular access to the Project Site's parking garage from the Ocean Way and Glencoe Avenue access points will be provided on the sides of buildings, away from the public-right-of-way. While vehicular access to the Option B onsite parking garage will be provided along Maxella Avenue, Option B will not add additional curb cuts to the Maxella Avenue public right-of-way. The Maxella Avenue driveway will be located approximately 263 feet west of the Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue intersection.
- Minimize both the number of driveway entrances and overall driveway widths.
 - Option B proposes driveway entrances from the public right-of-way at the Ocean Way / Maxella Avenue intersection, along Maxella Avenue approximately 263 feet west of the Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue intersection and at the existing Glencoe Avenue driveway adjacent to the Project Site. As the existing Glencoe Avenue driveway is adjacent to the Project Site, Option B will remove all curb cuts along the Project Site's Glencoe Avenue frontage. All driveways will be constructed in accordance with City Standards.
- Do not locate drop-off/pick-up areas between principal building entrances and the adjoining sidewalks.
 - A passenger loading area is proposed along the east side of Ocean Way, along the westerly portion of the Project Site.

- Orient vehicular access as far from street intersections as possible.
 - The Maxella Avenue driveway will be located 263 feet west of the Glencoe Avenue / Maxella Avenue intersection.
- Place drive-through elements away from intersections and avoid placing them so that they create a barrier between the sidewalk and building entrance(s).
 - Option B does not propose any drive-through elements.
- Ensure that loading areas do not interfere with onsite pedestrian and vehicular circulation by separating loading areas and larger commercial vehicles from areas that are used for public parking and public entrances.
 - All loading activities will occur off-street and internal to the Project Site. Loading activities associated with service and delivery operations, trash collection and Waste Management for the Project will occur along the northwest and south-central portions of the Project Site. Service and delivery vehicles will utilize the northerly Ocean Way access points, Maxella Avenue driveway, and Glencoe Avenue driveway to access the loading zones and trash/recycling areas located within the at-grade level of the onsite parking garage. Additionally, a passenger drop-off/pick-up area is provided along east side of Ocean Way, internal to the Project Site.

C. NETWORK ACCESS

C.1. Alley, Street and Stairway Access

MP 2035 Policy 3.9 – Increased Network Access. Discourage the vacation of public rights-ofway.

• Option B will not vacate any public rights-of-way.

C.2. New Cul-de-sacs

 $MP \ 2035 \ Policy \ 3.10 - Cul-de-sacs$. Discourage the use of cul-de-sacs that do not provide access for active transportation options.

• The Project Site is not located on a cul-de-sac.

D. PARKING SUPPLY AND TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

MP 2035 Policy 3.8 – Bicycle Parking. Provide bicyclists with convenient, secure, and wellmaintained bicycle parking facilities.

• Option B is required to provide 48 short-term and 219 long-term bicycle parking spaces in accordance with LAMC. Option B will provide the LAMC-required number of short-term and long-term bicycle parking spaces. Additionally, Option B will provide end-of-trip

bicycle facilities, including secure bicycle parking and showers, to support safe and comfortable bicycle travel. Secure bicycle parking will be provided on all levels within the onsite parking garage.

MP 2035 Policy 4.8 – Transportation Demand Management Strategies. Encourage greater utilization of Transportation Demand Management Strategies to reduce dependance on single-occupancy vehicles.

- As stated in Section 2.9 of the Transportation Assessment, Option B will implement the following TDM strategies as mitigation measures:
 - Transit Subsidies;
 - Promotions and Marketing;
 - Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommuting Program;
 - Include Bicycle Parking per LAMC;
 - Include Secure Bicycle Parking and Showers; and
 - Pedestrian Network Improvements.
- Additionally, the Applicant will comply with existing applicable City ordinances (e.g., the City's existing TDM Ordinance, referred to in the LAMC Section 12.26.J) and the other requirements per the City's Municipal Code, as well as the TDM requirements of the Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan.

MP 2035 Policy 4.13 – Parking and Land Use Management. Balance on-street and off-street parking supply with other transportation and land use objectives.

• The Project would not conflict with the portion of Policy 4.13 that discourages utilizing land for parking that could have been used for other valuable uses since most of the onsite parking will be located below grade.

While Option B would provide parking in excess of the minimum requirements as determined by the LAMC, it would include features to encourage walking and bicycling and LAMC-required bicycle parking spaces. As discussed in Section 4.2 of the Transportation Assessment, the Project would be consistent with the applicable goals and objectives of the SCAG 2016–2040 RTP/SCS and 2020–2045 RTP/SCS to locate jobs and housing in infill locations served by public transportation. Therefore, Option B would not undermine broader regional goals of creating vibrant public spaces and a robust multi-modal transportation system.

Under CEQA, a project is considered consistent with an applicable plan if it is consistent with the overall intent of the plan and would not preclude the attainment of its primary goals. A project does not need to be in perfect conformity with each and every policy. Therefore, even though the Option B's parking may exceed the minimum requirements as determined by LAMC, the Project is consistent with the overall intent of Policy 4.13 and MP 2035.

Moreover, any inconsistency with an applicable policy, plan, or regulation is only a significant impact under CEQA if the policy, plan, or regulation were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and the inconsistency itself would result in a direct physical impact on the environment. The above policy is intended to implement broader regional goals, not to mitigate an environmental effect. Therefore, even if the amount of parking provided by Option B was conservatively considered to be inconsistent with Policy 4.13, such inconsistency would not be considered to be a significant impact under CEQA.

E. CONSISTENCY WITH REGIONAL PLANS

Option B applies one of the City's efficiency-based impact thresholds (i.e., VMT per Capita and VMT per Employee) as discussed in Section 4.2 of the Transportation Assessment. It is noted that Option B will incorporate TDM measures as mitigation measures, as described in Section 2.9 of the Transportation Assessment. The implementation of the TDM measures results in a Daily Household VMT per Capita impact that is less than significant. However, the maximum work based TDM reduction is achieved, and no further TDM measures can be implemented to reduce the Daily Work VMT per Employee below 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee.

While the Option B Daily Work VMT per Employee is greater than the West Los Angeles APC significance threshold of 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee, LLG has proposed an alternative assessment of the VMT impacts for Option B. As stated in Section 4.2.2 of the Transportation Assessment, the Daily Household VMT per Capita for the residential component of Option B is calculated to be 5.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, which is well below the threshold for the West Los Angeles APC of 7.4 Daily Household VMT per Capita. For the office component of Option B, the Daily Work VMT per Employee value is calculated to be reduced from 14.5 to 11.6 with consideration of TDM measures. While the Daily Work VMT per Employee value after application of TDM measures is greater than the threshold of 11.1 Daily Work VMT per Employee, a finding of a less than significant impact is made related to the Daily Work VMT per Employee for Option B in consideration of the "excess" mitigation provided by the TDM measures recommended for Option B. The resulting Daily Household VMT per Capita for the residential component is substantially less than the threshold of significance for the West Los Angeles APC and therefore is deemed to offset the unmitigated portion of the Daily Work VMT per Employee related to the office component. As the VMT impacts related to Option B have been shown to be mitigated, Option B is shown to be consistent with the VMT and greenhouse gas (GHG) goals of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS).

Additional Review

The following provides a review of the transportation-related goals listed in the Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles (Healthy LA).

• Option B supports the transportation-related goals listed in Healthy LA. Option B is designed in a manner that facilitates travel on foot between the Project Site and nearby transit facilities and commercial destination. Option B will provide the LAMC-required number of bicycle parking spaces. Option B would not conflict with, limit or preclude the City's ability to implement programs and policies in furtherance of Healthy LA.

The following provides a review of the transportation-related goals listed in the Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey Community Plan. The Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey Community Plan was adopted in 1997. While an updated Community Plan is currently under development, the plan from 1997 is currently in effect and forms the basis for this review of conflicts relating to the transportation system.

From a transportation perspective, the Community Plan offers the following goals and objectives related to the Project.

Objective 10-2: To increase the work trips and non-work trips made on public transit.

• Option B is located within convenient walking distance to many public transit lines along Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue.

Objective 11-1: To pursue transportation management strategies that can maximize vehicle occupancy, minimize average trip length, and reduce the number of vehicle trips.

Policy 11-1.1: Encourage non-residential development to provide employee incentives for utilizing alternatives to the automobile, such as carpools, vanpools, buses, flex time, bicycles, and walking.

Policy 11-1.2: Encourage the use of multiple-occupancy vehicle programs for shopping and other activities to reduce midday traffic.

- As stated in Section 2.9 of the Transportation Assessment, Option B will implement the following TDM strategies as mitigation measures:
 - Transit Subsidies;
 - Promotions and Marketing;
 - Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommuting Program;

- Include Bicycle Parking per LAMC;
- Include Secure Bicycle Parking and Showers; and
- Pedestrian Network Improvements.
- Additionally, the Applicant will comply with existing applicable City ordinances (e.g., the City's existing TDM Ordinance, referred to in the LAMC Section 12.26.J) and the other requirements per the City's Municipal Code, as well as the TDM requirements of the Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan.

Objective 12-1: To promote an adequate system of bikeways for commuter, school, and recreational use.

Policy 12-1.4: Encourage the provision of changing rooms, showers, and bicycle storage at new and existing non-residential developments and public places.

• Option B is required to provide 48 short-term and 219 long-term bicycle parking spaces in accordance with LAMC. Option B will provide the LAMC-required number of short-term and long-term bicycle parking spaces. Additionally, Option B will provide end-of-trip bicycle facilities, including secure bicycle parking and showers, to support safe and comfortable bicycle travel Secure bicycle parking will be provided on all levels within the onsite parking garage.

Objective 12-2: To promote pedestrian oriented mobility and utilization of the bicycle for commuter, school, recreational use, economic activity, and access to transit facilities.

• Option B will provide connections to the sidewalks along the Project Site's Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue frontages, as well as the Project Site's Ocean Way frontage. Option B is required to provide 48 short-term and 219 long-term bicycle parking spaces in accordance with the LAMC. Option B will provide the LAMC-required number of short-term and long-term bicycle parking spaces. Secure bicycle parking will be provided on all levels within the onsite parking garage.

Objective 13-1: To provide parking in appropriate locations in accordance with Citywide standards and community needs.

Policy 13-1.1: Consolidate parking where appropriate, to minimize the number of ingress and egress points onto arterials.

Policy 13-1.2: New parking lots and garages shall be developed in accordance with design standards.

• Option B will provide a total of 1,287 vehicle parking spaces onsite. While Option B will provide parking in excess of LAMC requirements, Option B will implement TDM

strategies to encourage travel to and from the Project Site by alternative modes of transportation. The TDM strategies are described in detail in Section 2.9 of the Transportation Assessment. The Option B onsite parking garage will be developed in accordance with City standards.

APPENDIX I

VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED ANALYSIS FOR MIXED-USE PROJECTS – LADOT APPROVED METHODOLOGY FOR MITIGATION OF VMT IMPACTS

MEMORANDUM

| Subject: | Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis for Mixe Alternative Methodology for Mitigation o Passo Marine Project 13400 Maxelle Ave | d-Use Pi of VMT | rojects Impacts TC20 109212 | |
|----------|--|--------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| From: | David S. Shender, P.E. Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers | LLG Ref: | 5-16-0265-1 | |
| To: | Eddie Guerrero Los Angeles Department of Transportation | Date: | January 28, 2021 | |

This memorandum has been prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers (LLG) to request consideration from the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) for an alternative methodology related to mitigation of impacts at mixeduse development projects identified through the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) methodology. For this analysis, we have referenced the proposed Paseo Marina project located at 13400 Maxella Avenue in the Marina del Rey area of Los Angeles.

Paseo Marina Project Description

A Transportation Assessment for the Paseo Marina project is currently in preparation based on LADOT's Transportation Assessment Guidelines¹ (the "Guidelines"). The Transportation Assessment will evaluate the transportation effects of two development options proposed by the project applicant:

- Option A
 - 592 market-rate residential units
 - o 66 affordable residential units
 - o 13,650 square feet of restaurant floor area
 - o 13,650 square feet of retail floor
- Option B
 - o 382 market-rate residential units
 - 43 affordable residential units
 - 20,000 square feet of restaurant floor area
 - o 20,000 square feet of retail floor area
 - o 90,000 square feet of office floor area

An LADOT Memorandum of Understanding was prepared and executed for both Option A and Option B, although the transportation effects of each development option will be evaluated within a single Transportation Assessment document. The Transportation Assessment will be incorporated into a Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) to be prepared for the Paseo Marina project.

LINSCOTT LAW & GREENSPAN

engineers

Engineers & Planners Traffic Transportation Parking

Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers

20931 Burbank Boulevard Suite C Woodland Hills, CA 91367 818.835.8648 T 818.835.8649 F www.llgengineers.com

Pasadena Irvine San Diego Woodland Hills

¹ Transportation Assessment Guidelines, LADOT, July 2020.

SB 743/OPR Background

The LADOT Guidelines reference Senate Bill 743 (SB 743), which requires the use of "...a transportation performance metric that promotes: the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multi modal networks, and access to diverse land uses..." when evaluating the potential transportation effects of development projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Further, the Guidelines note that the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has provided technical guidance² to jurisdictions in California for purposes of implementing SB 743, including the recommendation that VMT be used to quantify the transportation effects of development projects.

Additionally, OPR provided two additional recommendations with respect to implementing SB 743:

- VMT for residential projects and commercial projects should be quantified on a VMT per capita and VMT per employee basis, respectively; and
- A project per capita or per employee VMT that is 15% below that of current conditions is a reasonable threshold of significance for purposes of assessing the relative transportation impacts of development projects.

For development projects that are calculated to exceed the 15% below current VMT standard, OPR states that measures such as implementation of transportation demand management (TDM) measures would be a valid mitigation of VMT impacts. OPR acknowledges that while there are a variety of State legislative mandates and adopted policies related to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, the intent of SB 743 is to reduce *all* GHG emissions, and not a specific emission related to a particular type of land use. Thus, a TDM measure that eliminates one vehicle mile traveled for a residential project component would have the same benefit in reducing GHG emissions as a TDM measure that eliminates one vehicle mile traveled for a commercial project component.

The LADOT Guidelines incorporate the OPR recommendations by: 1) Calculating per capita VMT for residential projects and per employee VMT for commercial projects; 2) Adopting the significance threshold whereby a significant impact is determined if the project's calculated VMT per capita and/or VMT per employee is greater than a corresponding value that is 15% less than the existing local Area Planning Commission (APC) VMT per capita and/or VMT per employee; and 3) Considering the quantitative effects of TDM measures as mitigation measures for purposes of reducing the calculated project-related VMT values to a level below the thresholds of significance.

² Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, OPR, December 2018.

It is noted that the LADOT Guidelines also adopted the OPR recommendation that commercial retail projects providing less than 50,00 square feet of building floor area are assumed to be local-serving in nature and therefore presumed to result in a less than significant VMT impact.

LADOT VMT Calculator

LADOT has developed a VMT Calculator for purposes of calculating per capita VMT values for residential projects and per employee VMT values for commercial projects. For mixed-use development projects that feature both types of land uses (such as the Paseo Marina project), the VMT Calculator produces both VMT values: a per capita VMT for the residential component and a per employee VMT for the commercial component.

The resultant VMT values provided by the VMT Calculator are compared to the applicable thresholds of significance based on the project's location in the City of Los Angeles. The Paseo Marina project, for example, is located within the City's West Los Angeles APC where the VMT thresholds of significance are 7.4 VMT per capita and 11.1 VMT per employee, both of which are 15% below the existing VMT values in the APC. It is noted that for some mixed-use projects, the VMT Calculator may identify a significant VMT impact related to one project component (e.g., residential), while the calculated VMT impact for the other component (e.g., commercial) may be less than significant.

The VMT Calculator also includes a menu of TDM measures, which, when applied to a project, have the effect of reducing the calculated per capita and/or per employee VMT values. Some TDM measures are applicable only to commercial projects (such as parking cash-out), while other measures are applicable only to residential projects (such as unbundled parking). Also, there are TDM measures that are applicable to both commercial and residential projects (such as promotions and marketing). We understand that the relative quantitative effectiveness of the TDM in reducing the VMT values within the VMT Calculator is primarily based on references published by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA).

An additional feature of the LADOT VMT Calculator is that it "caps" the overall effectiveness of the TDM measures in reducing the per capita and per employee VMT values. The cap is based on the development project's "place type" as determined by LADOT. The place types vary from urban, compact infill, suburban center, and suburban. Presumably, much of Downtown Los Angeles would be considered urban and the VMT Calculator permits up to a 75% reduction in VMT values due to TDM measures while portions of the San Fernando Valley are likely considered suburban and the VMT Calculator caps the effectiveness of TDM measures at 15%.

According to the LADOT VMT Calculator, the Paseo Marina project is in a suburban center place type for which the TDM effectiveness is capped at 20%. Thus, for example, as the thresholds of significance applicable to the Paseo Marina project are 7.4 VMT per capita for the residential component and 11.1 VMT per employee for the commercial component, a calculated VMT exceeding either threshold by more than 20% (i.e., 9.3 VMT per capita or greater for residential and 13.9 VMT per employee or greater for commercial) cannot be completely mitigated within the VMT Calculator, as the effectiveness of the available TDM measures is capped.

Paseo Marina VMT Calculation

The Paseo Marina Option A and Option B projects were evaluated through the LADOT VMT Calculator. *Table 1* below provides the results of the VMT values calculated for the residential and commercial components of the two development options prior to consideration of mitigation (i.e., TDM measures), which would reduce the resultant VMT values.

| Paseo Marina | Threshold of | Calculated Per Capita and Per Employee VMT Without Mitigation | | |
|--------------|--------------|--|----------|--|
| Component | Significance | Option A | Option B | |
| Residential | 7.4 VMT | 6.9 VMT | 6.8 VMT | |
| Commercial | 11.1 VMT | N/A [a] | 14.5 VMT | |

Table 1Paseo Marina VMT Calculation

[a] VMT for commercial component is not calculated because it is less than 50,000 square feet in size and therefore considered as local-serving and presumed to result in a less than significant VMT impact.

XXX Bold values denote a significant impact.

As shown in *Table 1*, the residential and commercial components of the Paseo Marina Option A project would result in a less than significant impact because the residential VMT per capita value is less than the City's threshold of significance, while the commercial component (retail and restaurant uses) is presumed to be local-serving because it is proposed to provide less than 50,000 square feet in floor area. Therefore, no mitigation measures (e.g., TDM measures) are required for Option A.

For the Paseo Marina Option B project, *Table 1* shows that while the VMT per capita value for the residential component is less than the threshold of significance, the commercial component (which includes 90,000 square feet of proposed office floor area and 40,000 square feet of retail/restaurant floor area) is calculated at 14.5 VMT per employee, which exceeds the City's threshold of significance of 11.1 VMT per employee. Of further note is the calculated VMT value of 14.5 is more than 30% higher than the 11.1 VMT threshold of significance, which means that the Option B project's VMT per employee value cannot be reduced to a level below the significance threshold because the VMT Calculator will only permit a menu of TDM measures that is capped at a 20% level of effectiveness. Thus, the project's VMT per employee can only be reduced with TDM measures by 20% to a value of 11.6 VMT, which still exceeds the significance threshold of 11.1 VMT, and therefore would be considered a significant and unmitigated impact based on current LADOT policy.

Proposed Alternative Assessment of VMT Impacts for Mixed-Use Projects

LLG believes the current City process for assessing the significance of VMT impacts at mixed-use projects does not consider the SB 743 mandate of encouraging development projects that reduce *all* GHG emissions. Therefore, this section outlines an alternative assessment of VMT impacts utilizing the current calculation procedures and output provided by LADOT's VMT Calculator.

In review, *Table 1* shows the Paseo Marina Option B project without TDM measures would have a calculated VMT per capita that is less than the applicable LADOT threshold of significance, but a per employee VMT that exceeds the threshold of significance. Further, the per employee VMT cannot be fully reduced to a level below the significance threshold with the application of TDM measures because of the "place type" limitations provided in the VMT Calculator.

As previously stated, the intent of SB 743 is to reduce *all* GHG emissions related to development projects. A mixed-use project's total GHG emissions is not considered under the current LADOT methodology for determining VMT impacts, as the methodology provides separate assessments of impacts for residents and employees. Therefore, an alternative assessment is proposed that considers the effects of the *total* VMT for a mixed-use project, and not an individual component (residential or commercial).

Table 2 below has been prepared to evaluate VMT impacts for the Paseo Marina Option B project, a mixed-use development, using total VMT, and not separately the per capita VMT or per employee VMT related to the project components. This assessment of total VMT utilizes the data and calculations already provided by LADOT's VMT Calculator. A copy of the VMT Calculator report prepared for the Paseo Marina Option B project is attached to this memorandum for reference.

engineers

Table 2Proposed Alternative Approach for Assessing Significant VMT ImpactPaseo Marina Option B Project

| | | [1] Project V | MT | [2] Significar Thresholds Ba Total Project | nce ased on VMT | [3] Project V With Mitig Allowed in L VMT Calcu | MT ation ADOT ılator |
|---------------------------|------------|----------------------------------|--------------|---|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Paseo Marina Component | Population | VMT Per Capita or Employee | Total VMT | VMT Per Capita or Employee [a] | Total VMT | VMT Per Capita or Employee | Total VMT |
| Residential | 996 | 6.8 | 6,736 | 7.4 | 7,089 | 5.4 | 5,389 |
| Commercial | 480 | 14.5 | 6,968 | 11.1 | 5,524 | 11.6 [c] | 5,574 |
| Tota | al | | 13,704 | | 12,417 [b] | | 10,963 [d] |

[a] West LA APC per capita and per employee thresholds used to calculate total VMT threshold of significance.[b] Derived total VMT threshold of significance based on project population values and APC per capita VMT and per employee VMT thresholds of significance.

[c] VMT per employee exceeds target of 11.1 VMT per employee.

[d] However, total VMT (10,998) with mitigation is less than proposed total VMT (12,417) threshold of

significance. Thus, overall VMT impact of project is less than significant.

As shown in *Table 2*, per the LADOT VMT Calculator, the residential component of the Option B project is estimated to have 996 residents while the commercial component is estimated to have 480 employees. Further, as shown in column [1] of *Table 2*, based on the per capita and per employee VMT values produced by the VMT Calculator, the Option B project is calculated to generate 6,736 VMT and 6,968 VMT, respectively, or a total VMT of 13,704 generated by the residents and employees.

Column [2] in *Table 2* provides the next step which is the calculation of a total VMT threshold of significance for the project using the current per capita and per employee VMT thresholds related to the West Los Angeles APC. As shown in *Table 2*, the project's residential and employee population values derived from the VMT Calculator are applied to APC thresholds of significance to derive a total project VMT of 12,417. As shown in *Table 2*, this alternative significance threshold is less than the initial calculation of 13,704 total VMT for the Paseo Marina Option B project, meaning that a significant impact related to VMT is calculated prior to consideration of TDM measures that would reduce the project's total VMT value.

Finally, column [3] of *Table 2* illustrates the effect of implementing TDM measures to the Option B project through the VMT Calculator. As previously discussed, the VMT Calculator limits the effect of the TDM measures to a 20% reduction in the VMT values due its place type, and therefore the project's per employee VMT can only be reduced to 11.6 VMT, which exceeds the 11.1 VMT per employee threshold for the West Los Angeles APC. It is noted that several of the TDM measures applied in the VMT Calculator also reduce the calculated VMT per capita (i.e., for the residential component) even though the baseline VMT value was already below the applicable threshold of significance.

However, it is of note in column [3] of *Table 2* that the total VMT related to residents and employees is calculated at 10,963 VMT, which is well below the 12,417 total VMT of both of the project's resident and employee populations attained through the corresponding per capita and per employee threshold values. Thus, the Option B project with the suggested menu of TDM measures implemented through the VMT Calculator results in less total VMT (and fewer GHG emissions) than what would otherwise be provided if both residential and commercial elements met their respective per capita and per employee VMT targets. Accordingly, it is reasonable and appropriate to conclude that the transportation effects of the Paseo Marina Option B project, as analyzed through the City's VMT Calculator, is mitigated to less than significant with implementation of TDM measures.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The City of Los Angeles has implemented SB 743 through its new Transportation Assessment Guidelines and VMT Calculator. As recommended by OPR, LADOT's VMT Calculator evaluates VMT for development projects by producing a per capita VMT for residential projects and a per employee VMT for commercial projects. The output is compared to VMT thresholds of significance that are generally 15% current VMT levels in the local APC. TDM measures are included in the VMT Calculator to reduce calculated VMT values in instances where the initial VMT value exceeds the threshold of significance.

LLG believes the VMT Calculator does not correctly consider the VMT effects of mixed-use development projects within the mandate of SB 743. This is because the VMT Calculator separately calculates the per capita and per employee VMT values for residential and commercial components of a project, resulting in the possibility that one of the two values may exceed the applicable threshold of significance and thereby resulting in a finding of an overall significant impact. This methodology, however, does not consider the total VMT related to the project, which in fact may be less than desired 15% local threshold even though one of the project components may exceed its target value.

Accordingly, for mixed-use development projects, it is recommended that LADOT permit consideration of the total VMT value attributed to the project's residents and employees when assessing the overall VMT effects. The total VMT value can be established for a specific project by: 1) Determining the project's resident and employee populations estimated through the VMT Calculator; 2) Multiplying the respective resident and employee populations by the local APC per capita and per employee local thresholds of significance; and 3) Summing the resident and employee VMT values to determine the project's total VMT threshold of significance.

cc: File

CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR Version 1.3



Project Screening Criteria: Is this project required to conduct a vehicle miles traveled analysis?

Existing Land Use

Project Information



Is the project replacing an existing number of residential units with a smaller number of residential units AND is located within one-half mile of a fixed-rail or fixed-guideway transit station?

O No

• Yes

| Land Use Type | | Value | Unit | |
|-------------------------|---|---------|------|---|
| Retail General Retail | - | 100.781 | ksf | • |
| Retail General Retail | | 100.781 | ksf | |
| | | | | |

Click here to add a single custom land use type (will be included in the above list)

Proposed Project Land Use

| Land Use Type | | Value | Unit | |
|--|---|-------|------|---|
| Office General Office | - | 90 | ksf | + |
| Housing Multi-Family | | 382 | DU | |
| Housing Affordable Housing - Family | | 43 | DU | |
| Retail High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant | t | 20 | ksf | |
| Retail General Retail | | 20 | ksf | |
| Office General Office | | 90 | ksf | |

Project Screening Summary

| Existing Land Use | Propos Proje | ed ct | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------|--|--|
| 3,595 Daily Vehicle Trips | 5,574 Daily Vehicle Trips | | | |
| 29,609 Daily VMT | 45,17 Daily VI | 78 MT | | |
| Tier 1 Scree | ning Criteria | | | |
| Project will have less reside to existing residential units mile of a fixed-rail station. | ntial units compa & is within one-h | red alf | | |
| The net increase in daily tri | ps < 250 trips | 1,979 Net Daily Trips | | |
| The net increase in daily VM | /IT ≤ 0 | 15,569 Net Daily VMT | | |
| The proposed project consi land uses ≤ 50,000 square f | sts of only retail eet total. | 40.000 ksf | | |
| The proposed project is required to perform VMT analysis. | | | | |

Click here to add a single custom land use type (will be included in the above list)

CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR Version 1.3



Project Information



| Proposed Project Land Use Type | Value | Unit |
|--|-------|------|
| Housing Multi-Family | 382 | DU |
| Housing Affordable Housing - Family | 43 | DU |
| Retail High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant | 20 | ksf |
| Retail General Retail | 20 | ksf |
| Office General Office | 90 | ksf |

TDM Strategies - Max Mitigation Reduction

Use 🗹 to denote if the TDM strategy is part of the proposed project or is a mitigation strategy

Select each section to show individual strategies

Analysis Results

| Max Home Based TDM Ac Max Work Based TDM Ac | chieve hieve | Prop ed? d? | osed Project No No | With Mitigation Yes Yes | |
|--|--------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|--|
| A | | Parking | | | |
| Reduce Parking Supply | 100 | city code parking | g provision for th | e project site | |
| Proposed Prj Mitigation | 74 | actual parking p | | | |
| Proposed Prj Mitigation | 175 | monthly parking site | g cost (dollar) for | the project | |
| Parking Cash-Out | 100 | percent of emplo | oyees eligible | | |
| Price Workplace Parking | 6.00 100 | daily parkir percent of emplo parking | ng charge (dollar) oyees subject to p | priced | |
| Residential Area Parking Permits Proposed Prj Mitigation | 200 | cost (dollar |) of annual perm | it | |
| B | | Transit | | | |
| C Educa | tion | & Encoura | gement | | |
| D Com | mute | e Trip Redu | ictions | | |
| E | Shar | ed Mobilit | у | | |
| F Bi | cycle | Infrastruct | ture | | |
| G Neigh | Neighborhood Enhancement | | | | |

| Proposed Project | With Mitigation |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 5,574 | 4,459 |
| Daily Vehicle Trips | Daily Vehicle Trips |
| 45,178 | 36,142 |
| Daily VMT | Daily VMT |
| 6.8 | 5.4 |
| Houseshold VMT per Capita | Houseshold VMT per Capita |
| 14.5 | 11.6 |
| Work VMT | Work VMT |
| per Employee | per Employee |
| Significant | VMT Impact? |
| Household: No | Household: No |
| Threshold = 7.4 | Threshold = 7.4 |
| 1370 Delow AFC | 15% below Ar c |
| Work: Yes | Work: Yes |
| Threshold = 11.1 | Threshold = 11.1 |
| 15% Below APC | 15% Below APC |
| | |



Report 1: Project & Analysis Overview

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| Project Information | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|--------|----------|
| Land | Use Type | Value | Units |
| | Single Family | 0 | DU |
| | Multi Family | 382 | DU |
| Housing | Townhouse | 0 | DU |
| | Hotel | 0 | Rooms |
| | Motel | 0 | Rooms |
| | Family | 43 | DU |
| Affordable Housing | Senior | 0 | DU |
| Allordable Housing | Special Needs | 0 | DU |
| | Permanent Supportive | 0 | DU |
| | General Retail | 20.000 | ksf |
| | Furniture Store | 0.000 | ksf |
| | Pharmacy/Drugstore | 0.000 | ksf |
| | Supermarket | 0.000 | ksf |
| | Bank | 0.000 | ksf |
| | Health Club | 0.000 | ksf |
| Datall | High-Turnover Sit-Down | 20.000 | 1.0 |
| Retail | Restaurant | 20.000 | KST |
| | Fast-Food Restaurant | 0.000 | ksf |
| | Quality Restaurant | 0.000 | ksf |
| | Auto Repair | 0.000 | ksf |
| | Home Improvement | 0.000 | ksf |
| | Free-Standing Discount | 0.000 | ksf |
| | Movie Theater | 0 | Seats |
| Office | General Office | 90.000 | ksf |
| Office | Medical Office | 0.000 | ksf |
| | Light Industrial | 0.000 | ksf |
| Industrial | Manufacturing | 0.000 | ksf |
| | Warehousing/Self-Storage | 0.000 | ksf |
| | University | 0 | Students |
| | High School | 0 | Students |
| School | Middle School | 0 | Students |
| | Elementary | 0 | Students |
| | Private School (K-12) | 0 | Students |
| Other | | 0 | Trips |

Project and Analysis Overview

Report 1: Project & Analysis Overview

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| | Analysis Res | sults | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| | Total Employees: | 480 | | | | |
| | Total Population: | 996 | | | | |
| Propose | ed Project | With Mi | tigation | | | |
| 5,574 | Daily Vehicle Trips | 4,459 | Daily Vehicle Trips | | | |
| 45,178 | Daily VMT | 36,142 | Daily VMT | | | |
| 6.0 | Household VMT | 5.4 | Household VMT per | | | |
| 6.8 | per Capita | 5.4 | Capita | | | |
| | Work VMT | | Work VMT per | | | |
| 14.5 | per Employee | 11.6 | Employee | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Significant VMT | Impact? | | | | |
| | APC: West Los A | Angeles | | | | |
| | Impact Threshold: 15% Belo | ow APC Average | | | | |
| | Household = 7 | 7.4 | | | | |
| | Work = 11.1 | L | | | | |
| Propose | Proposed Project With Mitigation | | | | | |
| VMT Threshold | Impact | VMT Threshold | Impact | | | |
| Household > 7.4 | No | Household > 7.4 | No | | | |
| Work > 11.1 | Yes | Work > 11.1 | Yes | | | |

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



Report 2: TDM Inputs

| Reduce parking supply Unbundle parking | Description City code parking provision (spaces) Actual parking provision (spaces) Monthly cost for parking (\$) | Proposed Project 0 0 0 | Mitigation: 0 0 |
|---|--|--|--|
| Reduce parking supply Unbundle parking | City code parking provision (spaces) Actual parking provision (spaces) Monthly cost for parking (\$) | 0 0 | 0 |
| Unbundle parking | Actual parking provision (spaces) Monthly cost for parking (\$) | 0 | 0 |
| Unbundle parking | Monthly cost for parking (\$) | | |
| Parking cash-out | parting (9) | \$0 | \$0 |
| | Employees eligible (%) | 0% | 0% |
| Price workplace parking | Daily parking charge (\$) | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| | Employees subject to priced parking (%) | 0% | 0% |
| Residential area parking permits | Cost of annual permit (\$) | \$0 | \$0 |
| (| cont. on following page | :) | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | Price workplace parking Residential area parking permits | Price workplace parking (\$) Employees subject to priced parking (%) Residential area parking permits permit (\$) (cont. on following page | Price workplace parkingDaily parking charge (\$)\$0.00Employees subject to priced parking (%)0%Residential area parking permitsCost of annual permit (\$)\$0\$0\$0(cont. on following page) |

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| Strate | еду Туре | Description | Proposed Project | Mitigations | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|------------------|-------------|--|
| | | Reduction in headways (increase in frequency) (%) | 0% | 0% | |
| R h Transit Ir | Reduce transit headways | Existing transit mode share (as a percent of total daily trips) (%) | 0% | 0% | |
| | | Lines within project site improved (<50%, >=50%) | 0 | 0 | |
| | Implement neighborhood shuttle | Degree of implementation (low, medium, high) | 0 | 0 | |
| | | Employees and residents eligible (%) | 0% | 0% | |
| | | Employees and residents eligible (%) | 0% | 100% | |
| Transit subsidies | | Amount of transit subsidy per passenger (daily equivalent) (\$) | \$0.00 | \$2.98 | |
| Education & | Voluntary travel behavior change program | Employees and residents participating (%) | 0% | 0% | |
| Encouragement | Promotions and marketing | Employees and residents participating (%) | 0% | 100% | |

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| TDM Strategy Inputs, Cont. | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|-------------|--|--|
| Strate | gy Туре | Description | Proposed Project | Mitigations | | |
| | Required commute trip reduction program | Employees participating (%) | 0% | 0% | | |
| | Alternative Work | Employees participating (%) | 0% | 5% | | |
| Schedules and Telecommute Program Commute Trip Reductions Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle | Type of program | 0 | 1.5 days of telecommuting per week | | | |
| | Degree of implementation (low, medium, high) | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle | Employees eligible (%) | 0% | 0% | | |
| | | Employer size (small, medium, large) | 0 | 0 | | |
| | Ride-share program | Employees eligible (%) | 0% | 0% | | |
| | Car share | Car share project setting (Urban, Suburban, All Other) | 0 | 0 | | |
| Shared Mobility Bike share | Bike share | Within 600 feet of existing bike share station - OR- implementing new bike share station (Yes/No) | 0 | 0 | | |
| | School carpool program | Level of implementation (Low, Medium, High) | 0 | 0 | | |
| | (1 | cont. on following page | :) | | | |

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



Report 2: TDM Inputs

| TDM Strategy Inputs, Cont. | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Strate | Strategy Type | | Proposed Project | Mitigations | | | |
| | Implement/Improve on-street bicycle facility | Provide bicycle facility along site (Yes/No) | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Bicycle | Include Bike parking per LAMC | Meets City Bike Parking Code (Yes/No) | 0 | Yes | | | |
| Infrastructure | Include secure bike parking and showers | Includes indoor bike parking/lockers, showers, & repair station (Yes/No) | 0 | Yes | | | |
| | Traffic calming | Streets with traffic calming improvements (%) | 0% | 0% | | | |
| Neighborhood | improvements | Intersections with traffic calming improvements (%) | 0% | 0% | | | |
| Ennancement | t Pedestrian network improvements | Included (within project and connecting off- site/within project only) | 0 | within project and connecting off-site | | | |

Report 3: TDM Outputs

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| TDM Adjustments by Trip Purpose & Strategy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------|---------------------|----------|------------|------------|---------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|---------------------|---|
| | | | | | | Place type | : Suburban | Center | | | | | | |
| | | Ноте Ва | ased Work | Ноте Ва | ised Work | Home Bo | ised Other | Ноте Вс | ased Other | Non-Home | Based Other | Non-Home | Based Other | |
| | | Prod | uction Mitigated | Attro | Aitigated | Prod | uction Mitigated | Attro | action Mitigated | Proc | luction Mitigated | Attr | action Mitigated | Source |
| | | Proposed | wiitigateu | Proposed | wiitigated | Proposed | wiitigated | Proposed | wiitigateu | Proposed | wiitigated | Proposed | willigated | |
| | Reduce parking supply | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | _ |
| | Unbundle parking | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy |
| Parking | Parking cash-out | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | Appendix, Parking |
| | Price workplace parking | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1 - 5 |
| | Residential area parking permits | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |
| | Reduce transit headways | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Stratogy |
| Transit | Implement neighborhood shuttle | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | Appendix, Transit sections 1 - 3 |
| | Transit subsidies | 0% | 16% | 0% | 16% | 0% | 16% | 0% | 16% | 0% | 16% | 0% | 16% | - |
| Education & | Voluntary travel behavior change program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, Education & |
| Encouragement | Promotions and marketing | 0% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | Encouragement sections 1 - 2 |
| | Required commute trip reduction program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| Commute Trip Reductions | Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommute Program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, Commute Trip |
| | Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | Reductions sections 1 - 4 |
| | Ride-share program | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| | Car-share | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | TDM Strategy |
| Shared Mobility | Bike share | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | Appendix, Shared |
| | School carpool program | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | Mobility sections 1 - 3 |

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



Report 3: TDM Outputs

| TDM Adjustments by Trip Purpose & Strategy, Cont. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------------|------------------|-------------|---|
| Place type: Suburban Center | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Home Bo Prod | ased Work luction | Home Bo Attr | ased Work action | Home Bo Proc | ased Other luction | Home Bo Attr | ased Other action | Non-Home Prod | Based Other luction | Non-Home Attr | Based Other | Source |
| | | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | |
| | Implement/ Improve on-street bicycle facility | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | TDM Strategy |
| Bicycle Infrastructure | Include Bike parking per LAMC | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | Appendix, Bicycle Infrastructure |
| | Include secure bike parking and showers | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.6% | sections 1 - 3 |
| Neighborhood | Traffic calming improvements | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | TDM Strategy Appendix, |
| Enhancement | Pedestrian network improvements | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 2.0% | Neighborhood Enhancement sections 1 - 2 |

| Final Combined & Maximum TDM Effect | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|-----------|------------------------------------|-----------|------------------------------------|-----------|
| | Home Based Work Production | | Home Based Work Attraction | | Home Based Other Production | | Home Based Other Attraction | | Non-Home Based Other Production | | Non-Home Based Other Attraction | |
| | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated | Proposed | Mitigated |
| COMBINED TOTAL | 0% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 0% | 22% | 0% | 19% |
| MAX. TDM EFFECT | 0% | 20% | 0% | 20% | 0% | 20% | 0% | 20% | 0% | 20% | 0% | 20% |

| = Min | = Minimum (X%, 1-[(1-A)*(1-B)]) | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------------------------|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| where X%= | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| PLACE | urban | 75% | | | | | |
| ТҮРЕ | compact infill | 40% | | | | | |
| MAX: | suburban center | 20% | | | | | |
| | suburban | 15% | | | | | |

Note: (1-[(1-A)*(1-B)...]) reflects the dampened combined effectiveness of TDM Strategies (e.g., A, B,...). See the TDM Strategy Appendix (*Transportation Assessment Guidelines Attachment G*) for further discussion of dampening.

> Report 3: TDM Outputs 10 of 13

Report 4: MXD Methodology

Date: June 21, 2021 Project Name: Paseo Marina Project Scenario: Option B Project Address: 13400 W MAXELLA AVE, 90292



| MXD Methodology - Project Without TDM | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------|---------------------|----------------|---------|--|--|
| | Unadjusted Trips | MXD Adjustment | MXD Trips | Average Trip Length | Unadjusted VMT | MXD VMT | | |
| Home Based Work Production | 379 | -18.5% | 309 | 8.3 | 3,146 | 2,565 | | |
| Home Based Other Production | 1,049 | -32.6% | 707 | 5.9 | 6,189 | 4,171 | | |
| Non-Home Based Other Production | 1,358 | -6.1% | 1,275 | 7.4 | 10,049 | 9,435 | | |
| Home-Based Work Attraction | 696 | -20.5% | 553 | 12.6 | 8,770 | 6,968 | | |
| Home-Based Other Attraction | 2,457 | -26.3% | 1,810 | 7.5 | 18,428 | 13,575 | | |
| Non-Home Based Other Attraction | 987 | -6.8% | 920 | 9.2 | 9,080 | 8,464 | | |

MXD Methodology with TDM Measures

| | | Proposed Project | | Project with Mitigation Measures | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--|
| | TDM Adjustment | Project Trips | Project VMT | TDM Adjustment | Mitigated Trips | Mitigated VMT | |
| Home Based Work Production | 0.0% | 309 | 2,565 | -20.0% | 247 | 2,052 | |
| Home Based Other Production | 0.0% | 707 | 4,171 | -20.0% | 566 | 3,337 | |
| Non-Home Based Other Production | 0.0% | 1,275 | 9,435 | -20.0% | 1,020 | 7,548 | |
| Home-Based Work Attraction | 0.0% | 553 | 6,968 | -20.0% | 442 | 5,574 | |
| Home-Based Other Attraction | 0.0% | 1,810 | 13,575 | -20.0% | 1,448 | 10,860 | |
| Non-Home Based Other Attraction | 0.0% | 920 | 8,464 | -20.0% | 736 | 6,771 | |

| MXD VMT Methodology Per Capita & Per Employee | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Total Population: 996 | | | | | | | | |
| | Total Employees: 480 | | | | | | | |
| APC: West Los Angeles | | | | | | | | |
| | Proposed Project | Project with Mitigation Measures | | | | | | |
| Total Home Based Production VMT | 6,736 | 5,389 | | | | | | |
| Total Home Based Work Attraction VMT | 6,968 | 5,574 | | | | | | |
| Total Home Based VMT Per Capita | 6.8 | 5.4 | | | | | | |
| Total Work Based VMT Per Employee | 14.5 | 11.6 | | | | | | |

VMT Calculator User Agreement

The Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), in partnership with the Department of City Planning and Fehr & Peers, has developed the City of Los Angeles Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Calculator to estimate project-specific daily household VMT per capita and daily work VMT per employee for land use development projects. This application, the VMT Calculator, has been provided to You, the User, to assess vehicle miles traveled (VMT) outcomes of land use projects within the City of Los Angeles. The term "City" as used below shall refer to the City of Los Angeles. The terms "City" and "Fehr & Peers" as used below shall include their respective affiliates, subconsultants, employees, and representatives.

The City is pleased to be able to provide this information to the public. The City believes that the public is most effectively served when they are provided access to the technical tools that inform the public review process of private and public land use investments. However, in using the VMT Calculator, You agree to be bound by this VMT Calculator User Agreement (this Agreement).

VMT Calculator Application for the City of Los Angeles. The City's consultant calibrated the VMT Calculator's parameters in 2018 to estimate travel patterns of locations in the City, and validated those outcomes against empirical data. However, this calibration process is limited to locations within the City, and practitioners applying the VMT Calculator outside of the City boundaries should not apply these estimates without further calibration and validation of travel patterns to verify the VMT Calculator's accuracy in estimating VMT in such other locations.

Limited License to Use. This Agreement gives You a limited, non-transferrable, non-assignable, and nonexclusive license to use and execute a copy of the VMT Calculator on a computer system owned, leased or otherwise controlled by You in Your own facilities, as set out below, provided You do not use the VMT Calculator in an unauthorized manner, and that You do not republish, copy, distribute, reverse-engineer, modify, decompile, disassemble, transfer, or sell any part of the VMT Calculator, and provided that You know and follow the terms of this Agreement. Your failure to follow the terms of this Agreement shall automatically terminate this license and Your right to use the VMT Calculator.

Ownership. You understand and acknowledge that the City owns the VMT Calculator, and shall continue to own it through Your use of it, and that no transfer of ownership of any kind is intended in allowing You to use the VMT Calculator.

Warranty Disclaimer. In spite of the efforts of the City and Fehr & Peers, some information on the VMT Calculator may not be accurate. The VMT Calculator, OUTPUTS AND ASSOCIATED DATA ARE PROVIDED "as is" WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, whether expressed, implied, statutory, or otherwise including but not limited to, the implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose.

Limitation of Liability. It is understood that the VMT Calculator is provided without charge. Neither the City nor Fehr & Peers can be responsible or liable for any information derived from its use, or for any delays, inaccuracies, incompleteness, errors or omissions arising out of your use of the VMT Calculator or with respect to the material contained in the VMT Calculator. You understand and agree that Your sole remedy against the City or Fehr & Peers for loss or damage caused by any defect or failure of the

VMT Calculator, regardless of the form of action, whether in contract, tort, including negligence, strict liability or otherwise, shall be the repair or replacement of the VMT Calculator to the extent feasible as determined solely by the City. In no event shall the City or Fehr & Peers be responsible to You or anyone else for, or have liability for any special, indirect, incidental or consequential damages (including, without limitation, damages for loss of business profits or changes to businesses costs) or lost data or downtime, however caused, and on any theory of liability from the use of, or the inability to use, the VMT Calculator, whether the data, and/or formulas contained in the VMT Calculator are provided by the City or Fehr & Peers, or another third party, even if the City or Fehr & Peers have been advised of the possibility of such damages.

This Agreement and License shall be governed by the laws of the State of California without regard to their conflicts of law provisions, and shall be effective as of the date set forth below and, unless terminated in accordance with the above or extended by written amendment to this Agreement, shall terminate on the earlier of the date that You are not making use of the VMT Calculator or one year after the beginning of Your use of the VMT Calculator.

By using the VMT Calculator, You hereby waive and release all claims, responsibilities, liabilities, actions, damages, costs, and losses, known and unknown, against the City and Fehr & Peers for Your use of the VMT Calculator.

Before making decisions using the information provided in this application, contact City LADOT staff to confirm the validity of the data provided.

Print and sign below, and submit to LADOT along with the transportation assessment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

| You, the User | |
|----------------|--|
| By: | Jash |
| Print Name: | Jason Shender, AICP |
| Title: | Transportation Planner III |
| Company: | Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers |
| Address: | 20931 Burbank Boulevard, Suite C Woodland Hills, CA 91367 |
| Phone: | (818) 835-8648 |
| Email Address: | jshender@llgengineers.com |
| Date: | 6/21/2021 |
| | |

APPENDIX J

HCM AND LEVELS OF SERVICE EXPLANATION HCM DATA WORKSHEETS – WEEKDAY AM AND PM PEAK HOURS OPTION A

LEVEL OF SERVICE FOR SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

In the *Highway Capacity Manual (HCM)*, published by the Transportation Research Board, 2010, level of service for signalized intersections is defined in terms of delay, which is a measure of driver discomfort, frustration, fuel consumption, and increased travel time. The delay experienced by a motorist is made up of a number of factors that relate to control, geometrics, traffic, and incidents. Total delay is the difference between the travel time actually experienced and the reference travel time that would result during base conditions: in the absence of traffic control, in the absence of geometric delay, in the absence of incidents, and when there are no other vehicles on the road. Only the portion of total delay attributed to the control facility is quantified. This delay is called *control delay*. Control delay includes initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay.

Level of Service criteria for traffic signals are stated in terms of the average control delay per vehicle. Delay is a complex measure and is dependent on a number of variables, including the quality of progression, the cycle length, the green ratio, and the v/c ratio for the lane group in question.

| Level of Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Level of Service | Control Delay (Sec/Veh) | | | | | |
| А | ≤ 10 | | | | | |
| В | > 10 and ≤ 20 | | | | | |
| С | > 20 and ≤ 35 | | | | | |
| D | $> 35 \text{ and} \le 55$ | | | | | |
| E | > 55 and ≤ 80 | | | | | |
| F | > 80 | | | | | |

Level of Service (LOS) values are used to describe intersection operations with service levels varying from LOS A (free flow) to LOS F (jammed condition). The following descriptions summarize *HCM* criteria for each level of service:

LOS A describes operations with very low control delay, up to 10 seconds per vehicle. This level of service occurs when progression is extremely favorable and most vehicles arrive during the green phase. Most vehicles do not stop at all. Short cycle lengths may also contribute to low delay values.

LOS B describes operations with control delay greater than 10 and up to 20 seconds per vehicle. This level generally occurs with good progression, short cycle lengths, or both. More vehicles stop than with LOS A, causing higher levels of delay.

LOS C describes operations with control delay greater than 20 and up to 35 seconds per vehicle. These higher delays may result from fair progression, longer cycle lengths, or both. Individual cycle failures may begin to appear at this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant at this level, though many still pass through the intersection without stopping.

LOS D describes operations with control delay greater than 35 and up to 55 seconds per vehicle. At LOS D, the influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Longer delays may result from some combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, or high v/c ratios. Many vehicles stop, and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines. Individual cycle failures are noticeable.

LOS E describes operations with control delay greater than 55 and up to 80 seconds per vehicle. This level is considered by many agencies to be the limit of acceptable delay. These high delay values generally indicate poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high v/c ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences.

LOS F describes operations with control delay in excess of 80 seconds per vehicle. This level, considered to be unacceptable to most drivers, often occurs with oversaturation, that is, when arrival flow rates exceed the capacity of the lane groups. It may also occur at high v/c ratios with many individual cycle failures. Poor progression and long cycle lengths may also be major contributing factors to such delay levels.

LEVEL OF SERVICE FOR UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

In the *Highway Capacity Manual (HCM)*, published by the Transportation Research Board, 2010, level of service for unsignalized intersections is defined in terms of delay, which is a measure of driver discomfort, frustration, fuel consumption, and lost travel time. The delay experienced by a motorist is made up of a number of factors that relate to control, geometrics, traffic, and incidents. Total delay is the difference between the travel time actually experienced and the reference travel time that would result during base conditions, in the absence of incidents, control, traffic, or geometric delay. Only the portion of total delay attributed to the traffic control measures, either traffic signals or stop signs, is quantified. This delay is called *control delay*. Control delay includes initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay.

Level of Service criteria for unsignalized intersections are stated in terms of the average control delay per vehicle. The level of service is determined by the computed or measured control delay and is defined for each minor movement. Average control delay for any particular minor movement is a function of the service time for the approach and the degree of utilization. (Level of service is not defined for the intersection as a whole for two-way stop controlled intersections.)

| Level of Service Criteria for TWSC/AWSC Intersections | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Level of Service | Average Control Delay (Sec/Veh) | | | | | | | | |
| А | ≤ 10 | | | | | | | | |
| В | $> 10 \text{ and } \le 15$ | | | | | | | | |
| С | > 15 and ≤ 25 | | | | | | | | |
| D | > 25 and ≤ 35 | | | | | | | | |
| Е | $>$ 35 and \leq 50 | | | | | | | | |
| F | > 50 | | | | | | | | |

Level of Service (LOS) values are used to describe intersection operations with service levels varying from LOS A (free flow) to LOS F (jammed condition). The following descriptions summarize *HCM* criteria for each level of service:

LOS A describes operations with very low control delay, up to 10 seconds per vehicle.

LOS B describes operations with control delay greater than 10 and up to 15 seconds per vehicle.

LOS C describes operations with control delay greater than 15 and up to 25 seconds per vehicle.

LOS D describes operations with control delay greater than 25 and up to 35 seconds per vehicle.

LOS E describes operations with control delay greater than 35 and up to 50 seconds per vehicle.

LOS F describes operations with control delay in excess of 50 seconds per vehicle. For two-way stop controlled intersections, LOS F exists when there are insufficient gaps of suitable size to allow side-street demand to safely cross through a major-street traffic stream. This level of service is generally evident from extremely long control delays experienced by side-street traffic and by queuing on the minor-street approaches.

HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report General Information Site Information Analyst JAS Intersection Walgrove / Washington

| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Walgrove / Washington |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Culver City |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Washington Boulevard |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Walgrove Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Fasth | ound | | Westbound | | | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | |
|---|------|---------|--------|------|-----------|--------|------|-----|---|-------|-------|---|------------|------|------|------|--|
| Approach | | Lastu | т | D | | vvesti | т | D | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement | U | L | 1 | К | U | L | 1 | К | U | L | 1 | ĸ | U | L | 1 | К | |
| Priority | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 40 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 290 | 1180 | | | | 1107 | 164 | | | | | | 13 | | 254 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Left | Only | | | | | | 5 | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 315 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 290 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 487 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 323 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.65 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.90 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 4.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 8.6 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 25.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 64.4 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | С | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | 4.9 | | | | | | | | | 64.4 | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | I | - | | |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

| General InformationSite InformationAnalystJASIntersectionWalgrove / WashingtonAgency/Co.Linscott, Law & GreenspanJurisdictionCity of Culver CityDate Performed8/12/2020East/West StreetWashington BoulevardAnalysis Year2020North/South StreetWalgrove AvenueTime AnalyzedExisting + Project - AMPeak Hour Factor0.92Intersection OrientationEast-WestAnalysis Time Period (hrs)0.25Project DescriptionPaseo MarinaHour HactorHour Hactor | HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| AnalystJASIntersectionWalgrove / WashingtonAgency/Co.Linscott, Law & GreenspanJurisdictionCity of Culver CityDate Performed8/12/2020East/West StreetWashington BoulevardAnalysis Year2020North/South StreetWalgrove AvenueTime AnalyzedExisting + Project - AMPeak Hour Factor0.92Intersection OrientationEast-WestAnalysis Time Period (hrs)0.25Project DescriptionPaseo MarinaStreetStreet | General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co.Linscott, Law & GreenspanJurisdictionCity of Culver CityDate Performed8/12/2020East/West StreetWashington BoulevardAnalysis Year2020North/South StreetWalgrove AvenueTime AnalyzedExisting + Project - AMPeak Hour Factor0.92Intersection OrientationEast-WestAnalysis Time Period (hrs)0.25Project DescriptionPaseo MarinaStreetStreet | Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Walgrove / Washington | | | | | | | | |
| Date Performed8/12/2020East/West StreetWashington BoulevardAnalysis Year2020North/South StreetWalgrove AvenueTime AnalyzedExisting + Project - AMPeak Hour Factor0.92Intersection OrientationEast-WestAnalysis Time Period (hrs)0.25Project DescriptionPaseo Marina | Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Culver City | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year2020North/South StreetWalgrove AvenueTime AnalyzedExisting + Project - AMPeak Hour Factor0.92Intersection OrientationEast-WestAnalysis Time Period (hrs)0.25Project DescriptionPaseo MarinaStreet Street Stre | Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Washington Boulevard | | | | | | | | |
| Time AnalyzedExisting + Project - AMPeak Hour Factor0.92Intersection OrientationEast-WestAnalysis Time Period (hrs)0.25Project DescriptionPaseo MarinaEast-WestEast-West | Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Walgrove Avenue | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation East-West Analysis Time Period (hrs) 0.25 Project Description Paseo Marina Second Sec | Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description Paseo Marina | Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | | | |
| | Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | Westbound | | | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | |
|---|------|-------|--------|------|-----------|---|------|-----|---|-------|-------|---|------------|------|------|------|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 290 | 1211 | | | | 1120 | 164 | | | | | | 13 | | 254 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | |) | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Left | Only | | | | | | | ł | 5 | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 315 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 290 | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 481 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 317 | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.66 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.92 | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 4.7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 8.9 | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 25.6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 68.2 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | D | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | 5.0 | | | | | | | | | | 68.2 | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.
HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Walgrove / Washington | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Culver City | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Washington Boulevard | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Walgrove Avenue | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Future - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | Westbound | | | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|--------|------|-----------|---|------|-----|---|-------|-------|---|------------|------|-------|------|--|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 308 | 1290 | | | | 1191 | 174 | | | | | | 14 | | 270 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Left | Only | | | | 5 | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adway | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 335 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 309 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 444 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 271 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.14 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 6.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13.4 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 33.9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 138.1 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | D | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 6. | 5 | | | | | | | | | | 138.1 | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | | |

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop | o-Control Report | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Walgrove / Washington |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Culver City |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Washington Boulevard |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Walgrove Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| Lanes | | | |

La



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastbound Westbound | | | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | | | | |
|---|------|---------------------|--------|------|------|---|-------|-------|---|------------|---|---|-------|------|-------|------|--|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 308 | 1321 | | | | 1204 | 174 | | | | | | 14 | | 270 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Left | Only | | | | 5 | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 335 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 309 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 439 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 264 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.76 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.17 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 6.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13.9 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 35.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 149.2 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | E | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 6 | .6 | | | | | | | | | | 149.2 | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | I | = | | |

HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Walgrove / Washington |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Culver City |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Washington Boulevard |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Walgrove Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| ,- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|-----------|--------|---|----|-------|-------|----|---|-------|-------|---|------------|------|-------|------|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | Westb | bound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 256 | 1153 | | | | 1156 | 82 | | | | | | 51 | | 329 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | Left Only | | | | | | | | | ! | 5 | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 264 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 392 | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 534 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 323 | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.49 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.21 | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 2.7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 17.2 | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 18.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 155.5 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | С | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 3 | .3 | | | | | | | | | | 155.5 | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | | |

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop | o-Control Report | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Walgrove / Washington |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Culver City |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Washington Boulevard |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Walgrove Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|-----------|--------|---|----|------|-------|----|---|-------|-------|---|------------|------|-------|------|--|--|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 256 | 1152 | | | | 1169 | 82 | | | | | | 51 | | 329 | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | Left Only | | | | | | | | 5 | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 264 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 392 | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 528 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 320 | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.23 | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q_{95} (veh) | | 2.8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 17.4 | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 18.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 160.8 | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | C | | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 3 | .4 | | | | | | | | | | 160.8 | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ſ | | | | |

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop | o-Control Report | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Walgrove / Washington |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Culver City |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Washington Boulevard |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Walgrove Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | |
|---|-----------|-------|--------|---|----|------|-------|----|---|-------|-------|---|------------|------|-------|------|--|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 272 | 1258 | | | | 1281 | 87 | | | | | | 54 | | 349 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | Left Only | | | | | | | | 5 | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 280 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 415 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 474 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 271 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.59 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.53 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 3.8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 24.4 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 23.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 291.2 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | С | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 4 | .1 | | | | | | | | | | 291.2 | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | | | |

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop | o-Control Report | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Walgrove / Washington |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Culver City |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Washington Boulevard |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Walgrove Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| Lanos | | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-------|--------|---|----|------|-------|----|---|-------|-------|---|------------|------|-------|------|--|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 272 | 1257 | | | | 1294 | 87 | | | | | | 54 | | 349 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | Left Only | | | | | | | 5 | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 280 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 415 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 469 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 268 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.55 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 3.8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 24.8 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 23.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 300.0 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | С | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 4. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | 300.0 | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | | | |

| | | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | | nanze | su mu | 51360 | | 163 | unto c | Jun | Innary | y | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|----------|----------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------|----------|------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inter | sect | ion Info | ormatio | on | K | *** | ι I _a |
| Agency | lation | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | Fnain | eers | | | | Durat | tion. | h | 0.250 | | | ╡↓↓↓└ | <u>ل</u> |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | | 7 2020 | | Area | Type | د | Other | | | | ۲. ۲. |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | | Fxistir | $n_{\rm r} = \Delta M$ | | PHF | Type | , | 0 98 | | → _* -> | w∔e | *_ <u>}</u> ≁_∲ |
| Urban Street | | Lincoln Boulevard | | Analys | sis Year | 2020 | ig - 7 (W | | Analy | vsis F | Period | 1> 8.0 | 00 | ¥ 7 | | |
| Intersection | | Lincoln / Maxella | | File N | ame | 02AM | - Existi | na vi | is is | y 010 1 | onou | 11 0.0 | | | | <u>_</u> _ |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | ig.nu | | | | | | - | 1) 1 1 4 1 4 1 1 1 | ſ * ſ* |
| T TOJECT Descrip | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | T | R | L | | Т | R | L | T | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 76 | 80 | 196 | 183 | 3 | 39 1 | 122 | 117 | 2072 | 277 | 122 | 1827 | 59 |
| | | | | 1 | | b 116 | _ | | | | | _ | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | 245 | < <mark>∎4</mark> ¥∎ | | | E | _7 | | ļ | | rta | | |
| Cycle, s | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | ľ | 517 | * | 2 | 2 F | ₹ | | | 1 | | | ♣ 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 18.9 | 19.6 | 19.1 | 18 | 3.9 2 | 23.9 | 0.0 | | | | | 5 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.9 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 3. | 6 3 | 3.6 | 0.0 | | <u>ר</u> ן א | | | Y |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 2. | 5 2 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timer Peculta | | | | EDI | _ | EDT | \//D | | \//D ⁻ | т | NDI | | NDT | CDI | | ерт |
| Assigned Phase | 0 | | | EDI | | | VVD | | VVD | <u> </u> | 5 | | 2 | 301 | | 6 |
| Assigned Phase | U | | | <u> </u> | | 4 | | \rightarrow | 0 | | 10 | | 2 | 10 | <u> </u> | 0 |
| Case Number | | | | | _ | 9.0 | | - | 9.0 | | 25.0 | | 3.0 | 1.2 | | 4.0 |
| Charge Duration | | | | <u> </u> | | SU.U | | \rightarrow | 25.0 | , | 25.0 | <u> </u> | 50.0 | 25.0 | | 50.0 |
| Change Period | , (Y+R | c), S |), S | | | 6.1 | | - | 6.1 | - | 5.9 | | 5.9 | 6.1 | _ | 5.4 |
| Max Allow Head | dway(/ | VIAH), S | H), s g s), s | | | 4.4 | | - | 4.3 | | 3.1 | _ | 0.0 | 3.1 | _ | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | | e (g s), s | <u> </u> | | 14.3 | <u> </u> | _ | 10.3 | 3 | 2.0 | | | 5.3 | \rightarrow | | |
| Green Extensio | n lime | (ge), s | | <u> </u> | | 1.0 | | _ | 0.9 | | 7.8 | | 0.0 | 0.2 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | <u> </u> | | 1.00 |) | 1.00 |) | | 1.00 | <u></u> | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.09 | | | 0.13 | 3 | 0.26 | 5 | | 0.00 | , | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | W | В | | _ | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | F | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | 78 | 82 | 200 | 125 | 10 | 1 12 | 24 | 119 | 2114 | 283 | 124 | 1451 | 473 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1610 | 1810 | 184 | 15 16 | 610 | 1757 | 1725 | 1610 | 1757 | 1900 | 1857 |
| Queue Service | Time (| g s), s | | 4.8 | 4.8 | 12.3 | 8.3 | 6. | 57. | .7 | 0.0 | 44.1 | 14.3 | 3.3 | 29.2 | 29.2 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 4.8 | 4.8 | 12.3 | 8.3 | 6. | 57. | .7 | 0.0 | 44.1 | 14.3 | 3.3 | 29.2 | 29.2 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.33 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 5 0.2 | 29 | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | 4:- (X) | | 333 | 349 | 533 | 263 | 26 | 8 46 | 68 | 6/6 | 1/56 | 780 | 622 | 1956 | 637 |
| Volume-to-Capa | | $\frac{100(X)}{100(X)}$ | | 0.233 | 104.4 | 0.376 | 0.476 | 120 | 10 0.2 | 200 | 72.0 | 1.204 | 0.362 | 0.200 | 0.742 | 0.742 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), IU | in (95 in percentile) | | 99.5 | 104.4 | 140.9 | 1/5 | 138 | 1.Z 14 | 41 | 13.9 | 1225. 2 | 234.3 | 02.7 | 495.7 | 511.9 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 4.0 | 4.2 | 5.6 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 6 5. | .6 | 3.0 | 49.0 | 9.4 | 2.5 | 19.7 | 20.5 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0.0 | 00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d 1), s | /veh | | 45.2 | 45.2 | 6.7 | 51.0 | 50. | .2 35 | 5.4 | 44.6 | 43.0 | 20.9 | 33.7 | 37.6 | 37.6 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 | e), s/veh | | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 90. | .3 | 0.0 | 97.6 | 1.3 | 0.1 | 2.6 | 7.6 |
| Initial Queue De | elay(d | з), 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 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| d), s/ve | eh | | 45.6 | 45.6 | 7.1 | 52.3 | 51. | .1 35 | 5.7 | 44.6 | 140.5 | 22.2 | 33.8 | 40.2 | 45.3 |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | D | D | A | D | D | | D | D | F | С | С | D | D |
| Approach Delay | y, s/veh | / LOS | | 24.2 | 2 | С | 46.1 | 1 | D | | 122. | 7 | F | 41.0 |) | D |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | eh / LOS | | | | 79 | 9.2 | | | | | | | E | | |
| Multiment | a | | | | | | | 144 | D | | | | | | 0.0 | |
| Nuttimodal Re | SUITS | 11.00 | | 0.07 | - EB | 0 | 0.07 | 7 | | | 0.00 | NB | | 0.00 | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LUS | | 2.97 | | | 2.87 | | C | | 2.32 | | В | 2.32 | | в |
| BICYCIE LOS SC | ore / LC | 72 | | 1.08 | 5 | А | 1.07 | | А | | 1.87 | | В | 1.33 |) | А |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|-------------------|--|-------------------------------|--------|---------|----------|----------|----------|-------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------|-------|-----------------|-----------|-------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intors | octic | on Info | rmatio | n | | **** | ۰ ل <u>ـ</u> |
| | lation | Linscott Law & Gre | onenan | Engine | ore | | | | Durati | on h | | 0 250 | /// | | 4 + + + L | L. |
| Apolyot | | | enspan | | | | 7 2020 | | | 511, 11 5400 | 1 | Othor | | 1 | | <u>گ</u> |
| Analysi | | City of Los Angeles | | Time | oriod | Fixiatin | 7, 2020 | | | ype | | | | →_* | w1= | ~ _}_ ★ |
| Junsaiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Projec | t - AM | | | | | 0.96 | | 14 M | | |
| Urban Street | | Lincoln Boulevard | | Analys | sis Year | 2020 | | | Analys | sis P | eriod | 1> 8:0 | 00 | | 55 + + + | ~ |
| Intersection | | Lincoln / Maxella | | File Na | ame | 02AM | - Existi | ng wi | th Proje | ect.xu | us | | | 5 | 4 1 4 Y 1 | ۳ ۲ |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | _ | | EB | _ | | W | /B | | | NB | _ | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | T F | र | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 76 | 80 | 196 | 195 | 3 | 9 13 | 34 | 117 | 2072 | 291 | 127 | 1827 | 59 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | 215 | | | | | 7 | | | Ĺ | | _ | |
| Cycle, s | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | P | | - | 2 | 1 | o € | | | | $\mathbf{\Psi}$ | | ÷ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 18.9 | 19.6 | 19 1 | 18 | 39 2 | 39 | 0.0 | | 1 | _ ∠ | 3 | X 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.9 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 6 3. | .6 | 0.0 | | | | | \rightarrow |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 2. | 5 2. | 5 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | - | EBT | WB | L | WBT | | NBL | | NBT | SBI | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 4 | | | 8 | | 5 | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 9.0 | | | 9.0 | | 1.3 | | 3.0 | 1.2 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | uration, s Period,(Y+Rc), s | | | | | 30.0 | | | 25.0 | | 25.0 | | 50.0 | 25.0 |) : | 50.0 |
| Change Period, | eriod, (Y+R c), s Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 6.1 | | | 6.1 | | 5.9 | | 5.9 | 6.1 | | 5.4 |
| Max Allow Head | e Period, (Y+R c), s ow Headway (MAH), s | | | | | 4.4 | | | 4.3 | | 3.1 | | 0.0 | 3.1 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | Ige Period, (Y+R c), s Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s ie Clearance Time (<i>g</i> s), s | | | | | 14.3 | | | 10.8 | | 2.0 | | | 5.4 | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | 1.0 | | | 0.9 | | 7.8 | | 0.0 | 0.2 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | ange Period, ($Y+R c$), s k Allow Headway (MAH), s eue Clearance Time ($g s$), s en Extension Time ($g e$), s ase Call Probability (Out Brobability | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | nge Period, ($Y+R_c$), s Allow Headway (MAH), s ue Clearance Time (g_s), s en Extension Time (g_e), s se Call Probability Out Probability | | | | | 0.09 | | | 0.18 | | 0.27 | | | 0.00 |) | |
| | , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate(<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | 78 | 82 | 200 | 133 | 105 | 5 137 | 7 | 119 | 2114 | 297 | 130 | 1451 | 473 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1610 | 1810 | 184 | 4 161 | 0 | 1757 | 1725 | 1610 | 1757 | 1900 | 1857 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | | 4.8 | 4.8 | 12.3 | 8.8 | 6.7 | 7 8.6 | ; | 0.0 | 44.1 | 15.1 | 3.4 | 29.2 | 29.2 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 4.8 | 4.8 | 12.3 | 8.8 | 6.7 | 7 8.6 | ; | 0.0 | 44.1 | 15.1 | 3.4 | 29.2 | 29.2 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.33 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 5 0.2 | 9 | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 333 | 349 | 533 | 263 | 268 | 3 468 | 3 | 676 | 1756 | 780 | 622 | 1956 | 637 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | itio(X) | | 0.233 | 0.234 | 0.376 | 0.507 | 0.39 | 0.29 | 92 0 | 0.177 | 1.204 | 0.381 | 0.208 | 0.742 | 0.742 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) | | 99.3 | 104.4 | 140.9 | 187.8 | 145 | .1 156 | .2 | 73.9 | 1225. 2 | 245.9 | 65.4 | 493.7 | 511.9 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 4.0 | 4.2 | 5.6 | 7.5 | 5.8 | 3 6.2 | 2 | 3.0 | 49.0 | 9.8 | 2.6 | 19.7 | 20.5 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1). s | /veh | | 45.2 | 45.2 | 6.7 | 51.2 | 50.4 | 4 35. | 7 | 44.6 | 43.0 | 21.2 | 33.8 | 37.6 | 37.6 |
| Incremental De | lav (d 2 |), s/veh | | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.0 | 97.6 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 2.6 | 7.6 |
| Initial Queue De | elav (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/ve | eh | | 45.6 | 45.6 | 7.1 | 52.8 | 51 | 3 36 | 1 | 44.6 | 140.5 | 22.6 | 33.8 | 40.2 | 45.3 |
| Level of Service | | | | D | D | Α | D | | D | | D | F | C | C | D | D |
| Approach Delay | () | / LOS | | 24.2 | 2 | C | 46.3 | | D | | 122.2 | 2 | F | 41.0 |) | D_ |
| Intersection De | lav, s/ve | eh / LOS | | | | - 78 | 3.9 | | | | | | | E | | - |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | S Score | /LOS | | 2.97 | 7 | С | 2.87 | 7 | С | | 2.32 | | В | 2.32 | 2 | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 1.08 | 3 | Α | 1.11 | | А | | 1.88 | | В | 1.33 | 3 | А |

| | | 1100 | i olg | nanze | a mi | 61366 | | 103 | unts c | Jun | Innary | y | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|---|-------------------|---------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|----------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| General Inforn | nation | | | | | | | | Inters | secti | ion Info | ormatio | on | K | 4741 | ι I _a |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | Engine | ers | | | | Durat | tion. | h | 0.250 | | | ╡↓↓↓└ | 4 |
| Analyst | | JAS | onopun | Analys | sis Date | | 7 2020 | | Area | Type | د | Other | | - - 1 - 4 | | <u>گ</u> |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | - AM | | PHF | 1990 | , | 0.98 | | → _* * → | w∔e | *_ <u>}</u> ≁_∲ |
| Urban Street | | Lincoln Boulevard | | Analys | sis Year | 2026 | 5 7 11 | | Analy | vsis F | Period | 1> 8.0 | 0 | * ~ | | |
| Intersection | | Lincoln / Maxella | | File Na | ame | 02AM | - Future | | , and y | ,010 1 | onou | 11 0.0 | | ┤҇─┓ | | <u>~</u> ⊂ |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | 02/ (1/1 | - i uture | J.Auc | , | | | | | - | 1 | ۲ ۲ ۲ |
| r reject Becchip | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | ۷ | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | /eh/h | | | 81 | 85 | 208 | 262 | 4 | 11 1 | 135 | 124 | 2213 | 304 | 132 | 1964 | 63 |
| | | | | | b 111 | | | | | | _ | _ | | | | 1 |
| Signal Informa | ation | | | | 215 | s etter | | | Ę | 7 | | Į | L | -+- | | _ |
| Cycle, s | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | ľ | 1 <u>51</u> | * 1 2 SA | 7 | - ^e F | ₹ | | | 1 | | * 📑 - | € ₄ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 18.9 | 19.6 | 19.1 | 18 | 8.9 2 | 23.9 | 0.0 | | | | - | <u> </u> |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.9 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 3. | .6 3 | 3.6 | 0.0 | ' | く 4 | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 2. | .5 2 | 2.5 | 0.0 | ↓ | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timer Desults | | | | | | EDT | | | | T I | | | NDT | 0.01 | | ODT |
| Assigned Dhee | | | | EBI | | EBI | VVB | | VVB | - | NBL | - | NBI | SBL | - | 5B1 |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 4 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 0 | - | 2 | | 2 | 10 | | 0 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 9.0 | | - | 9.0 | | 25.0 | | 3.0 | 1.2 | | 4.0 |
| Change Duration | | | s | | | SU.U | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 25.0 | , I | 25.0 | | 50.0 | 25.0 | , ; | 50.0 |
| Change Period | , (Y+R | c), S |), s | | | 0.1 | | - | 0.1 | - | 5.9 | | 5.9 | 0.1 | | 5.4 |
| Max Allow Heat | dway (<i>1</i> | MAH), S | H), s g s), s | | | 4.4 | | - | 4.3 | _ | 3.1 | | 0.0 | 3.1 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | | e (gs), s | | | 15.2 | | | 14.2 | <u> </u> | 2.0 | | 0.0 | 5.6 | | 0.0 | |
| Green Extensio | n lime | (ge), s | | | + | 1.0 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 0.8 | | 8.6 | | 0.0 | 0.2 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | | (MAH), s ne (g s), s e (g e), s | | | | 1.00 | <u> </u> | | 1.00 | - | 1.00 | | | 1.00 | , | |
| Max Out Proba | DIIITY | | | | | 0.15 | | | 0.85 | > | 0.32 | | | 0.00 |) | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | W | В | Т | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | F | र | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v | ′), veh/h | | 83 | 87 | 212 | 179 | 13 | 0 13 | 38 | 127 | 2258 | 310 | 135 | 1560 | 508 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1610 | 1810 | 183 | 39 16 | 10 | 1757 | 1725 | 1610 | 1757 | 1900 | 1858 |
| Queue Service | Time (| g s), s | | 5.1 | 5.1 | 13.2 | 12.2 | 8. | 5 8. | .6 | 0.0 | 44.1 | 16.0 | 3.6 | 32.2 | 32.2 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 5.1 | 5.1 | 13.2 | 12.2 | 8. | 58. | .6 | 0.0 | 44.1 | 16.0 | 3.6 | 32.2 | 32.2 |
| Green Ratio (g | ı/C) | | | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.33 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 5 0.2 | 29 | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 333 | 349 | 533 | 263 | 26 | 7 46 | 68 | 660 | 1756 | 780 | 622 | 1956 | 637 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | atio (X) | | 0.248 | 0.248 | 0.399 | 0.681 | 0.4 | 87 0.2 | 294 | 0.192 | 1.286 | 0.398 | 0.217 | 0.798 | 0.798 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft | /In (95 th percentile) | | 106.2 | 111.3 | 150.2 | 254.3 | 182 | 2.3 157 | 7.5 | 78.4 | 1459. 9 | 257 | 68 | 540.5 | 564.8 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), v | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 4.2 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 10.2 | 7.3 | 3 6. | .3 | 3.1 | 58.4 | 10.3 | 2.7 | 21.6 | 22.6 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay | (d 1), s | /veh | | 45.4 | 45.4 | 6.8 | 52.7 | 51. | .1 35 | 5.8 | 46.0 | 43.0 | 21.4 | 33.8 | 38.6 | 38.6 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 | e), s/veh | | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 7.0 | 1.4 | 4 0. | .3 | 0.1 | 133.2 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 3.5 | 10.0 |
| Initial Queue De | elay(d | з), 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 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| d), s/v | eh | | 45.8 | 45.7 | 7.2 | 59.6 | 52. | .5 36 | 6.1 | 46.0 | 176.2 | 22.9 | 33.9 | 42.1 | 48.7 |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | D | D | A | Е | D | | 2 | D | F | С | С | D | D |
| Approach Delay | y, s/veh | /LOS | | 24.3 | 3 | С | 50.3 | 3 | D | | 152.4 | 4 | F | 43.1 | | D |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | eh / LOS | | | | 93 | 3.9 | | | | | | | F | | |
| Multimodal De | eulte | | | | ED | | | \^/ | B | | | NP | | | SD | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /1.05 | | 2.07 | 7 | C | 2.87 | 7 | | - | 2 3 3 | | B | 2 20 | | B |
| Ricycle I OS Sc | | | | 2.97 | , | Δ | 1.07 | 2 | ^ | \rightarrow | 1.07 | | B | 1 10 | - | Δ |
| Dicycle LOS SC | | | | 1.12 | - | Л | 1.20 | , | А | | 1.97 | | U | 1.40 | , | Λ |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------|-------------|----------|--------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|------------|----------|------------|--|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intor | react | ion Info | ormatio | n | | ** | ۰ ل <u>ـ</u> |
| | lation | Linscott Law & Gre | onenan | Engine | ore | | | | Dura | ation | b | 0 250 | <i>,</i> ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | | 4 + + + L | L. |
| Apolyot | | | enspan | | | | 7 2020 | | Aroo | | <u></u> | Othor | | 1 | | <u>گ</u> |
| | | JAS City of Los Angeles | | Times | | Future | 7,2020 | | Area | атуре - | 5 | | | | w1 = | ×_ }_ |
| Jurisaiction | | City of Los Angeles | | | Period | Projec | e with ct - AM | | | - | | 0.98 | | 14 1/2 14 | 8 | ± 1 |
| Urban Street | | Lincoln Boulevard | | Analys | sis Year | 2026 | | | Anal | lysis l | Period | 1> 8:0 | 00 | | <u> </u> | <u>م</u> |
| Intersection | | Lincoln / Maxella | | File Na | ame | 02AM | - Future | e with | n Proje | ect.xı | ıs | | | 5 | 4 1 4 7 1 | ▼ |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | T | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 81 | 85 | 208 | 274 | 4 | 1 | 147 | 124 | 2213 | 318 | 137 | 1964 | 63 |
| - | | | | | _ | | _ | <u> </u> | | - | | | | | <u> </u> | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | 215 | | | | \exists | 7 | | l | Ĺ | -+- | | _ |
| Cycle, s | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | ľ | 1 5th | - 12 SA | 2 | | Ř. | | | | Y | Ľ⊢;- | -€ ₄ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 18.9 | 19.6 | 19.1 | 18 | 3.9 | 23.9 | 0.0 | _ | | | • | K |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.9 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 3. | 6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | ^ | く 2 | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 2. | 5 | 2.5 | 0.0 | ļ | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | _ | | _ | | | _ | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | - | EBT | WB | | WB | 3T | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 4 | | _ | 8 | | 5 | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 9.0 | | \rightarrow | 9.0 | 0 | 1.3 | | 3.0 | 1.2 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | n, s I, (Y+R c), s | | | | | 30.0 | | \rightarrow | 25.0 | .0 | 25.0 | | 50.0 | 25.0 |) ; | 50.0 |
| Change Period, | , (Y+R) | /+R c), s y (MAH), s | | | | 6.1 | | | 6.1 | 1 | 5.9 | | 5.9 | 6.1 | | 5.4 |
| Max Allow Head | d, (Y+R c), s adway (<i>MAH</i>), s ince Time (<i>q</i> s), s | | | | | 4.4 | | \rightarrow | 4.3 | 3 | 3.1 | | 0.0 | 3.1 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | adway (MAH), s ance Time (g_s), s | | | | | 15.2 | | | 14.8 | .8 | 2.0 | | | 5.7 | | |
| Green Extensio | v Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s earance Time (<i>g</i> _s), s tension Time (<i>g</i> _e), s | | | | | 1.0 | | | 0.8 | 8 | 8.6 | | 0.0 | 0.2 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | e Duration, s ge Period, ($Y+Rc$), s Nlow Headway (MAH), s e Clearance Time (gs), s n Extension Time (ge), s e Call Probability Dut Probability | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 | 00 | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | adway (<i>MAH</i>), s ance Time (<i>g</i> s), s ion Time (<i>g</i> e), s robability pability | | | | | 0.15 | | | 1.00 | 00 | 0.33 | | | 0.00 |) | |
| Movement Gre | | | | | ED | | | \٨/٢ | D | _ | | ND | _ | | S P | |
| Approach Move | mont | Suits | | | ED | D | | | 5 | D | 1 | | D | | зы | D |
| Approach Move | mont | | | | 1 | 14 | | 0 | | 10 | L 5 | ו ר | 12 | | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow | |) yoh/h | | 1 | 4 | 14 | 3 107 | 0 | 1 1 | 10 | 107 | 2 | 12 | 140 | 1560 | 509 |
| Adjusted Flow r | tion Flo |), ven/n | n | 03 | 0/ | 212 | 107 | 102 | + I | 610 | 121 | 4705 | 324 | 140 | 1000 | 1050 |
| Adjusted Satura | | | n | 1010 | 1900 | 1010 | 1010 | 103 | | 010 | 1757 | 1725 | 1010 | 1/5/ | 1900 | 1000 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | gs), s a Tima (a) a | | 5.1 | 5.1 | 13.2 | 12.8 | 8.7 | 7 9 7 0 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 44.1 | 10.9 | 3.7 | 32.2 | 32.2 |
| | | e filme (<i>g</i> c), s | | 5.1 0.40 | 0.10 | 13.2 | 12.0 | 0.1 | | 9.5 | 0.0 | 44.1 | 10.9 | 3.7 | 32.2 | 32.2 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.33 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 5 U. 7 4 | 1.29 | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Valume to Con | en/n | tio (X) | | 333 | 349 | 0.200 | 203 | 20 | $\frac{7}{2}$ | 220 | 000 | 1/00 | 780 | 022 | 1956 | 037 |
| Volume-to-Capa | | llio (X) //n (OE the nemeratile) | | 0.248 | 0.248 | 0.399 | 0.712 | 0.50 | JZ U. | .320 | 0.192 | 1.280 | 0.416 | 0.225 | 0.798 | 0.798 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), II/ | in (95 in percentile) | | 106.2 | 111.3 | 150.2 | 208.1 | 188 | .5 17 | 72.9 | 78.4 | 1459. 9 | 208.8 | 70.8 | 540.5 | 504.8 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 4.2 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 10.7 | 7.5 | 5 6 | 6.9 | 3.1 | 58.4 | 10.8 | 2.8 | 21.6 | 22.6 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d 1), s | /veh | | 45.4 | 45.4 | 6.8 | 53.0 | 51. | 2 3 | 86.1 | 46.0 | 43.0 | 21.6 | 33.9 | 38.6 | 38.6 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 8.7 | 1.5 | 5 0 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 133.2 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 3.5 | 10.0 |
| Initial Queue De | elay(d | з), 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/ve | eh | | 45.8 | 45.7 | 7.2 | 61.7 | 52. | 7 3 | 86.4 | 46.0 | 176.2 | 23.3 | 33.9 | 42.1 | 48.7 |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | D | D | A | Е | D | | D | D | F | С | С | D | D |
| Approach Delay | , s/veh | /LOS | | 24.3 | 3 | С | 51.1 | 1 | D |) | 151.8 | 3 | F | 43.1 | | D |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | eh / LOS | | | | 93 | 3.5 | | | | | | | F | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | W | В – | | | NB | _ | | SB | _ |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.97 | | С | 2.87 | <u> </u> | С | | 2.32 | | В | 2.32 | 2 | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | JS | | 1.12 | 2 | А | 1.27 | | A | ۱. | 1.98 | | В | 1.40 |) | А |

| | | inscott, Law & Greenspan, Er | | nanze | u mu | 61360 | | 163 | untə | Juli | mai | y | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|--------|----------|----------|---------|----------|-------|----------|---------|---|---------|-------|-----------|----------------------|---------------|
| O an a sel la fa se | 4! | | | | | | | | Inte | 4 | | | | T D | | T. |
| General Inforn | hation | | | <u> </u> | | | | | Inte | ersect | | ormatio | on | - 1 | ╡↓↓↓└ | Ļ |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Dur | ration, | n | 0.250 | | | | R |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | Aug 2 | 7, 2020 | | Are | ea Type | e | Other | • | ×× | | ~ _ |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existin | ng - PM | | PHI | F | | 0.98 | | | w+e 8 | |
| Urban Street | | Lincoln Boulevard | | Analys | sis Year | 2020 | | | Ana | alysis | Period | 1> 17 | :00 | ار الح | | 7 7 |
| Intersection | | Lincoln / Maxella | | File Na | ame | 02PM | - Existi | ng.xı | ls | | | | | | <u>11111</u> | 7 |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | শ 1 প শ 1 | <u>" "</u> |
| Domand Inform | nation | | | | ED | | | V | | | <u>, </u> | ND | | | CD. | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | | Т | R | | V | т | R | 1 | | R | 1 1 | Т | R |
| Demand (v) v | oh/h | | | 86 | 65 | 103 | 321 | | 1 | 102 | 10/ | 1705 | 346 | 104 | 2060 | 118 |
| Demand (V), V | en/n | | | 00 | 05 | 105 | 521 | | 0 | 192 | 134 | 1790 | 540 | 104 | 2000 | 110 |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | UL. | | | | 3 | | | | 1 | | | |
| Cvcle, s | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | 1 | 12 V 3 | | | _ | F | B. | | | | * | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | | 40.0 | | | | 7 | | | _ | 1 | 2 | 3 | Y 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult, Gap E/W | On | Green | 18.9 | 19.6 | 19.1 | 18 | 3.9 6 | 23.9 | 0.0 | _ | | | | \rightarrow |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult, Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 2 | 5 | 2.5 | 0.0 | -7 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | - | | 1 | | | Щ | | 1 - | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | W | /BT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phas | e | | | | | 4 | | | 8 | 8 | 5 | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 9.0 | | | 9. | .0 | 1.3 | | 3.0 | 1.2 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | . S | | | | | 30.0 | | | 25 | 5.0 | 25.0 | | 50.0 | 25.0 |) : | 50.0 |
| Change Period | . (Y+R) | c). S | s | | | 6.1 | | | 6. | .1 | 5.9 | | 5.9 | 6.1 | | 5.4 |
| Max Allow Hea | dwav (/ | иАН), s | s | | | 4.3 | | | 4. | .3 | 3.1 | | 0.0 | 3.1 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (q s), S | s | | | 8.1 | | - | 17 | 7.3 | 3.6 | | | 4.8 | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | s | | | 0.8 | | | 0. | .5 | 6.7 | | 0.0 | 0.2 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.0 | 00 | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | 1.0 | 00 | 0.25 | | | 0.00 | , | |
| | , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | - | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate(<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | 88 | 66 | 105 | 219 | 20 | 8 | 196 | 198 | 1832 | 353 | 106 | 1683 | 540 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1610 | 1810 | 185 | 53 1 | 1610 | 1757 | 1725 | 1610 | 1757 | 1900 | 1827 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g ₅), s | | 5.4 | 3.8 | 6.1 | 15.3 | 14. | .1 1 | 12.8 | 1.6 | 44.1 | 18.8 | 2.8 | 35.8 | 35.8 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 5.4 | 3.8 | 6.1 | 15.3 | 14. | .1 1 | 12.8 | 1.6 | 44.1 | 18.8 | 2.8 | 35.8 | 35.8 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.33 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 5 (| 0.29 | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 333 | 349 | 533 | 263 | 26 | 9 4 | 468 | 645 | 1756 | 780 | 622 | 1956 | 627 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | tio(X) | | 0.264 | 0.190 | 0.197 | 0.834 | 0.7 | 72 0 |).418 | 0.307 | 1.043 | 0.452 | 0.171 | 0.861 | 0.861 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | 113.1 | 84 | 71.9 | 332.5 | 302 | .4 2 | 223.3 | 122.9 | 814 | 293.7 | 53.2 | 598.6 | 627.2 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 4.5 | 3.4 | 2.9 | 13.3 | 12. | .1 | 8.9 | 4.9 | 32.6 | 11.7 | 2.1 | 23.9 | 25.1 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay | (d 1), s | /veh | | 45.5 | 44.9 | 6.3 | 54.0 | 53. | .5 3 | 37.2 | 47.1 | 43.0 | 22.1 | 33.6 | 39.8 | 39.8 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 20.1 | 12. | .9 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 33.7 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 14.5 |
| Initial Queue D | elay (<i>d</i> | з), 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 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| d), s/ve | eh | | 45.9 | 45.1 | 6.5 | 74.1 | 66. | .4 3 | 37.8 | 47.2 | 76.7 | 24.0 | 33.6 | 45.0 | 54.3 |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | D | D | A | E | E | | D | D | F | С | С | D | D |
| Approach Dela | y, s/veh | /LOS | | 29.7 | 7 | С | 60.1 | | E | E | 66.4 | | E | 46.7 | | D |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | h / LOS | | | | 55 | 5.8 | | | | | | | E | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | // 00 | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | _ | | SB | _ |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LOS | | 2.97 | | C | 2.87 | | C | ; | 2.32 | | В | 2.32 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS So | ore / LC |)S | | 0.92 | 2 | A | 1.52 | 2 | E | В | 1.80 | | В | 1.45 | | A |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS[™] Streets Version 7.8.5

| | | nee | . eig | | | 01000 | | | anto | oun | | , | | | | |
|--------------------|--|----------------------------|--------|----------|-----------|-------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|------------|----------|----------|------------------|---------------|
| Gonoral Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | oreact | ion Infr | ormatio | n | | 4.14.1 | × L. |
| | ation | Linscott Law & Gre | onenan | Engin | ore | | | | | ration | h | 0 250 | | | 4 + + + L | L. |
| Apolyot | | | enspan | | | | 7 2020 | | Aro | | <u>.</u> | Othor | | 1 | | <u>گ</u> |
| Analysi | | JAO City of Loo Angoloo | | Time | oriod | Fixiati | 7, 2020 | | | за туре п | 3 | | | ^ | w↓ F | ₹ }- |
| Junsalction | | City of Los Angeles | | | enou | Projec | t - PM | | | | | 0.90 | | | | |
| Urban Street | | Lincoln Boulevard | | Analys | sis Year | · 2020 | | | Ana | alysis l | Period | 1> 17 | :00 | | 5 5 6 6 6 | <u>م</u> |
| Intersection | | Lincoln / Maxella | | File Na | ame | 02PM | - Existi | ng wi | ith Pr | roject.; | kus | | | 5 | ব ↑�Y1 | × (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | VB | | | NB | | <u> </u> | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | <u> </u> | Т | R | | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 86 | 65 | 103 | 320 | 9 | 98 | 191 | 194 | 1795 | 5 360 | 109 | 2060 | 118 |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | F III | | Г | | | - | | | † | | 1 | |
| Cycle s | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 642 | | | _# | Ē | | | ļ | ╮┗╴ | 572 | | ~ |
| Offset s | 0 | Reference Point | End | L | | 5 1i | ~ P 51 | | 2 | Fi. | | | 1 | 2 | | Y 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult Cap E/W | On | Green | 18.9 | 19.6 | 19.1 | 18 | 3.9 | 23.9 | 0.0 | _ | | | | A |
| Earoo Mada | Fixed | Simult Cop N/S | On | Yellow | 3.9 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 3. | 6 5 | 3.6 | 0.0 | — — | ∕ੇ ¦≚ | | 7 | ¥ . |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Rea | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.3 | Ζ. | 5 | 2.5 | 0.0 | • | 5 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | | EBT | WB | L | W | /BT | NBL | _ | NBT | SBL | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | Э | | | | | 4 | | | 8 | 8 | 5 | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | lumber Duration s | | | | | 9.0 | | \neg | 9. | .0 | 1.3 | | 3.0 | 1.2 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | Duration, s | | | | | 30.0 | | | 25 | 5.0 | 25.0 |) | 50.0 | 25.0 |) : | 50.0 |
| Change Period, | Duration, s Period, (Y+R c), s | | | | | 6.1 | | | 6. | .1 | 5.9 | | 5.9 | 6.1 | | 5.4 |
| Max Allow Head | dway (/ | <i>MAH</i>), s | | | | 4.3 | | | 4. | .3 | 3.1 | | 0.0 | 3.1 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | e Period, (Y+R c), s ow Headway (MAH), s Clearance Time (g s), s | | | | | 8.1 | | \rightarrow | 17 | 7.3 | 3.6 | | | 4.9 | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | 0.8 | | | 0. | .5 | 6.7 | | 0.0 | 0.2 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.0 | 00 | 1.00 |) | | 1.00 | | |
| Max Out Probal | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | 1.0 | 00 | 0.26 | ; | | 0.00 | , | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | 1 - | | W | B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | | 88 | 66 | 105 | 219 | 20 | 8 | 195 | 198 | 1832 | 367 | 111 | 1683 | 540 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1610 | 1810 | 185 | 53 1 | 1610 | 1757 | 1725 | 1610 | 1757 | 1900 | 1827 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), s | | 5.4 | 3.8 | 6.1 | 15.3 | 14. | 0 ' | 12.7 | 1.6 | 44.1 | 19.8 | 2.9 | 35.8 | 35.8 |
| | learanc | e Time (g c), s | | 5.4 | 3.8 | 6.1 | 15.3 | 14. | 0 ' | 12.7 | 1.6 | 44.1 | 19.8 | 2.9 | 35.8 | 35.8 |
| Green Ratio (g. | /C) | | | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.33 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 5 (| 0.29 | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Capacity (c), v | en/n | tio (X) | | 333 | 349 | 533 | 203 | 26 | 9 ⁴ | 468 | 045 | 1/50 | 780 | 622 | 1956 | 627 |
| Pook of Ououo | | (0) (λ) | | 0.204 | 0.190 | 71.0 | 0.032 | 201 | 0 0 | J.4 10 | 122.0 | 014 | 206 5 | 0.179 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| Back of Queue | $(\mathbf{Q}), \mathbf{u}$ | ah/ln (95 th percentie) | (ما | 115.1 | 04 3./ | 20 | 13.2 | 12 | .0 Z | 80 | 122.9 | 32.6 | 12.3 | 22 | 23.0 | 027.2 25.1 |
| | Ratio (| RO (95 th percent | | 4.5 | 0.00 | 2.9 | 0.00 | 12. | | 0.9 | 4.9 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 23.9 | 20.1 |
| Uniform Delay (| | | | 45.5 | 11 9 | 6.3 | 54.0 | 53 | 5 (| 37.2 | <i>1</i> 7 1 | 13.0 | 22.4 | 33.6 | 30.8 | 30.8 |
| | $\left[\frac{u}{d} \right], \frac{u}{d}$ | | | | 03 | 0.3 | 19.7 | 12 | 8 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 33.7 | 22.4 | 0.1 | 52 | 14.5 |
| Initial Queue De | elav (d | 3) s/veh | | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | บ า | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| d) s/v | eh | | 45.9 | 45.1 | 6.5 | 73.7 | 66 | 3 (| 37.8 | 47.2 | 76.7 | 24.4 | 33.7 | 45.0 | 54.3 |
| Level of Service | | | | D | D | Δ | F | F | | | D | F | <u> </u> | C | D | D |
| Approach Delay | / s/voh | /105 | | 20.7 | , , | C | 60.0 | | | F | 66.2 | | F | 46.6 | | |
| Intersection Delay | | h/10S | | 23.1 | | 5 | 57 | , | | _ | 00.2 | | - | F | | - |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LOS | | 2.97 | 7 | С | 2.87 | 7 | C | С | 2.32 | 2 | В | 2.32 | 2 | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 0.92 | 2 | А | 1.51 | | E | В | 1.81 | | В | 1.45 | ; | А |

| | nee | r org | nanzo | a int | .01300 | | 100 | unt | Jour | innai j | , | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|--------|--------------------|-------|-----------------|----------------|----------|--------|-------|-------|------------|---------------|
| General Information | | ott, Law & Greenspan, Eng Anal | | | | | | In | torsoct | tion Inf | ormati | 20 | | 4 | × l <u>.</u> |
| | Lincott Low & Gro | onenan | Engin | ore | | | | | uration | b | 0.250 | | | 4 ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ | L. |
| Agency | | enspan | | | Aug 2 | 7 2020 | | | | <u></u> | Othou | , | 1 | | ۲_ ۲_ |
| Analyst | JAS City of Los Annalas | | Times | | | 7,2020 | | | еатур | e | | | | wî e | ₹ }_ |
| Jurisaiction | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | erioa | Future | 9 - PIVI | | Pr | | Daniad | 0.98 | | | | × * * |
| Urban Street | | | Analys | sis rea | r 2026 | E. A. | | Ar | naiysis | Period | > / | :00 | | | к. К. |
| | Lincoln / Maxella | | File Na | ame | 02PM | - Future | e.xus | S | | | | | _ | <u> </u> | ſ |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 1 44 1 1 | * |
| Demand Information | 1 | | | EB | | | V | NB | | T | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Movement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), veh/h | | | 91 | 69 | 109 | 382 | 1 | 04 | 209 | 206 | 200 | 1 411 | 116 | 2241 | 125 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| Signal Information | | | | 215 | | | Τ | 2 | | | | Ĺ | | | |
| Cycle, s 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | P | - R. | . N S 10 | 2 | Ù | . ¥ | | | | Ψ | | ÷ |
| Offset, s 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 18.0 | 19.6 | 10 1 | 1 | <u>/</u> 8 0 | ¹ 3 | 0.0 | _ | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| Uncoordinated No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.9 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 3 | .6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | | < 🛛 | | | \rightarrow |
| Force Mode Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 2 | .5 | 2.5 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | ۷ | VBT | NBL | - | NBT | SBI | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | | | | | 4 | | | | 8 | 5 | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | 9.0 | | | ę | 9.0 | 1.3 | | 3.0 | 1.2 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | | | | | 30.0 | | | 2 | 25.0 | 25.0 | | 50.0 | 25.0 |) ; | 50.0 |
| Change Period, (Y+ | ₹ c), s | s | | | 6.1 | | | (| 6.1 | 5.9 | | 5.9 | 6.1 | | 5.4 |
| Max Allow Headway | (<i>MAH</i>), s | s H), s a s) s | | | 4.3 | | | 4 | 4.3 | 3.1 | | 0.0 | 3.1 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearance Tin | ne (g s), s | AH), s g s), s | | | 8.5 | | | 2 | 20.7 | 4.5 | | | 5.1 | | |
| Green Extension Time | e (ge), s | (gs), s (ge), s | | | 0.9 | | | (| 0.0 | 7.5 | | 0.0 | 0.2 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability | / | | | | 1.00 | | | 1 | .00 | 1.00 | , | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Probability | | | | | 0.00 | | | 1 | .00 | 0.37 | · | | 0.00 |) | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Group Re | esults | | | EB | | | W | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Movement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | - | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Movement | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate (| <i>v</i>), veh/h | | 93 | 70 | 111 | 261 | 23 | 35 | 213 | 210 | 2042 | 419 | 118 | 1827 | 587 |
| Adjusted Saturation F | low Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1610 | 1810 | 18 | 50 | 1610 | 1757 | 1725 | 1610 | 1757 | 1900 | 1829 |
| Queue Service Time | (gs), s | | 5.7 | 4.1 | 6.5 | 18.7 | 16 | .1 | 14.1 | 2.5 | 44.1 | 23.6 | 3.1 | 40.3 | 40.4 |
| Cycle Queue Clearan | ice Time (<i>g ₀</i>), s | | 5.7 | 4.1 | 6.5 | 18.7 | 16 | .1 | 14.1 | 2.5 | 44.1 | 23.6 | 3.1 | 40.3 | 40.4 |
| Green Ratio (g/C) | | | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.33 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 15 | 0.29 | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Capacity (c), veh/h | | | 333 | 349 | 533 | 263 | 26 | 69 | 468 | 632 | 1756 | 780 | 622 | 1956 | 627 |
| Volume-to-Capacity F | Ratio (X) | | 0.279 | 0.202 | 0.209 | 0.993 | 0.8 | 73 | 0.456 | 0.333 | 1.163 | 0.537 | 0.190 | 0.934 | 0.936 |
| Back of Queue (Q), | ft/ln (95 th percentile) |) | 120 | 89.5 | 76.2 | 457.8 | 363 | 3.3 | 241.4 | 130.4 | 1111.2 | 355.3 | 59.5 | 684.3 | 732.8 |
| Back of Queue (Q), | veh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 4.8 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 18.3 | 14 | .5 | 9.7 | 5.2 | 44.4 | 14.2 | 2.4 | 27.4 | 29.3 |
| Queue Storage Ratio | (RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d 1), | s/ven | | 45.6 | 45.0 | 6.3 | 55.5 | 54 | .4 | 31.1 | 47.7 | 43.0 | 23.3 | 33.7 | 41.3 | 41.3 |
| Incremental Delay (a | 2), s/ven | | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 53.4 | 25 | .4 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 80.0 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 9.8 | 23.3 |
| | u 3), s/ven | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0. | U | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/ | ven | | 46.1 | 45.2 | 6.5 | 108.8 | /9 | .8 | 38.4 | 47.8 | 123.0 | 26.0 | 33.7 | 51.1 | 64.6 |
| Level of Service (LOS | 5) / 00 | | D | | A | F | Ē | : | 0 | D | F | | C | U | E |
| Approach Delay, s/ve | n/LOS | | 29.8 | 5 | C | 78.0 | ו | | E | 101.8 | 5 | F | 53.4 | | D |
| Intersection Delay, s/ | /en / LOS | | | | 76 | 5.1 | | | | | | | E | | |
| Multimodal Results | | | | FR | | | \٨/ | /B | | | NR | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS Scor | e/10S | | 2 07 | , | C | 2.87 | 7 | | С | 2 32 | | В | 2 32 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Score / I | _OS | | 0.94 | | A | 1.66 | 3 | | B | 1.96 | | B | 1.53 | 3 | B |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS[™] Streets Version 7.8.5

| | | nee | . eig | indin 20 | a ma | .01000 | | | anto | oun | inner j | , | | | | |
|-------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------|----------|----------|--------------|----------------|--------|-----------|------------|----------|---------|---------------|----------|-------------------------|-------------|
| Gonoral Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | oreact | ion Inf | ormatic | n n | | 4.14.1 | × L. |
| | ation | Linscott Law & Gre | onenan | Engin | ore | | | | | ration | b | 0 250 | | - | 4 + + + L | L. |
| Apolyot | | | enspan | | | | 7 2020 | | Are | | | Othor | | 1 | | <u>ل</u> |
| Analyst | | JAS City of Los Angelos | | Time | ors Date | = Aug Z | 7, 2020 | | | затур п | 8 | | | →× > | w↓ F | ₹ }- |
| Junsalction | | City of Los Angeles | | I Ime i | enou | Projec | t - PM | | | | | 0.90 | | | | |
| Urban Street | | Lincoln Boulevard | | Analys | sis Yea | r 2026 | | | Ana | alysis | Period | 1> 17 | :00 | | | × |
| Intersection | | Lincoln / Maxella | | File Na | ame | 02PM | - Future | e with | ו Pro | oject.xu | JS | | | 1 | ব ↑ ক• Y [*] 1 | * * |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | <u> </u> | N | VB T | - | <u> </u> | NB | | <u> </u> | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | | R | L | | | R | L | | R | L | | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 91 | 69 | 109 | 381 | 1 | 04 | 208 | 206 | 2001 | 425 | 121 | 2241 | 125 |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | <u> </u> | БЛU | . UL | Г | | | • | | | † | | | |
| Cycle s | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | 1 | 642 | | | _ | F | Ŀ | | ļ | | 512 | | |
| Offset s | 0 | Reference Point | End | | | ``î î | <u>```````</u> | | 2 | Þ. | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | Y 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult Gan E/W | On | Green | 18.9 | 19.6 | 19.1 | 18 | 3.9 | 23.9 | 0.0 | _ | | | | ð- |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult, Gap N/S | On | Red | 3.9 | 4.4 | 3.0 | 3. | 6 5 | 3.0 | 0.0 | | ो ⁵∣⊾₁ | 6 | 7 | ₹ 8 |
| T OICE MODE | TIXEU | Sindit. Gap N/S | OII | Reu | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.5 | Ζ. | 5 | 2.5 | 0.0 | • | | 0 | , | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | _ | EBT | WB | L | W | /BT | NBL | _ | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 4 | | | 6 | 8 | 5 | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 9.0 | | | 9. | .0 | 1.3 | | 3.0 | 1.2 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | e Duration, s | | | | | 30.0 | | | 25 | 5.0 | 25.0 |) | 50.0 | 25.0 |) : | 50.0 |
| Change Period, | (Y+R | c), S | | | | 6.1 | | | 6 | 5.1 | 5.9 | | 5.9 | 6.1 | | 5.4 |
| Max Allow Head | dway (/ | MAH), s | | | | 4.3 | | | 4. | .3 | 3.1 | | 0.0 | 3.1 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ge Period, (Y+R c), s Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s le Clearance Time (<i>g</i> s), s | | | | | 8.5 | | | 20 | 0.7 | 4.5 | | | 5.3 | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 0.9 | | | 0. | .0 | 7.5 | | 0.0 | 0.2 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | e Number se Duration, s nge Period, ($Y+R c$), s Allow Headway (MAH), s ue Clearance Time ($g s$), s en Extension Time ($g e$), s se Call Probability Out Probability rement Group Results | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.0 | .00 | 1.00 |) | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Probal | nge Period, ($Y+R c$), s Allow Headway (MAH), s ue Clearance Time ($g s$), s en Extension Time ($g e$), s se Call Probability Out Probability | | | | | 0.00 | | | 1.0 | .00 | 0.38 | } | | 0.00 |) | |
| Manager | | | | | | | _ | 14/ | _ | | | | | | 00 | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | <u> </u> | EB | | | | R | - | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | | 1 | R | | | + | 10 | L E | 1 | К 10 | | I G | |
| Adjusted Flow | ment Poto (v | () yeb/b | | 1 | 4 | 14 | 3 260 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 5 210 | 2042 | 12 | 102 | 1007 | 10 597 |
| Adjusted Flow r | |), ven/n w Rate (s) veb/b/l | n | 93 | 1000 | 1610 | 1810 | 185 | 4 50 / | 212 | 210 | 1725 | 434 | 125 | 1027 | 1820 |
| | Time (/ | α_{c}) s | | 57 | 4 1 | 65 | 18.7 | 16 | 1 | 14.0 | 25 | 44 1 | 24.7 | 33 | 40.3 | 40.4 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>a</i> c), s | | 5.7 | 4.1 | 6.5 | 18.7 | 16. | 1 | 14.0 | 2.5 | 44.1 | 24.7 | 3.3 | 40.3 | 40.4 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | • · · · · · • (9 •), • | _ | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.33 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 5 (| 0.29 | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Capacity (c), y | /eh/h | | | 333 | 349 | 533 | 263 | 26 | 9 | 468 | 632 | 1756 | 780 | 622 | 1956 | 627 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | atio (X) | | 0.279 | 0.202 | 0.209 | 0.990 | 0.87 | 71 0 | 0.453 | 0.333 | 1.163 | 0.556 | 0.199 | 0.934 | 0.936 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft | /In (95 th percentile) |) | 120 | 89.5 | 76.2 | 455.2 | 362 | .5 2 | 240.3 | 130.4 | 1111.2 | 369.4 | 62.2 | 684.3 | 732.8 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/ln (95 th percenti | le) | 4.8 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 18.2 | 14. | 5 | 9.6 | 5.2 | 44.4 | 14.8 | 2.5 | 27.4 | 29.3 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | tile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | | 45.6 | 45.0 | 6.3 | 55.5 | 54. | 4 : | 37.7 | 47.7 | 43.0 | 23.6 | 33.7 | 41.3 | 41.3 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 | 2), s/veh | | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 52.6 | 25. | 2 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 80.0 | 2.8 | 0.1 | 9.8 | 23.3 |
| Initial Queue De | elay(d | з), 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/ve | eh | | 46.1 | 45.2 | 6.5 | 108.1 | 79. | 6 | 38.3 | 47.8 | 123.0 | 26.5 | 33.8 | 51.1 | 64.6 |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | D | D | Α | F | E | | D | D | F | С | С | D | Е |
| Approach Delay | /, s/veh | /LOS | | 29.8 | 3 | С | 77.7 | 7 | E | E | 101. | 5 | F | 53.4 | | D |
| Intersection Del | lay, s/ve | eh / LOS | | | | 75 | 5.9 | | | | | | | E | | |
| Navia: | | | | | | | | 1.4.1 | | | | | | | 05 | |
| Nultimodal Re | SUITS | /1.02 | | 0.07 | EB | 6 | 0.07 | 7 | В | | 0.00 | NB | P | 0.00 | SB | |
| Biovolo LOS So | | | | 2.97 | | ^ | 2.87 | | С г | B | 2.32 | - | B | 2.32 | · . | B |
| | UIG / L | | | 0.94 | - | А | 1.05 | , | | 0 | 1.90 | , | U | 1.03 | | U |

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop | o-Control Report | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Del Rey / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Del Rey Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|----------------|--------|---|----|-------|------|----|---|-------|-------|---|---|-------|-------|------|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | Westb | ound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 146 | 361 | | | | 277 | 82 | | | | | | 35 | | 76 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (|) | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | Left Only | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 2 | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | Left Only ways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 152 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 116 | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 1174 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 645 | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.18 | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q_{95} (veh) | | 0.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.6 | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 8.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 11.8 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | А | | | | | | | | | | | | | В | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 2. | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | 11 | .8 | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | E | 3 | |

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop | o-Control Report | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Del Rey / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Del Rey Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | Westk | bound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
|---|-------|-------|--------|------|------|-------|-------|----|---|-------|-------|---|---|-------|-------|------|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 146 | 380 | | | | 300 | 82 | | | | | | 35 | | 76 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (|) | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Left | Only | | | | | | | 2 | 2 | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adway | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 152 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 116 | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 1150 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 632 | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.18 | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.7 | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 8.6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 12.0 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | А | | | | | | | | | | | | | В | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 2 | .4 | | | | | | | | | | | 12 | 0 | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | E | 3 | |

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop | o-Control Report | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Del Rey / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Del Rey Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |

Project Description



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

Paseo Marina

| | Eastb | ound | | | Westk | ound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | |
|-----------|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | |
| 0 | 155 | 395 | | | | 319 | 86 | | | | | | 55 | | 129 |
| 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Left Only | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| adway | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 |
| | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 |
| | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 |
| | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 |
| Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 161 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 192 | |
| | 1127 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 620 | |
| | 0.14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.31 | |
| | 0.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.3 | |
| | 8.7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13.4 | |
| | А | | | | | | | | | | | | | В | |
| | 2. | 5 | | | | | | | | | | 13.4 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | В | | | |
| | U 1U 0 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 | Eastb U I 1U 1 1U 1 0 1 1U 1 1 0 1 1 0 155 3 3 3 4 155 3 4 155 3 2 2 3 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | EastburdULT1U1201201201301553953333333310155395331015539533101553953310155104.161102.231102.231101611112711100.142100.51108.7110A110A1 | Eastburger U I R 1U 1 2 3 1 1 1 1 1 155 395 1 0 155 395 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 <td>FastburdULTRU1U1234U1U1234U012001200101200012001331133111111111111111111111111211</td> <td>Fastbund West U L R U L 1U 1 2 3 4U 4 0 1 2 0 0 0 1U 1 2 0 0 0 1U 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 0 15 395 4 0 1 0 155 395 5 5 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 Idew Hatter Idew Hatte</td> <td>Image: static structureULTRULT1U1234U4501200021U1200021U1200021U1200021U1200021120002113951133331111333111<</td> <td>Vertication of the section of the sect</td> <td>EastburdIRULTRU11234U45611U1234U4561012000201120002011112011711112000201112011111333111111331111111331111111133111111111111111111411</td> <td>VerturnNorthiULTRUL1U1234U456701200020001U1200020001U1200020001U1200020001U1200020001120001210101015395111111111010101010115539511<</td> <td>Note the set of the set of</td> <td>VertexNorthermation (Colspan="4">Northermation (Colspan="4")ULTRULTRULTR1U1234U456G78901200020G0001U12000201078901120002010000117R1010101010101010117R10101010101010101033310101010101010101010103310101010101010101010101033101010101010101010101010331010101010101010101010101111111111111111111111111111111111</td> <td>UUUUUTRULTRULTRU11234U456107891011234U456107891011200020101010101011200017R1010101011200017R1010101011200011110101010101010333111<</td> <td>Lestburger Image: Normal and the sector of the sector</td> <td>U L T R U L T R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R I R I R I R I <thi< th=""> <thi< th=""> <thi< th=""></thi<></thi<></thi<></td> | FastburdULTRU1U1234U1U1234U012001200101200012001331133111111111111111111111111211 | Fastbund West U L R U L 1U 1 2 3 4U 4 0 1 2 0 0 0 1U 1 2 0 0 0 1U 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 0 15 395 4 0 1 0 155 395 5 5 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 Idew Hatter Idew Hatte | Image: static structureULTRULT1U1234U4501200021U1200021U1200021U1200021U1200021120002113951133331111333111< | Vertication of the section of the sect | EastburdIRULTRU11234U45611U1234U4561012000201120002011112011711112000201112011111333111111331111111331111111133111111111111111111411 | VerturnNorthiULTRUL1U1234U456701200020001U1200020001U1200020001U1200020001U1200020001120001210101015395111111111010101010115539511< | Note the set of | VertexNorthermation (Colspan="4">Northermation (Colspan="4")ULTRULTRULTR1U1234U456G78901200020G0001U12000201078901120002010000117R1010101010101010117R10101010101010101033310101010101010101010103310101010101010101010101033101010101010101010101010331010101010101010101010101111111111111111111111111111111111 | UUUUUTRULTRULTRU11234U456107891011234U456107891011200020101010101011200017R1010101011200017R1010101011200011110101010101010333111< | Lestburger Image: Normal and the sector of the sector | U L T R U L T R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R I R I R I R I <thi< th=""> <thi< th=""> <thi< th=""></thi<></thi<></thi<> |

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop | o-Control Report | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Del Rey / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Del Rey Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| 2005 | | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | |
|---|-----------|-------|--------|---|----|------|-------|----|---|-------|-------|---|------------|------|------|------|--|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 155 | 414 | | | | 342 | 86 | | | | | | 55 | | 129 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | Left Only | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 161 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 192 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 1104 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 608 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.32 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.3 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 8.8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13.6 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | А | | | | | | | | | | | | | В | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 2 | .4 | | | | | | | | | | | 13.6 | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | В | | | | |

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop | top-Control Report | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | | | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Del Rey / Maxella | | | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Del Rey Avenue | | | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | | | |

Project Description



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

Paseo Marina

| · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-------|--------|---|----|------|------|----|---|-------|-------|---|------------|------|------|------|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | ound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 81 | 477 | | | | 428 | 81 | | | | | | 89 | | 189 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | Left Only | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 87 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 299 | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 1011 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 596 | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.09 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.50 | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2.8 | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 8.9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 17.0 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | А | | | | | | | | | | | | | С | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 1. | .3 | | | | | | | | | | 17.0 | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | C | | | | | |

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop | o-Control Report | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Del Rey / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Del Rey Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| | Jastinents | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|-----------|--------|---|----|-------|-------|----|---|-------|-------|---|------------|------|------|------|--|--|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | Westk | bound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 81 | 496 | | | | 427 | 81 | | | | | | 89 | | 189 | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | Left Only | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 87 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 299 | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 1012 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 594 | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.09 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.50 | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2.8 | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 8.9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 17.0 | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | А | | | | | | | | | | | | | С | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 1. | 2 | | | | | | | | | | 17.0 | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | С | | | | | | | | | | |

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop | o-Control Report | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Del Rey / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Del Rey Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|---------|--------|---|----|------|-------|-----|---|-------|-------|------|------------|------|------|------|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 98 | 545 | | | | 490 | 104 | | | | | | 97 | | 210 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | Left Only | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 105 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 330 | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 934 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 543 | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.61 | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4.0 | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 9.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 21.4 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | А | | | | | | | | | | | | | С | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 1.4 | | | | | | | | | | 21.4 | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | С | | | | | | | |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

_

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop | o-Control Report | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Del Rey / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Del Rey Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-------|--------|---|----|------|-------|-----|---|-------|-------|---|------------|------|------|------|--|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 98 | 564 | | | | 489 | 104 | | | | | | 97 | | 210 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | Left Only | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 105 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 330 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 935 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 541 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.61 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 9.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 21.5 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | А | | | | | | | | | | | | | С | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 1. | .4 | | | | | | | | | | 21.5 | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | С | | | | | | | | |

HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Ocean Way / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Ocean Way |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach Eactbound Westbound Northbound Southbound | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|---|---|-------|-------|------|---|-------|-------|----|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | Westb | bound | | | North | oound | | | South | bound | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | L | Т | | | L | | R | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 305 | 43 | 0 | 33 | 278 | | | 50 | | 62 | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | 3 | 3 | | | | 3 | | 3 | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | N | 0 | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.1 | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.16 | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.2 | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.23 | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | 35 | | | | 53 | | 66 | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | 1178 | | | | 439 | | 822 | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | 0.03 | | | | 0.12 | | 0.08 | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | 0.1 | | | | 0.4 | | 0.3 | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 8.2 | | | | 14.3 | | 9.8 | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | А | | | | В | | А | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 0 | .9 | | | 11 | .8 | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | E | 3 | | | | | |

| | | 1100 | r eigi | nanzo | u mit | 01000 | | | | iiiiiia | , | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------|----------|------------|----------|----------|---------------|----------|-----------|----------|-------|------------|--|--------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intorso | ction Inf | ormat | ion | 2 | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | <u>له لړ</u> |
| | lation | Linscott Law & Gre | enenan | Engine | ore | | | | Duratio | n h | 0 25 | | | | |
| Apolyet | | | chopan | | ic Data | | 3 2020 | | | n, n | Othc | | <u>_</u> | | ۲_ الح |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time E | | Evictir | 3, 2020 | | | he | 0.04 | 51 | ⇒→ | w∔e | ↓ ↓ |
| Junsaletion | | City of Los Angeles | | | enou | Projec | t - AM | | | | 0.94 | | A A | | |
| Urban Street | | Maxella Avenue | | Analys | is Year | 2020 | | | Analysi | s Period | 1> 8 | :00 | | 5.8 | |
| Intersection | | Ocean Way/Maxella | à | File Na | ime | 04AM | - Existi | ng wit | h Projec | t.xus | | | ٦ ۲ | ৰ ↑ কণ্শ | 1* (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | В | | NE | 3 | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | | 307 | 60 | 36 | 27 | 8 | 73 | | 85 | | | |
| | 41a.a | | | 1 | | - | - | | | _ | | 1 | | | 1 |
| | co o | Deference Dhace | 2 | | . 🕈 | - | 6 | | | | | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 5 . | .[≞i | 7 | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | Ena | Green | 24.8 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | NO | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | → | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | Y 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timor Poculto | | | | EDI | _ | ERT | \//R | | | NR | | NRT | SBI | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | signed Phase | | | | | EDT 6 | VVD | | 2 | IND | - | | 300 | | 301 |
| Case Number | case Number | | | | | 80 | | \rightarrow | 6.0 | - | | 90 | | | |
| Phase Duration | Phase Duration, s | | | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 | | | |
| Change Period | hase Duration, s | | | | | 52 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 5.2 | | | 5 1 | | | |
| Max Allow Hear | | (), S (AH) s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 3.1 | | | |
| | away (n | $(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ | | | - | 0.0 | | + | 0.0 | - | + | 1.1 | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | $(g_s), s$ | | | | 0.0 | | - | 0.0 | | | 4.1 | | | |
| Phase Call Pro | hahility | (ge), s | | <u> </u> | | 0.0 | | \rightarrow | 0.0 | - | | 1.00 | | | |
| Max Out Proba | hility | | _ | | - | | | - | | | | 0.00 | | | |
| | onity | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | WE | ; | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | 3 | | 18 | | | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | | | 199 | 192 | 38 | 296 | - | 78 | - | 90 | | _ | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | | 1900 | 1792 | 1009 | 180 | 9 | 1810 | | 1610 | | | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | y s), S | | | 4.1 | 4.2 | 1.6 | 3.1 | | 1.6 | | 2.1 | | | |
| Cycle Queue C | learance | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | | 4.1 | 4.2 | 5.8 | 3.1 | | 1.6 | | 2.1 | | | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | | 0.42 | | 0.42 | | | |
| Capacity (c), v | /h | | | | 785 | 741 | 466 | 149 | 5 | 751 | | 668 | | | |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | tio(X) | | | 0.253 | 0.259 | 0.082 | 0.19 | 8 | 0.103 | | 0.135 | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) |) | | 78.5 | 76.3 | 16.9 | 54.2 | 2 | 28.5 | | 34.1 | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | 3.1 | 3.1 | 0.7 | 2.2 | | 1.1 | - | 1.4 | | | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |) | 0.00 | | 0.00 | | | |
| Uniform Delay (| (d 1), s/ | /veh | | | 11.5 | 11.6 | 13.5 | 11.2 | 2 | 10.7 | - | 10.9 | | | |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.3 | | 0.3 | | 0.4 | | | |
| Initial Queue De | nitial Queue Delay (<i>d</i> ₂), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | |
| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | | 12.3 | 12.4 | 13.8 | 11.5 | 5 | 11.0 | | 11.3 | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | В | В | В | В | | В | | В | | | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 12.4 | | В | 11.8 | 3 | В | 11.2 | 2 | В | 0.0 | | |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 11 | .9 | | | | | | B | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Iultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 1.92 | | В | 0.72 | 2 | Α | 2.28 | 3 | В | 2.11 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC |)S | | 0.81 | | А | 0.76 | 6 | А | | | F | | | |

HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Ocean Way / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Ocean Way |
| Time Analyzed | Future - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach Easthound Westhound Northbound Southbound | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|---------|--------|------|-------|------|-------|---|---|-------|-------|------|---|-------|-------|----|--|--|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | oound | | | South | bound | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | L | Т | | | L | | R | | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 351 | 49 | 0 | 38 | 307 | | | 65 | | 77 | | | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | 3 | 3 | | | | 3 | | 3 | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | N | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.1 | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.16 | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.2 | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.23 | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | 40 | | | | 69 | | 82 | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | 1123 | | | | 389 | | 789 | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | 0.04 | | | | 0.18 | | 0.10 | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | 0.1 | | | | 0.6 | | 0.3 | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 8.3 | | | | 16.2 | | 10.1 | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | А | | | | С | | В | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 0 | .9 | | | 12 | .9 | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | E | 3 | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | or inte | 01000 | | | | em | iiiiai y | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|--------|----------|------------|--------|---------------|--------|--------|-------|----------|-------|-------|----------|----------|---------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inters | ecti | ion Info | rmati | on | 2 | 4 가 수 † | ↓× l <u>×</u> |
| Agency | | Linscott Law & Gre | ensnan | Engine | Pers | | | | Durati | ion | h | 0 250 |) | | | |
| Apolyet | | | chopan | | vie Date | | 2 2020 | | Area | Type | | Otho | r | 1 | | ۲. ا |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time | Poriod | Euture | 2, 2020 | | DHE | туре | | 0 04 | | ⇒→ | w↓e | ↓ ↓ |
| Junsaletion | | City of Los Angeles | | | enou | Projec | t - AM | | 1 1 11 | | | 0.94 | | | | ÷ → |
| Urban Street | | Maxella Avenue | | Analys | sis Year | 2026 | | | Analy | sis F | Period | 1> 8: | 00 | | к л | |
| Intersection | | Ocean Way/Maxella | а | File Na | ame | 04AM | - Future | e with | Projec | ct.xu | IS | 1 | | <u>۴</u> | 1 ↑ 4+ Y | fr (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | • | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | | 353 | 66 | 41 | 30 |)7 | | 88 | | 100 | | | |
| | 41 o 10 | | | 1 | | - | - | | | | | | 1 | | | |
| Signal Informa | colo | Deference Dhees | 2 | 1 | . : | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | E . | [Si | 7 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Offset, s | | | Ena | Green | 24.8 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) () | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | NO | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) () | .0 | 0.0 | - | | → | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timor Pooulto | | | | EDI | | EDT | \ \ /D | 1 | | - | NDI | | NDT | SDI | | SPT |
| Assigned Phase | ed Phase | | | | · | 6 | VVD | | 2 | - | NDL | - | 8 | 3DL | | 301 |
| Case Number | se Number | | | | | 80 | | - | 6.0 | - | | + | 9.0 | | | |
| Phase Duration | hase Duration, s | | | | | 30.0 | | - | 30.0 | | | - | 30.0 | | | |
| Change Period | hase Duration, s hange Period (Y+R c), s | | | | | 52 | | - | 5.2 | + | | + | 5 1 | | | |
| Max Allow Hear | | (), S (/// H) e | | | | 0.0 | | - | 0.0 | | | | 3.1 | | | |
| | away (<i>T</i> | (α) | | <u> </u> | - | 0.0 | | - | 0.0 | - | | - | 1.5 | | - | |
| Groop Extensio | n Timo | $(g_s), s$ | | | | 0.0 | | - | 0.0 | - | | | 4.5 | | | |
| Bhase Cell Brok | | (<i>g</i> , s | | <u> </u> | | 0.0 | <u> </u> | - | 0.0 | - | | - | 1.00 | | - | |
| Max Out Brobal | | | | | | | | - | | - | | | 0.00 | | | |
| | Jiiity | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 | | | |
| Movement Gro | up Res | sults | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | : | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | | 3 | | 18 | | | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | | | 227 | 218 | 44 | 327 | · | | 94 | | 106 | | | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | | 1900 | 1796 | 959 | 180 | 9 | | 1810 | | 1610 | | | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | | | 4.8 | 4.9 | 1.9 | 3.5 | | | 1.9 | | 2.5 | | | |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | | 4.8 | 4.9 | 6.8 | 3.5 | | | 1.9 | | 2.5 | | | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | | | 0.42 | | 0.42 | | | |
| Capacity (<i>c</i>), v | eh/h | | | | 785 | 742 | 439 | 149 | 5 | | 751 | | 668 | | _ | |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | itio(X) | | | 0.289 | 0.294 | 0.099 | 0.21 | 8 | Т | 0.125 | | 0.159 | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) |) | | 91.5 | 88.8 | 19.9 | 60.5 | 5 | | 31.7 | _ | 36.8 | | _ | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | ile) | | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0.8 | 2.4 | | | 1.3 | | 1.5 | | | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | tile) | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |) | | 0.00 | | 0.00 | | | |
| Uniform Delay (| d 1), s | /veh | | | 11.7 | 11.8 | 14.0 | 11.4 | 1 | | 10.8 | | 11.0 | | _ | |
| Incremental De | lay (d 2 |), s/veh | | | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.3 | | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | |
| Initial Queue De | nitial Queue Delay ($d z$), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | |
| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | | 12.7 | 12.8 | 14.5 | 11.7 | 7 | | 10.9 | | 11.0 | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | В | В | В | В | | | В | | В | | | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 12.7 | 7 | В | 12.0 | | В | | 10.9 | | В | 0.0 | | |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 12 | 2.1 | | | | | | | В | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Iultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 1.92 | 2 | В | 0.72 | 2 | Α | | 2.28 | | В | 2.11 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 0.86 | 6 | А | 0.79 | | Α | | | | F | | | |

HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Ocean Way / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Ocean Way |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| - - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|-------|--------|------|-------|------|------|---|---|-------|-------|------|---|-------|-------|----|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | ound | | | North | oound | | | South | oound | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | L | Т | | | L | | R | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 441 | 90 | 0 | 49 | 392 | | | 64 | | 49 | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | 3 | 3 | | | | 3 | | 3 | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | N | 0 | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.1 | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.16 | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.2 | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.23 | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | 51 | | | | 67 | | 51 | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | 1006 | | | | 299 | | 718 | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | 0.05 | | | | 0.22 | | 0.07 | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | 0.2 | | | | 0.8 | | 0.2 | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 8.8 | | | | 20.5 | | 10.4 | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | А | | | | С | | В | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 1 | .0 | | | 16 | 5.1 | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | (| 2 | | | | | |

| | | | | Indineo | | 01000 | | | | un | innar y | , | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--------|----------|---------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|----------------|----------|-------|--------|-----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intore | ecti | ion Info | rmati | on | 2 | 석 가 추 ↑ | ₽ L |
| | lation | Lincott Low & Gro | onenan | Enging | ore | | | | Durat | ion | | 0 250 | | | | |
| Agency | | | enspan | | | Aug 1 | 2 2020 | | Durat | 1011, Turne | | 0.250 |) r | _* | | ۲_ ۲_ |
| Analyst | | | | Analys | as Date | Aug T | 3, 2020 | | Area | туре | ; | | | → | N w↑r | |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | I Ime F | riod | Proied | t - PM | | PHF | | | 0.96 | | ** | 8 | v~ <mark>↓</mark> |
| Urban Street | | Maxella Avenue | | Analys | is Year | 2020 | | | Analy | sis F | Period | 1> 17 | 7:00 | - <mark></mark> | K A | <u> </u> |
| Intersection | | Ocean Way/Maxella | 3 | File Na | ame | 04PM | - Existin | ng wit | h Proj | ect.x | us | | | 1 | ☆ ↑ 4 * Y | יז יז <i>י</i> י |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | · | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | | 443 | 107 | 52 | 39 | 2 | _ | 63 | | 48 | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | <u> </u> | | "i | Γ | | 1 | | _ | | | | , , | |
| | 60.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | L 🕯 | | 8 | | | | | | | | | |
| Offect s | 00.0 | Reference Point | End | | | 51 | 7 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult Con E/M | On | Green | 24.8 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) (| 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | | | |
| | Tixed | Simult Cap N/S | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | _ | र | - | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Rea | 1.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) [0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | | 1 | 8 |
| Timer Results | | | | FBI | | FBT | WB | | WBT | - 1 | NBI | | NBT | SBI | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | _ | | | 6 | | | 2 | | | | 8 | | | |
| Case Number | - | | | | | 8.0 | | - | 6.0 | - | | + | 9.0 | | + | |
| Phase Duration | hase Duration, s | | | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 | | | | 30.0 | | | |
| Change Period | hase Duration, s hange Period, (Y+R c), s | | | | | 5.2 | | - | 5.2 | + | | | 5 1 | | + | |
| Max Allow Hear | | MAH) s | | | | 0.0 | | - | 0.0 | - | | | 3.1 | | | |
| | | $(a_{\alpha}) \in $ | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | + | | | 33 | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | $(g_{s}), s$ | | | - | 0.0 | - | | 0.0 | - | | | 0.2 | | +- | |
| Phase Call Prot | hability | (ge), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | - | | | 1.00 | | -+- | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | - | | - | | | 0.00 | | | |
| | onity | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 | | a de la come | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | WB | ; | Т | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | 2 | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | | 3 | | 18 | | | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | | | 295 | 278 | 54 | 408 | | | 66 | | 50 | | - | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | | 1900 | 1772 | 853 | 1809 | 9 | | 1810 | | 1610 | | | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | | | 6.4 | 6.6 | 2.8 | 4.5 | | | 1.3 | | 1.1 | | | |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | | 6.4 | 6.6 | 9.4 | 4.5 | | Т | 1.3 | | 1.1 | | | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | | Т | 0.42 | | 0.42 | | | |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | | 785 | 733 | 379 | 1495 | 5 | | 751 | _ | 668 | | | |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | itio(X) | | | 0.375 | 0.380 | 0.143 | 0.27 | 3 | Т | 0.087 | | 0.075 | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) | | | 125.1 | 119 | 27 | 77.7 | 7 | | 23.9 | - | 18.3 | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | 5.0 | 4.8 | 1.1 | 3.1 | | | 1.0 | | 0.7 | | - | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |) | | 0.00 | | 0.00 | | | |
| Uniform Delay (| (d 1), s | /veh | | | 12.2 | 12.2 | 15.5 | 11.6 | ; | | 10.7 | | 10.6 | | | |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | | 1.4 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 0.5 | | | 0.2 | | 0.2 | | | |
| Initial Queue De | nitial Queue Delay (<i>d z</i>), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | | 13.6 | 13.7 | 16.3 | 12.1 | | Т | 10.9 | | 10.8 | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | В | В | В | В | | | В | | В | | | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 13.7 | · | В | 12.6 | ; | В | | 10.9 | | В | 0.0 | | - |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 12 | 2.9 | | | | | | | B | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | lultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | WB | } | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LOS | | 1.92 | 2 | В | 0.72 | 2 | Α | | 2.28 | | В | 2.11 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 0.96 | ; | А | 0.87 | , | Α | | | | F | | | |

HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Ocean Way / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Ocean Way |
| Time Analyzed | Future - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | |
|---|------|-------|--------|------|-------|------|-------|---|---|-------|-------|------|---|-------|-------|----|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | L | Т | | | L | | R | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 496 | 110 | 0 | 64 | 463 | | | 75 | | 59 | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | 3 | 3 | | | | 3 | | 3 | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | N | 0 | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.1 | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.16 | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.2 | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.23 | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | 67 | | | | 78 | | 61 | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | 940 | | | | 239 | | 677 | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | 0.07 | | | | 0.33 | | 0.09 | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | 0.2 | | | | 1.4 | | 0.3 | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 9.1 | | | | 27.2 | | 10.8 | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | А | | | | D | | В | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 1 | .1 | | | 20 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | (| 2 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | <i>-</i> | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|--------|----------|----------|--------|-------------------|---------------|-------|----------|----------|-------|------------|------------|---------------|-----------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intor | sort | ion Info | rmati | 20 | 2 | 4 년 4 1 | ₽ L |
| | lation | Lincott Low & Gro | onenan | Enging | ore | | | | Dura | tion | | 0.250 | | | | |
| Agency | | | enspan | | | Aug 1 | 2 2020 | | Dura | Turne | | 0.250 | | | | ۲_ ۲_ |
| Analyst | | | | Analys | as Date | Aug T | 3, 2020 | | Area | туре | ; | Other | | | | ← <u>}</u> |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | I Ime F | riod | Proiec | e with ct - PM | | PHF | | | 0.96 | | | 6 6 | ↓ ↓ |
| Urban Street | | Maxella Avenue | | Analys | is Year | 2026 | | | Analy | ysis I | Period | 1> 17 | 2:00 | - | | e e e |
| Intersection | | Ocean Way/Maxella | a | File Na | ame | 04PM | - Future | e with | Proje | ect.xu | IS | | | - 1 | ব † ቁጥ | ۲ |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | · | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (<i>v</i>), v | eh/h | | | | 498 | 127 | 67 | 46 | 63 | | 74 | | 58 | | | |
| | tion | | | <u> </u> | | | | | | - | | | | | | |
| Signal morma | co o | Deference Dhees | 2 | | . 🛨 | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 5 | [Si | 7 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 24.8 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) (| 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) (| 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | → | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) (| 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timor Pooulto | | | | EDI | | EDT | \//D | | \//D | т | NDI | | NDT | CDI | | SPT |
| Assigned Dhoor | | | | EDL | - | ED I | | | 200 | · | INDL | | | SBL | | 301 |
| Assigned Phase | 9 | | | | | 0 | | \rightarrow | 2 | | | _ | 0 | | + | |
| Case Number | | | | | | 8.0 | | \rightarrow | 0.0 | | | _ | 9.0 | | \rightarrow | |
| Phase Duration | nase Duration, s | | | | | 30.0 | | \rightarrow | 30.0 | , | | _ | 30.0 | | \rightarrow | |
| Change Period, | Change Period,(Y+R c), s | | | | | 5.2 | | \rightarrow | 5.2 | | | | 5.1 | | + | |
| Max Allow Head | dway(/ | MAH), s | | | | 0.0 | | \rightarrow | 0.0 | | | | 3.4 | | \rightarrow | |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | \rightarrow | | | | | 3.6 | | \rightarrow | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (g _e), s | | | | 0.0 | | \rightarrow | 0.0 | | | | 0.3 | | \rightarrow | |
| Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | | | | \rightarrow | | | | | 1.00 | | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 | | | |
| Movement Gro | un Res | ults | | | FB | | | WE | 2 | | | NB | | | SB | _ |
| Approach Move | mont | | | | Т | R | 1 | | , | R | 1 | т | R | 1 | т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | + ' | | 3 | | 18 | | | |
| Adjusted Flow | Poto (v |) voh/h | | | 336 | 215 | 70 | 492 | , | | 77 | | 60 | | | |
| Adjusted Flow P | | y, ven/n | n | | 1000 | 1766 | 702 | 1900 | | | 1910 | | 1610 | | | |
| | Time () | | | | 7.5 | 7.6 | / 1 | 5.4 | 5 | | 16 | | 1/ | | | |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (a_c) s | | | 7.5 | 7.6 | 11.8 | 5.4 | +- | | 1.0 | | 1.4 | | - | |
| Green Ratio (a | /C) | o milo (g o), o | | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 1 | | 0.42 | | 0.42 | | | |
| Capacity (c) y | /eh/h | | | | 785 | 730 | 347 | 149 | 5 | | 751 | | 668 | | - | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | itio (X) | | | 0.428 | 0.431 | 0.201 | 0.32 | 3 | | 0 103 | | 0.090 | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Ω) ft | (In (95 th percentile) | | | 147 4 | 139.4 | 37.5 | 94 3 | 2 | | 28.3 | - | 22.2 | | | |
| Back of Queue | $(\mathbf{Q}), \mathbf{u}$ | h/ln (95 th percenti | le) | | 59 | 5.6 | 15 | 3.8 | | | 1 1 | | 0.9 | | | |
| | Ratio (| RO (95 th percent | ile) | | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | | | 0.00 | | 0.00 | | | |
| Uniform Delay (| (d_1) s | /veh | | | 12.5 | 12.6 | 16.8 | 11 9 | 2 | | 10.7 | | 10.7 | | | |
| Incremental De | av (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | | 1.7 | 1.9 | 1.3 | 0.6 | | | 0.3 | | 0.3 | | | |
| Initial Queue De | ncremental Delay (d ₂), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | +- | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | |
| Control Delay (d 3), s/ven | | | | | 14.2 | 14.4 | 18.1 | 12 5 | 5 | | 11.0 | | 10.9 | | _ | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | R | R | R | R | | | B | | - 0.0 B | | | $ \rightarrow $ |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 1/ 3 | | B | 13.0 | | R | | 11 0 | | B | 0.0 | | |
| Intersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | 14.0 | | 19 | 3.5 | - | | | 11.0 | | | 0.0 B | | |
| mersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | _ | | |
| Multimodal Re | Aultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LOS | | 1.92 | 2 | В | 0.72 | 2 | А | | 2.28 | | В | 2.11 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 1.02 | 2 | А | 0.94 | 1 | А | | | | F | | | |

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Maxella Dwy / Maxella | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Maxella Avenue Driveway | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|-----------|--------|----|----|------|-------|---|-----|-------|-------|------|------------|----|----|----|--|--|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | | Т | | | | | R | | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 342 | 1 | | | 283 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | N | 0 | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | Undivided | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | dways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.9 | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.96 | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.3 | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.33 | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 821 | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q_{95} (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 9.4 | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | А | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | 9.4 | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | A | | | | | | | | | |

| HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Maxella Dwy / Maxella | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Maxella Avenue Driveway | | | | | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lanes | | | | | | | | | | | | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| remere rolumes and Auje | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|-------|--------|-------|-------|------|-------|---|-----|-------|-------|------|------------|----|----|----|--|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | | Т | | | | | R | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 365 | 3 | | | 286 | | | | | 9 | | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | N | 0 | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undiv | vided | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.9 | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.96 | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.3 | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.33 | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 10 | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 804 | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.01 | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 9.5 | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | А | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | 9.5 | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | A | A | | | | | | |

Copyright $\ensuremath{\mathbb{C}}$ 2020 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop | o-Control Report | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Maxella Dwy / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Maxella Avenue Driveway |
| Time Analyzed | Future - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | |
|---|-------|---------|--------|------|-------|------|-------|---|-----|-------|-------|------|------------|----|----|----|--|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | | Т | | | | | R | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 401 | 1 | | | 315 | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | N | lo | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adway | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.9 | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.96 | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.3 | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.33 | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 783 | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 9.6 | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | А | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | 9.6 | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | A | | | | | | | | |

| HCS7 Two-Way Stop | o-Control Report | |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| | Site Information | |
| JAS | Intersection | Maxella Dwy / Maxella |
| Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| 2026 | North/South Street | Maxella Avenue Driveway |
| Future + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Paseo Marina | | |
| | | |
| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop JAS Linscott, Law & Greenspan 8/13/2020 2026 Future + Project - AM East-West Paseo Marina | HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control ReportSite InformationJASIntersectionLinscott, Law & GreenspanJurisdiction8/13/2020East/West Street2026North/South StreetFuture + Project - AMPeak Hour FactorEast-WestAnalysis Time Period (hrs)Paseo MarinaHour Factor |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | oound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
|---|------|-------|--------|------|-------|------|-------|---|-----|-------|-------|------|---|-------|-------|----|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | | Т | | | | | R | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 424 | 3 | | | 318 | | | | | 9 | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (| C | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | N | lo | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.9 | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.96 | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.3 | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.33 | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 10 | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 767 | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.01 | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 9.8 | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | А | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | 9.8 | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | / | 4 | | | | | |

Copyright $\ensuremath{\mathbb{C}}$ 2020 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Maxella Dwy / Maxella | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Maxella Avenue Driveway | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Venicie Volumes and Adja | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|------|------------|----|----|----|--|--|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | Westb | bound | | | North | oound | | Southbound | | | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | | Т | | | | | R | | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 464 | 3 | | | 394 | | | | | 6 | | | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | N | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undiv | vided | | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.9 | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.96 | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.3 | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.33 | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 7 | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 743 | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.01 | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 9.9 | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | А | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | 9. | 9 | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | A | 4 | | | | | | | |

| HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Maxella Dwy / Maxella | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Maxella Avenue Driveway | | | | | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lanes | | | | | | | | | | | | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| remere rolumes and Auje | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|-------|--------|------|-------|------|-------|---|-----|-------|-------|------|------------|----|----|----|--|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | | Т | | | | | R | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 463 | 5 | | | 397 | | | | | 6 | | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | N | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.9 | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.96 | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.3 | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.33 | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 7 | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 742 | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.01 | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 9.9 | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | А | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | 9.9 | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | A | | | | | | | | |

Copyright $\ensuremath{\mathbb{C}}$ 2020 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.
| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop | o-Control Report | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Maxella Dwy / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Maxella Avenue Driveway |
| Time Analyzed | Future - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| Lawaa | | | |

Lanes



| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
|---|------|---------|--------|------|-------|------|-------|---|---|-------|-------|------|---|-------|-------|----|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | | Т | | | | | R | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 528 | 3 | | | 477 | | | | | 6 | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | N | lo | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.9 | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.96 | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.3 | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.33 | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 7 | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 705 | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.01 | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 10.2 | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | В | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | 10 |).2 | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | E | 3 | | | | | |

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop | o-Control Report | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Maxella Dwy / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Maxella Avenue Driveway |
| Time Analyzed | Future + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| Lanes | | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| | Stiffe | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|---|---|-------|-------|------|---|-------|-------|----|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | Westb | bound | | | North | oound | | | South | oound | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | | Т | | | | | R | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 527 | 5 | | | 480 | | | | | 6 | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | N | 0 | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.9 | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.96 | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.3 | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.33 | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 7 | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 704 | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.01 | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 10.2 | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | В | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | 10 | .2 | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | E | 3 | | | | | |

Copyright $\ensuremath{\mathbb{C}}$ 2020 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

| | | | J - | | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|---------|--------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------------|----|---------|----------|---------|----------|--------------|---|--------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | In | tersect | tion Inf | ormatio | on | 2 | * | بد لي |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Greenso | an, Eng | neers | \$ | | | | D | uration | h | 0.250 | | | 444 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | Ana | vsis [| - Date | Aug 1 | 3 2020 | | | rea Tvp | e | Other | | | | ار ک |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | Time | Peri | od | Fxistir | na - AM | | P | HF | • | 0.96 | | → <u></u> ^* | w∔e | ≮_ ↓ |
| Urban Street | | Glencoe Avenue | Ana | vsis V | /ear | 2020 | 19 7 101 | | | nalvsis | Period | 1> 8 | 15 | | | |
| Intersection | | Glencoe/Maxella | File | Vame | | 06AM | - Existin | יא אי | | naryolo | | 1. 0. | 10 | | * * * | <u> </u> |
| Project Descript | tion | Paseo Marina | | Vanno | | | | ig.n | 45 | | | | | - 5 |]][[]]][[]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]] | × (* |
| T Toject Descrip | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | · |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | ٧ | VB | | T | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | L | | Т | R | L | Т | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | 108 | ; 1 | 100 | 135 | 65 | 8 | 83 | 83 | 116 | 569 | 56 | 73 | 533 | 84 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | | <u> </u> | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | 215 | | | | | | | | <u>A</u> | | |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase 2 | | | | - 542 | 7 | | | | | | 4 | ¥ _ | 2 | († x |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point En | d Gree | n 24 | 4 8 | 24.9 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W Or | Vello | w 3. | 6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | <u> </u> | | 512 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S Or | Red | 1. | 6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | Y 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | |
| Timer Results | | | E | 3L | | EBT | WB | L | V | WBT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | Э | | | | | 6 | | | | 2 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | | 6.0 | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | 3 | 30.0 | | | 3 | 30.0 | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period, | (Y+R | c), S | | | | 5.2 | | | | 5.2 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Head | dway(<i>N</i> | <i>MAH</i>), s | | | | 0.0 | | $ \rightarrow$ | | 0.0 | | | 3.4 | | | 3.4 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | (gs), s | | | | | | | | | | | 17.9 | | | 23.0 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 0.0 | | $ \rightarrow$ | | 0.0 | | | 2.6 | | | 1.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probal | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.54 | | | 1.00 |
| Movement Gro | un Res | ults | | F | -R | | | Ŵ | 'R | | | NB | _ | | SB | _ |
| Approach Move | ment | | | T | -D T | R | | Т | . | R | | Т | R | | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | 1 | | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | 113 | 1 | 04 | 141 | 68 | - 86 | 3 | 86 | 121 | 593 | 58 | 76 | 328 | 314 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s), veh/h/ln | 123 | 19 | 900 | 1610 | 1310 | 190 | 20 | 1610 | 799 | 1900 | 1610 | 837 | 1900 | 1809 |
| Queue Service | Time (o | 7 s). S | 3.7 | 2 | 2.0 | 3.4 | 2.0 | 1. | 7 | 2.0 | 7.6 | 15.9 | 1.3 | 5.1 | 7.3 | 7.4 |
| Cvcle Queue C | learance | e Time (<i>q</i> _c), s | 5.7 | 2 | .0 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 1. | 7 | 2.0 | 14.9 | 15.9 | 1.3 | 21.0 | 7.3 | 7.4 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | 0.4 | 0. | 41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.4 | 11 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| Capacity (c), y | /eh/h | | 588 | 7 | 85 | 666 | 617 | 78 | 5 | 666 | 353 | 789 | 668 | 245 | 789 | 751 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | tio(X) | 0.19 | 1 0.1 | 133 | 0.211 | 0.110 | 0.1 | 10 | 0.130 | 0.342 | 0.752 | 0.087 | 0.310 | 0.416 | 0.419 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | 47.9 | 38 | 8.6 | 55.2 | 27.5 | 31 | .7 | 32.5 | 59.4 | 280.9 | 19.5 | 44.2 | 128.1 | 122.7 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/ln (95 th percentile) | 1.9 | 1 | .5 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 3 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 11.2 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 5.1 | 4.9 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percentile) | 0.00 | 0. | .00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | 12.7 | · 1(| 0.9 | 11.3 | 12.2 | 10 | .8 | 10.9 | 17.7 | 14.9 | 10.7 | 23.9 | 12.4 | 12.4 |
| Incremental De | lay (d 2 |), s/veh | 0.7 | 0 | .4 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0. | 3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Initial Queue De | elay (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/ve | eh | 13.4 | . 11 | 1.3 | 12.0 | 12.5 | 11. | .1 | 11.3 | 17.9 | 18.6 | 10.7 | 24.1 | 12.5 | 12.6 |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | В | | В | В | В | В | ; | В | В | В | В | С | В | В |
| Approach Delay | , s/veh | /LOS | 12 | .2 | | В | 11.6 | ; | - | В | 17.9 |) | В | 13.8 | 3 | В |
| Intersection Del | lay, s/ve | h / LOS | | | | 14 | .8 | | | | | | | B | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | E | ΞB | | | W | Β | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | 2. | 28 | | В | 2.11 | | | В | 2.11 | | В | 2.28 | 3 | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | 1. | 28 | | А | 0.69 |) | | А | 1.76 | 6 | В | 1.08 | 3 | А |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS™ Streets Version 7.8.5

| | | - | - 5 | | | | | | | - | , | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------|---------------|---------|----------|---------------|-----------------|-----------|----------|-------|------------|------------|--------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Interse | ction Inf | ormatio | on | | * | × l <u>x</u> |
| Agency | | Linscott. Law & Gre | enspan | . Engine | ers | | | | Duratio | n. h | 0.250 | | | 444 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | e Aua 1 | 3. 2020 | | Area Tv | pe | Other | | | | <i>د</i> |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existir | ng with | | PHF | | 0.96 | | | w‡e s | ↓ ↓ ↓ |
| Linkan Otreat | | | | Analys | | Projec | ct - AM | | Analysi | Devied | 1> 0. | 4 5 | | | र २ |
| | | Glencoe Avenue | | | as rea | 2020 | Eviati | | Analysis | | 12 0. | 15 | | ግ ተ ሰ | |
| Intersection | 4° | Giencoe/Maxella | | File Na | ame | UGAIVI | - Existi | ng wi | in Projec | L.XUS | | | - " | A ↑ 47 Y 1 | × (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | FB | | | W | /B | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | | Т | R | 1 1 | - | T R | | Т | R | 1 1 | Т | R |
| Demand (v) , v | eh/h | | | 126 | 106 | 143 | 65 | 8 | 6 83 | 116 | 597 | 56 | 73 | 552 | 84 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | 215 | | | | | | | <u>A</u> | | \mathbf{L} |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | i 😫 🧯 | ∿∆⊘ | 7 | | | | | | | | (T) |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 24.8 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 00 | 0.0 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0. | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | A | | 512 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | Y 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | WBT | NB | L | NBT | SBI | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 6 | | _ | 2 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | | | \rightarrow | 5.0 | | | 6.0 | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | s H), s | | | 30.0 | | _ | 30.0 | <u> </u> | | 30.0 | | _ | 30.0 |
| Change Period, | (Y+R) | c), S | s H), s | | | 5.2 | | _ | 5.2 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Head | dway(<i>N</i> | ИАН), s | s H), s g s), s | | | 0.0 | | \rightarrow | 0.0 | | _ | 3.4 | <u> </u> | | 3.4 |
| Queue Clearan | ce lime | (gs), s | | | | 0.0 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 0.0 | | | 19.1 | | | 24.4 |
| Green Extensio | n nme | (ge), s | | | | 0.0 | | \rightarrow | 0.0 | - | | 2.5 | | _ | 0.3 |
| Max Out Brobal | bility | | | | | | | - | | | | 0.67 | | | 1.00 |
| | onity | | | | | | | | | | | 0.07 | | | 1.00 |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | W | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | 131 | 110 | 149 | 68 | 90 | 86 | 121 | 622 | 58 | 76 | 338 | 324 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1228 | 1900 | 1610 | 1303 | 190 | 0 1610 | 785 | 1900 | 1610 | 815 | 1900 | 1812 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), s | | 4.5 | 2.2 | 3.6 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 7 2.0 | 7.8 | 17.1 | 1.3 | 5.4 | 7.6 | 7.6 |
| Cycle Queue C | learance | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 6.5 | 2.2 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 1.7 | 7 2.0 | 15.4 | 17.1 | 1.3 | 22.4 | 7.6 | 7.6 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.4 | 1 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 587 | 785 | 666 | 611 | 78 | 5 666 | 346 | 789 | 668 | 226 | 789 | 752 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | itio (X) | | 0.224 | 0.141 | 0.224 | 0.111 | 0.11 | 4 0.130 | 0.350 | 0.789 | 0.087 | 0.336 | 0.429 | 0.431 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | 57.2 | 41.1 | 59 | 27.6 | 32. | 9 32.5 | 60.2 | 304.6 | 19.5 | 45.5 | 132.9 | 127.4 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), Ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 2.3 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 3 1.3 | 2.4 | 12.2 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 5.3 | 5.1 |
| | | KQ) (95 in percent | lie) | 0.00 | 11.0 | 11.4 | 12.2 | 10 | 0 0.00 | 19.00 | 15.2 | 10.00 | 0.00 | 12.5 | 12.5 |
| Incremental Delay | $(u_1), s_1$ | | | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.4 | | 8 0.4 | 0.2 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.1 | 12.5 |
| Initial Queue De | ay (uz |), s/ven | | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Control Delay (| d) elve | -h | | 13.8 | 11 3 | 12.2 | 12.6 | 11 | , 0.0 1 11 3 | 18.2 | 20.2 | 10.7 | 25.3 | 12.6 | 12.6 |
| Level of Service | | | _ | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | <u> </u> | B | 20.0 C. | R | R |
| Approach Delay | (_00) | /105 | | 12 5 | | B | 11 6 | | B | 19 | | B | 13 0 |) | B |
| Intersection Del | av. s/ve | h / LOS | | 12.0 | | 15 | 5.4 | | 5 | 10. | _ | | B | | 5 |
| | ., e, te | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | W | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.28 | 3 | В | 2.11 | | В | 2.1 | 1 | В | 2.28 | 3 | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 1.13 | 3 | А | 0.69 |) | А | 1.8 | 1 | В | 1.10 |) | А |

| | | | - 3 | | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|-------------------|------------|-------------------------------|--------|-----------|--------|---------|------------------------|---------------|--------|----------|----------|---------------|-------|---------------------|--|--------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | ersect | ion Info | ormatio | on | | * | بد لي |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Greens | span | Engine | ers | | | | Du | ration. | h | 0.250 | | | 444 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Dat | e Aug 1 | 3 2020 | | Are | a Typ | е | Other | | | | ار ک |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e, <u>e</u> e <u>e</u> | | PH | IF | - | 0.96 | | → <u>_</u> * + → | w‡e | ▲↓ ↓ |
| Urban Street | | Glencoe Avenue | | Analys | is Yea | r 2026 | , | | Ana | alvsis I | Period | 1> 8 | 15 | * * | | + * |
| Intersection | | Glencoe/Maxella | | File Na | me | 06AM | - Future | | | aryoro | | . 0. | | | K # 2 | <u>~</u> |
| Project Descript | tion | Paseo Marina | | 1 110 110 | | 00/ 11 | - duar | 5.77610 | | | | | | 5 | 1 (나라 1 (1 (1 (1 (1 (1 (1 (1 (1 (1 | × (* |
| r reject becomp | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | ٧ | VB | | Γ | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | T · | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 126 | 116 | 160 | 69 | Ę | 93 | 90 | 124 | 620 | 59 | 79 | 586 | 98 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ð- | | \mathbf{L} |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | Ħ' | ് ഉഹ | 7 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point E | nd | Green | 24.8 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | Dn | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | <u> </u> | | √ |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | Dn | Red | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | _ | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | · - | EBT | WB | | W | /BT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | 9 | | _ | | _ | 6 | | \rightarrow | 2 | 2 | | \rightarrow | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | _ | | | 5.0 | | _ | 6 | 5.0 | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | _ | | _ | 30.0 | | _ | 30 | 0.0 | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period, | (Y+R) | c), S | | | | 5.2 | | _ | 5 | 0.2 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Head | dway(A | <i>ИАН</i>), s | _ | | _ | 0.0 | | _ | 0 | 0.0 | | | 3.5 | | | 3.5 |
| Queue Clearan | | (gs), s | | | _ | | | \rightarrow | | | | | 20.1 | <u> </u> | | 26.2 |
| Green Extensio | n lime | (ge), s | e), S | | _ | 0.0 | | - | 0 | 0.0 | | | 2.3 | <u> </u> | _ | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | Dability | 1 e), S | | | | | | _ | | _ | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probal | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.82 | | | 1.00 |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | _ | | W | В | _ | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | T | R | L | Т | - - | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | | 131 | 121 | 167 | 72 | 97 | 7 | 94 | 129 | 646 | 61 | 82 | 365 | 348 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/ln | | 1211 | 1900 | 1610 | 1291 | 190 | 00 · | 1610 | 749 | 1900 | 1610 | 797 | 1900 | 1805 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | 7 s), S | | 4.5 | 2.4 | 4.1 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 9 | 2.2 | 9.1 | 18.1 | 1.4 | 6.1 | 8.3 | 8.4 |
| Cycle Queue C | learance | e Time (g c), s | | 6.7 | 2.4 | 4.1 | 4.6 | 1.9 | 9 | 2.2 | 17.4 | 18.1 | 1.4 | 24.2 | 8.3 | 8.4 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.4 | 1 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 577 | 785 | 666 | 602 | 78 | 5 | 666 | 326 | 789 | 668 | 211 | 789 | 749 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | tio (X) | | 0.228 | 0.154 | 0.250 | 0.119 | 0.12 | 23 0 | 0.141 | 0.396 | 0.819 | 0.092 | 0.391 | 0.463 | 0.464 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | 57.6 | 45.3 | 66.9 | 29.6 | 35. | .7 | 35.4 | 67.2 | 327 | 20.6 | 51.1 | 145.6 | 139.3 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percentile) | | 2.3 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 4 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 13.1 | 0.8 | 2.0 | 5.8 | 5.6 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percentile) | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | | 13.1 | 11.0 | 11.5 | 12.5 | 10. | .9 | 11.0 | 19.0 | 15.6 | 10.7 | 26.3 | 12.7 | 12.7 |
| Incremental De | lay (d 2 |), s/veh | | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 6.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Initial Queue De | elay (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 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| d), s/ve | eh | | 14.0 | 11.4 | 12.4 | 12.9 | 11. | .2 | 11.4 | 19.3 | 21.9 | 10.7 | 26.7 | 12.9 | 12.9 |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | В | В | В | В | В | | В | В | С | В | С | В | В |
| Approach Delay | , s/veh | /LOS | | 12.6 | | В | 11.7 | 7 | Ē | В | 20.7 | · | С | 14.3 | ; | В |
| Intersection Del | lay, s/ve | h / LOS | | | | 16 | 6.0 | | | | | | | B | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LOS | | 2.28 | | В | 2.11 | | E | В | 2.11 | | В | 2.28 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC |)S | | 1.18 | | А | 0.70 |) | ŀ | A | 1.87 | | В | 1.14 | | А |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS™ Streets Version 7.8.5

| | | _ | J | | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|------------------------------|--------|----------|----------|---------|----------|---------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|-----------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inter | rsect | ion Infe | ormatio | on | 2 | 4741 | 4 L <u>4</u> |
| Agency | | Linscott. Law & Gre | enspan | . Engine | eers | | | | Dura | ation. | h | 0.250 | | | 444 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | e Aua 1 | 3. 2020 | | Area | | e | Other | | | | <i>د</i> 4 |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e with | | PHF | : | | 0.96 | | \Rightarrow \rightarrow | w∱e | |
| | | , , | | | | Projec | ct - AM | | <u> </u> | | | <u> </u> | | | | |
| Urban Street | | Glencoe Avenue | | Analys | sis Yea | r 2026 | | | Anal | lysis l | Period | 1> 8: | 15 | | ካተr | |
| Intersection | | Glencoe/Maxella | | File Na | ame | 06AM | - Future | e with | n Proje | ect.xu | JS | | | 5 | 1 1 4 Y 1 | * /* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | FB | | | ١٨ | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | | Т | R | 1 | - | т | R | 1 | T | R | 1 1 | Т | R |
| Demand (v) v | eh/h | | | 144 | 122 | 168 | 69 | 0 | 96 | 90 | 124 | 648 | 59 | 79 | 605 | 98 |
| | 011/11 | | | | TEE | 100 | 00 | | | 00 | 121 | 010 | 00 | 10 | 000 | 00 |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | | Γ | | | | | | | <u> </u> | | I |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | | - 5 | 2 | | | | | | | | • | Φ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 24.8 | 24 9 | 1 | | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | x | | 512 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | Y 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | _ | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | WB | 3T | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 6 | | _ | 2 | | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 | 0 | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 30.0 | | _ | 30.0 | .0 | | _ | 30.0 | | _ | 30.0 |
| Change Period, | , (Y+R) | c), S | | | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 | 2 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Head | dway(/ | MAH), s | | | | 0.0 | | _ | 0.0 | 0 | | | 3.5 | | | 3.5 |
| Queue Clearan | | e (gs), s | | | | | <u> </u> | _ | | _ | | | 21.3 | <u> </u> | | 26.9 |
| Green Extensio | | (ge), s | | <u> </u> | | 0.0 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 0.0 | 0 | | | 1.9 | | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | | | | | | | | \rightarrow | | _ | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Proba | biiity | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.99 | | | 1.00 |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | I | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | | 150 | 127 | 175 | 72 | 100 | 0 9 | 94 | 129 | 675 | 61 | 82 | 375 | 358 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1208 | 1900 | 1610 | 1283 | 190 | 0 16 | 610 | 735 | 1900 | 1610 | 776 | 1900 | 1807 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | | 5.3 | 2.5 | 4.3 | 2.2 | 2.0 |) 2 | 2.2 | 9.3 | 19.3 | 1.4 | 5.6 | 8.6 | 8.7 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 7.5 | 2.5 | 4.3 | 4.8 | 2.0 |) 2 | 2.2 | 18.0 | 19.3 | 1.4 | 24.9 | 8.6 | 8.7 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.4 | 1 0. |).41 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 575 | 785 | 666 | 597 | 78 | 5 6 | 666 | 319 | 789 | 668 | 192 | 789 | 750 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | itio(X) | | 0.261 | 0.162 | 0.263 | 0.120 | 0.12 | 27 0.´ | .141 | 0.405 | 0.856 | 0.092 | 0.429 | 0.475 | 0.477 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | 67.3 | 47.9 | 70.8 | 29.9 | 37 | 35 | 85.5 | 68.1 | 359.7 | 20.6 | 53 | 150.6 | 144.2 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 2.7 | 1.9 | 2.8 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 5 1 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 14.4 | 0.8 | 2.1 | 6.0 | 5.8 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | | 13.3 | 11.1 | 11.6 | 12.6 | 10. | 9 11 | 1.0 | 19.4 | 15.9 | 10.7 | 27.6 | 12.8 | 12.8 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | 1.1 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 3 0 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 8.8 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Initial Queue De | elay (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 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| a), s/ve | en | | 14.4 | 11.5 | 12.5 | 13.0 | 11. | 2 11 | 1.4 D | 19.7 | 24.7 | 10.7 | 28.1 | 13.0 | 13.0 |
| Level of Service | e (LUS) | /1.00 | | B | В | L R | В | | | в | В | | В | C AA F | B | В |
| Approach Delay | y, s/ven | 100 | | 12.9 |) | B 47 | 11.8 | | В | · | 23.0 | | U | 14.5 D | | В |
| mersection De | iay, S/VE | m / LU3 | | | | | J.Ə | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | S Score | /LOS | | 2.28 | 3 | В | 2.11 | | В | | 2.11 | | В | 2.28 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 1.23 | 3 | А | 0.71 | | А | | 1.92 | 2 | В | 1.16 | ; | А |

| | | | 9 | | | | | | und (| | | , | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|-------|--------|---------|----------|---------|-------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inf | torsact | tion Inf | ormati | n | T | 4 7 4 1 1 | به لي |
| | lation | Linscott Law & Green | enan | Engine | oore | | | | | uration | b | 0 250 | | | 414 | |
| Apolyot | | | ispan | | | | 2 2020 | | Δr | | <u></u> | Othou | | 1 | | <u>گ</u> |
| Analyst | | | | Times | | E Aug I | 3, 2020 | | | чатур | e | | | →× | w1∈ | → <mark>→</mark> |
| Jurisdiction | | | | Analyse | | | ig - Pivi | | | | Dariad | 1 10.94 | | | | ¥ |
| Urban Street | | Giencoe Avenue | | Analys | sis rea | IF 2020 | E. J. Al | | An | alysis | Period | 1> 10 | :45 | | | к. К. |
| | | Giencoe/Maxella | | File Na | ame | 06PM | - Existi | ng.xı | us | | | | | _ | ጎተሰ | - 4 |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 144 | 141 | 185 | 96 | 1 | 52 | 100 | 125 | 354 | 72 | 47 | 693 | 117 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | | | Τ | | | | | | <u> </u> | | |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | 1 | | - 54 | 2 | | | | | | | | | Φ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Croop | | 24.0 | 100 | | 0 | 0.0 | | _ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | X | | st2 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | F 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | V | VBT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | э | | | | | 6 | | | | 2 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6 | 6.0 | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 30.0 | | | 3 | 0.0 | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period | (Y+R | c), S | | | | 5.2 | | | 5 | 5.2 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Head | dway (<i>I</i> | /АН), s | | | | 0.0 | | | (| 0.0 | | | 3.5 | | | 3.5 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | (g s), s | g s), S I e), S | | | | | | | | | | 24.4 | | | 12.9 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | e), S | | | 0.0 | | | (| 0.0 | | | 0.3 | | | 3.5 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | e), S | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.24 |
| | | | te | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | W | 'B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |), veh/h | | 153 | 150 | 197 | 102 | 13 | 9 | 129 | 133 | 377 | 77 | 50 | 442 | 420 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/ln | | 1129 | 1900 | 1610 | 1257 | 190 | 00 | 1655 | 652 | 1900 | 1610 | 1022 | 1900 | 1804 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | ys), S | | 6.0 | 3.0 | 4.9 | 3.4 | 2. | 8 | 3.0 | 11.7 | 8.7 | 1.8 | 2.3 | 10.6 | 10.6 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 9.0 | 3.0 | 4.9 | 6.4 | 2. | 8 | 3.0 | 22.4 | 8.7 | 1.8 | 10.9 | 10.6 | 10.6 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.4 | 11 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| Capacity (c), v | eh/h | | | 530 | 785 | 666 | 576 | 78 | 5 | 684 | 275 | 789 | 668 | 396 | 789 | 749 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | tio (X) | | 0.289 | 0.19 | 0.296 | 0.177 | 0.1 | 76 | 0.189 | 0.484 | 0.478 | 0.115 | 0.126 | 0.560 | 0.561 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | 72.3 | 57.2 | 81 | 44.7 | 52 | .6 | 50.1 | 77.2 | 151.8 | 25.9 | 22.7 | 189.4 | 180.2 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), Ve | eh/ln (95 th percentile) |) | 2.9 | 2.3 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 2. | 1 | 2.0 | 3.1 | 6.1 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 7.6 | 7.2 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percentile |) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (01), S | ven | _ | 14.1 | 11.2 | 11.8 | 13.2 | 11. | .1 | 11.2 | 21.9 | 12.8 | 10.8 | 16.8 | 13.4 | 13.4 |
| | iay (a 2 |), s/ven | | 1.4 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0. | 5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| | elay (d | 3), S/Ven | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0. | U C | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| a), s/ve | en | | 15.4 | 11.8 | 12.9 | 13.9 | 11. | .6 | 11.8 | 22.4 | 13.0 | 10.8 | 16.8 | 13.9 | 14.0 |
| Level of Service | e (LUS) | 11.00 | | В | В | | B | L B | 5 | В | C | В | В | В | В | В |
| Approach Delay | /, s/veh | 105 | | 13.3 | 5 | В | 12.3 | 5 | | В | 14.8 | 5 | В | 14.1 | | В |
| Intersection De | ay, s/ve | n / LOS | | | | 1: | 3.8 | | | | | | | В | | |
| Multimodal Po | sulte | | | | EP | | | 10/ | 'B | | | NR | | | SR | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /105 | | 2.25 | 20 | B | 2 11 | | 0 | B | 2 11 | | B | 2.29 | | B |
| Bicycle I OS Sc | ore / I C |)S | | 1.31 | | A | 0.70 | , | | A | 1 45 | ; | A | 1 24 | _ | A |
| | | - | | | | | 5.10 | - | | · · | | | | | | |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS™ Streets Version 7.8.5

| Intersection Intersectintersectinterintersection Intersection Intersection Intersectio | | | | J | | | | | | | | - | , | | | | |
|--|------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|----------|--------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Agency Luncolt, Law & Greenspan. Engineers Duration. In 0.200 Analysid JAS Analysis Date kurg 13, 2020 Area Type Other Other Jurisdiction City of Los Angeles Time Period Exclurg with Project 2:exclurg PHF 0.019 I<>10:16:15: I | General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | ersect | ion Infe | ormatio | on | 2 | 444, | به لي |
| Analysis JAS Analysis Date Aug 13, 220 Area Type Other Other <thother< th=""> <thother< th=""> <thother< td=""><td>Agency</td><td></td><td>Linscott. Law & Gre</td><td>enspan</td><td>. Engine</td><td>eers</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Dura</td><td>ation.</td><td>h</td><td>0.250</td><td></td><td></td><td>4</td><td></td></thother<></thother<></thother<> | Agency | | Linscott. Law & Gre | enspan | . Engine | eers | | | | Dura | ation. | h | 0.250 | | | 4 | |
| Jurisdiction Oky of Los Angeles Time Period Existing with Project Destription PHF 0.94 Image Period 1>16.45 Unan Street Glencoe Avenue Analysis Year 2020 Analysis Period 1>16.45 Image Period 1>16.45 Project Destription Pase Marina Image Period 1>16.45 Image Period 1>16.45 Image Period 1>16.45 Approach Movement L T R L T | Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | e Aua 1 | 3, 2020 | | Area | a Type | e | Other | | | | ₹ |
| Internation Glencoe Avenue Analysis Vera Analysis | Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existin | ng with | | PHF | F | - | 0.94 | | ראיץ ק † [ז | w ^N ∉ E | ↓ ↓ ↓ |
| Intersection Demone/Maxelia File Name 06PM - Existing with Project.vus Demone/Maxelia | Urban Street | | Glencoe Avenue | | Analys | sis Year | · 2020 | л - Pivi | | Ana | alysis | Period | 1> 16 | :45 | - 12 | 5 4 2 | 1 |
| Project Description Passeo Marina VI R L T R L R L R L R L R L R L R L R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R | Intersection | | Glencoe/Maxella | | File Na | ame | 06PM | - Existi | ng wi | th Pro | oject. | xus | | | | - | ۳) ۲ |
| Demand Information L T R | Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | - | | | | 1 7 | | |
| Demand InformationEBWBIITRLT | | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Movement L T R <thl< th=""> <thl< th=""> <tht< th=""></tht<></thl<></thl<> | Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | \vdash | N | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Demand (\u01et), veh/h 143 140 143 140 155 100 125 352 72 47 71.2 117 Signal Information Cycle, s 0.0 Reference Phase Green 24.8 24.9 0.0< | Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Signal information Cycle, s 60.0 Reference Plant Croce Croce Reference Plant Status | Demand (<i>v</i>), v | eh/h | | | 143 | 140 | 185 | 96 | 1 | 55 | 100 | 125 | 352 | 72 | 47 | 712 | 117 |
| Cycle. s 0 Reference Phase 2 Offset. s 0 Reference Pinte End 0 | Signal Informa | tion | | | | | " | Γ | | | Γ | | | | ĸ | | |
| Offset O Reference Point End Green 24.8 24.9 0.0 | Cycle s | 60.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | | 242 | | | | | | | | | 1 | <u> </u> |
| Number Construint | Offset s | 0 | Reference Point | - End | | | <u> </u> | | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Proce Mode Fixed Simult. Gap NS On Red 1.5 1.5 0.0 | Uncoordinated | No | Simult, Gap F/W | On | Green | 24.8 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | | _ | | -+- |
| Timer Results EBL EBT WBL WBT NBL NBT SBL SBT Assigned Phase - 60 - 2 - 8 - 4 Case Number - 5.0 6.0 - 5.0 6.0 - 30.0 Change Period (Y+R c).s - 5.2 - 5.1 - 5.1 Green Extension Time (g e).s - 0.0 0.0 0.0 3.5 - 3.6 Phase Call Probability - - 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 - 2.5 Movement Group Results - - - - 1.00 - 2.5 Assigned Movement 1 6 16 5 2 1.00 - 2.5 Assigned Movement 1 6 16 5 2 1.00 - 2.5 Assigned Movement 1 6 16 5 12 13 3.7 7 5 4 14 Adjusted Flow Rate (v), veh/h 152 | Force Mode | Fixed | Simult, Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | 5 | €₀ | 7 | Y. |
| Timer ResultsEBLEBLEBFWBLWBTNBLNBTSBLSBTAsigned PhaseCase Number $$ 5.0 $$ 6.0 $$ 8.0 $$ 8.0 $$ 8.0 $$ 8.0 $$ 8.0 $$ 8.0 $$ 8.0 $$ 8.0 $$ 8.0 $$ $$ 8.0 $$ $$ $$ $$ | | | | | <u></u> | 1 | 1.11 | | | - , | | | , | | | | |
| Assigned Phase Image 6 Image 7 8 1mage 4 Case Number Image 5.0 Image 30.0 Image Image 30.0 Image Im | Timer Results | | | | EBI | - | EBT | WB | L | WE | BT | NBL | - | NBT | SBI | - | SBT |
| Case Number F.0 | Assigned Phase | е | | | | | 6 | | | 2 | 2 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Phase Duration, s Image Paried, (YHR c), s Image Paried, (YHR c) | Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 | 0 | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | Phase Duration | l, S | | | | | 30.0 | | | 30. | .0 | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Max Allow Headway (MAH), s $\end{lemands}$ $\$ | Change Period, | , (Y+R | c), S | | | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 | 2 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Queue Clearance Time ($g \circ$), s Image of the section Time (g | Max Allow Head | dway(<i>I</i> | <i>MAH</i>), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0 | | | 3.5 | | | 3.5 |
| Green Extension Time ($g \circ$), s Image: Ima | Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | | | | | | 25.1 | | | 13.0 |
| Phase Call Probability Image: Im | Green Extensio | n Time | (g _e), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0 | | | 0.0 | | | 3.6 |
| Max Out Probability Image: Image | Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Movement Group ResultsImage: Control of the control of | Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.25 |
| Involument Group Results L T R R L T R R R< | Movement Cre | un Dee | | | | ГР | | | \\\/ | | | | ND | | | 00 | |
| Approach involvementII | Approach Move | mont | Suits | | | ED | D | <u> </u> | | <u>ь</u> | Б | 1 | | D | | ор Т | D |
| Adjusted flow Rate (v), veh/h 17 190 180 190 180 180 180 190 180 | Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | + | 12 | 2 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 1 | 14 |
| Adjusted Fight ratio (V), forming (V), | Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |) veh/h | | 152 | 1/0 | 107 | 102 | 1/1 | n 1 | 12 | 133 | 37/ | 77 | 50 | 452 | 430 |
| Answer of antities (e), rotation (e), solution (figs), s forestime (figs), s forestim (figs), s forestime (figs), | Adjusted Satura | ation Flo |), ven/n w Rate (s) veh/h/l | n | 1126 | 1900 | 1610 | 1258 | 190 | | 658 | 639 | 1900 | 1610 | 1024 | 1900 | 1806 |
| Construction of the field of the second | Queue Service | Time ((| γ_{s}) s | | 6.0 | 3.0 | 4.9 | 3.4 | 28 | 3 3 | 3.0 | 12.1 | 8.6 | 18 | 22 | 11 0 | 11 0 |
| Green Ratio (g/C) 0.41 0.41 0.41 0.41 0.41 0.41 0.41 0.42 0 | Cvcle Queue C | learanc | e Time (| | 9.0 | 3.0 | 4.9 | 6.4 | 2.8 | 3 3 | 3.0 | 23.1 | 8.6 | 1.8 | 10.9 | 11.0 | 11.0 |
| Capacity (c), veh/h 529 785 666 577 785 685 269 789 668 398 789 749 Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (X) 0.288 0.190 0.296 0.177 0.179 0.191 0.495 0.475 0.115 0.126 0.573 0.574 Back of Queue (Q), tf/ln (95 th percentile) 72 56.8 81 44.5 53.3 50.7 78.2 150.5 25.9 22.7 194.3 186.5 Back of Queue (Q), veh/ln (95 th percentile) 2.9 2.3 3.2 1.8 2.1 2.0 3.1 6.0 1.0 0.9 7.8 7.55 Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile) 0.00 | Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.4 | 1 0 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (X)0.2880.1900.2960.1770.1770.1910.4950.4750.1150.1260.5730.574Back of Queue (Q), ft/ln (95 th percentile)7256.88144.553.350.778.2150.525.922.7194.3186.5Back of Queue (Q), veh/ln (95 th percentile)2.92.33.21.82.12.03.16.01.00.97.87.5Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile)0.000. | Capacity (c), v | / /eh/h | | | 529 | 785 | 666 | 577 | 78 | 5 6 | 685 | 269 | 789 | 668 | 398 | 789 | 749 |
| Back of Queue (Q), ft/ln (95 th percentile)7256.88144.553.350.778.215.525.922.719.3186.5Back of Queue (Q), veh/ln (95 th percentile)2.92.33.21.82.12.03.16.01.00.97.87.5Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile)0.00< | Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | itio(X) | | 0.288 | 0.190 | 0.296 | 0.177 | 0.17 | 79 0. | .191 | 0.495 | 0.475 | 0.115 | 0.126 | 0.573 | 0.574 |
| Back of Queue (Q), veh/ln (95 th percentile)2.92.33.21.82.12.03.1 $\overline{6} \cdot \overline{0}$ 1.0 0.9 $\overline{7} \cdot \overline{3}$ $\overline{7} \cdot \overline{3}$ Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile)0.00 $\overline{0} \cdot \overline{0}$ 0.00 $\overline{0} \cdot \overline{0}$ < | Back of Queue | (Q), ft | /In (95 th percentile) |) | 72 | 56.8 | 81 | 44.5 | 53. | 35 | 50.7 | 78.2 | 150.5 | 25.9 | 22.7 | 194.3 | 186.5 |
| Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile)0.00 | Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 2.9 | 2.3 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 2.1 | 1 2 | 2.0 | 3.1 | 6.0 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 7.8 | 7.5 |
| Uniform Delay (d 1), s/veh14.111.211.813.211.111.222.312.810.816.713.513.5Incremental Delay (d 2), s/veh1.4 0.5 1.1 0.7 0.5 0.6 0.5 0.2 0.0 0.1 0.7 0.7 Initial Queue Delay (d 3), s/veh 0.0 <td>Queue Storage</td> <td>Ratio (</td> <td>RQ) (95 th percent</td> <td>ile)</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>0 0</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0.00</td> | Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Incremental Delay (d 2), s/veh1.4 0.5 1.1 0.7 0.5 0.6 0.5 0.2 0.0 0.1 0.7 0.7 Initial Queue Delay (d 3), s/veh 0.0 <t< td=""><td>Uniform Delay (</td><td>(d1), s</td><td>/veh</td><td></td><td>14.1</td><td>11.2</td><td>11.8</td><td>13.2</td><td>11.</td><td>1 1</td><td>11.2</td><td>22.3</td><td>12.8</td><td>10.8</td><td>16.7</td><td>13.5</td><td>13.5</td></t<> | Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | | 14.1 | 11.2 | 11.8 | 13.2 | 11. | 1 1 | 11.2 | 22.3 | 12.8 | 10.8 | 16.7 | 13.5 | 13.5 |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | 1.4 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 5 (| 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | Initial Queue De | elay(d | з), 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 |
| Level of Service (LOS)BBBBBBCBBBBBBApproach Delay, s/veh / LOS13.3B12.3B14.9B14.3BIntersection Delay, s/veh / LOS 13.3 B 12.3 B 14.9 B 14.3 BIntersection Delay, s/veh / LOS 13.3 B 12.3 B 14.9 B 14.3 B Multimodal Results 2.28 B 2.11 B 2.11 B 2.12 B 2.28 B Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS 2.28 B 2.11 B 2.14 B 2.28 B Bicycle LOS Score / LOS 1.31 A 0.80 A 1.45 A 1.26 A | Control Delay (| d), s/ve | əh | | 15.4 | 11.7 | 12.9 | 13.9 | 11. | 6 1 | 11.8 | 22.9 | 13.0 | 10.8 | 16.8 | 14.1 | 14.2 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS13.3B12.3B14.9B14.3BIntersection Delay, s/veh / LOSImage: Strategy of the section Delay, s/veh / LOSImage: Strategy of the section Delay, s/veh / LOSMultimodal ResultsImage: Strategy of the section Delay, s/veh / LOSImage: Strategy of the section Delay, s/veh / LOSPedestrian LOS Score / LOS2.28B2.11B2.11Bioxide LOS Score / LOS1.31A0.80A1.45A | Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | В | В | В | В | В | | В | С | В | В | В | В | В |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS13.9BMultimodal Results $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}$ $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}$ $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}$ $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}$ $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}$ $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}$ $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}$ $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}$ $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}$ $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}$ $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}$ $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}$ $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}$ $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}$ $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}$ $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}$ $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}$ $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}$ | Approach Delay | , s/veh | /LOS | | 13.3 | 3 | В | 12.3 | 3 | В | 3 | 14.9 | | В | 14.3 | 3 | В |
| Multimodal Results EB WB NB SB Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS 2.28 B 2.11 B 2.11 B 2.28 B Bicycle LOS Score / LOS 1.31 A 0.80 A 1.45 A 1.26 A | Intersection De | lay, s/ve | eh / LOS | | | | 13 | 3.9 | | | | | | | В | | |
| Multimodal results EB WB NB SB Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS 2.28 B 2.11 B 2.11 B 2.28 B Bicycle LOS Score / LOS 1.31 A 0.80 A 1.45 A 1.26 A | Multimedul | oultr | | | | 50 | | | 10.0 | D | | | NID | | | 00 | |
| Fedesulari Los Score / LOS 2.20 D 2.11 D 2.11 D 2.20 B Bicycle LOS Score / LOS 1.31 A 0.80 A 1.45 A 1.26 A | Redestrian LOS | Suits | /1.08 | | 2.20 | | P | 0.44 | | D D | 2 | 0.11 | INB | B | 2.20 | 20 | B |
| | Bicycle I OS Sc | ore / I C |)S | | 1.31 | , | A | 0.80 | , | Δ | | 1 45 | ; | A | 1.20 | , } | A |

| | | | <u>g</u> | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|--------|---------------|-----------|-------|--------|-------|---------|---------|-------|----------------|----------|-----------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | Inters | sort | ion Inf | ormatio | n | | * | x l <u>x</u> |
| Agency | lation | Linscott Law & Greensn | an Engir | eers | | | | Durat | tion | h | 0 250 | | | 414 | |
| Apolyet | | | | | to Aug 1 | 3 2020 | | Area | Type | | Other | | _3 _3 | | <u>ئ</u> ے ا |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angolos | Timo | Doriod | | 5, 2020 | | | туре | 6 | 0.04 | | → <u></u> _* | w↓e | |
| Jurisaiction | | City of Los Angeles | Apoly | | r 2026 | 5 - F IVI | | Analy | | Poriod | 1 16 | .45 | - ⁴ | | |
| Intersection | | Glencoe/Maxella | Filo N | | | Eutur | | Analy | 515 1 | renou | 1-10 | .45 | | | <u> </u> |
| Project Descrip | tion | | File IN | ame | | - Futur | e.xus | • | | | | | - 4 | | × (* |
| Project Descrip | lion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | EE | 3 | | V | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | 169 | 16 | 5 201 | 102 | 1 | 80 1 | 108 | 151 | 393 | 76 | 54 | 762 | 145 |
| | | | | | | <u> </u> | | | | | | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | N. | _ | | | | | | | Ð− | | \mathbf{k} |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase 2 | | HE - | * ¶ s⊕ | 2 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point End | Greer | 1 24.8 | 3 24.9 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W On | Yellov | v 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | <u>a</u> | | N |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S On | Red | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | Y 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | _ | _ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | EB | | EBT | WB | | WBT | r | NBL | - | NBT | SBI | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | - | | 6 | | _ | 2 | _ | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | - | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 | | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 | | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period | , (Y+R) | c), S | | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 | | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Head | dway(/ | <i>ИАН</i>), s | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | | 3.6 | | | 3.6 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | (gs), s | | | | | | | | | | 26.9 | | | 14.7 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | 0.0 | | _ | 0.0 | | | | 0.0 | | | 3.9 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.42 |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | _ | FB | | | W | 'B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | 1.1 | Т | R | 1 | Т | · R | २ | 1 | Т | R | 1 | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |), veh/h | 180 | 176 | 214 | 109 | 15 | 9 14 | 18 | 161 | 418 | 81 | 57 | 496 | 469 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s), veh/h/ln | 1090 | 1900 | 0 1610 | 1228 | 190 | 00 16 | 67 | 592 | 1900 | 1610 | 984 | 1900 | 1794 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | 7 s), S | 7.6 | 3.6 | 5.4 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 2 3. | .4 | 12.5 | 9.9 | 1.9 | 2.8 | 12.4 | 12.4 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>q</i> c), s | 11.1 | 3.6 | 5.4 | 7.3 | 3.2 | 2 3. | .4 | 24.9 | 9.9 | 1.9 | 12.7 | 12.4 | 12.4 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.4 | 1 0.4 | 41 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| Capacity (c), v | / veh/h | | 508 | 785 | 666 | 554 | 78 | 5 68 | 39 | 243 | 789 | 668 | 366 | 789 | 744 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | tio(X) | 0.354 | 0.22 | 4 0.321 | 0.196 | 0.2 | 02 0.2 | 14 | 0.661 | 0.530 | 0.121 | 0.157 | 0.629 | 0.629 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | 90.4 | 68.3 | 8 89.5 | 48.9 | 61 | 1 57 | '.8 | 116.9 | 174.9 | 27.4 | 27.4 | 218 | 208.9 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percentile) | 3.6 | 2.7 | 3.6 | 2.0 | 2.4 | 4 2. | .3 | 4.7 | 7.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 8.7 | 8.4 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percentile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | 14.9 | 11.4 | 11.9 | 13.7 | 11. | .3 11 | .3 | 25.2 | 13.2 | 10.8 | 17.9 | 13.9 | 13.9 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | 1.9 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 6 0. | .7 | 5.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 |
| Initial Queue De | elay(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 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| d), s/ve | eh | 16.8 | 12.0 |) 13.2 | 14.5 | 11. | .8 12 | 2.0 | 30.5 | 13.5 | 10.8 | 18.0 | 15.1 | 15.2 |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | В | В | В | В | В | E | 3 | С | В | В | В | В | В |
| Approach Delay | , s/veh | /LOS | 14. | 0 | В | 12.6 | 3 | В | | 17.3 | | В | 15.3 | 3 | В |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | h / LOS | | | 15 | 5.1 | | | | | | | В | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | 2.2 | 8 | В | 2.11 | | В | | 2.11 | | В | 2.28 | 3 | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | 1.4 | 3 | А | 0.83 | 3 | А | | 1.58 | | В | 1.33 | 3 | A |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS[™] Streets Version 7.8.5

| | | | | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|--------|------------------|---------|---------|---------|-------|--------------|--------------|------------------|
| General Information | | | | | | | | Inter | rsect | ion Inf | ormatio | on | 2 | *** | بد لي |
| Agency | Linscott. Law & Gre | enspan | . Engine | ers | | | | Dura | ation. | h | 0.250 | | | 444 | |
| Analvst | JAS | | Analys | is Date | e Aua 1 | 3. 2020 | | Area | a Tvpe | е | Other | | | | <i>د</i> 4 |
| Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e with | | PHF | = | | 0.94 | | 1 + L | W + E | 4 ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ |
| Urban Street | Glencoe Avenue | | Analys | sis Year | · 2026 | | | Anal | lysis l | Period | 1> 16 | :45 | | 5 ተ ፖ | |
| Intersection | Glencoe/Maxella | | File Na | ame | 06PM | - Future | e with | n Proje | ect.xı | JS | | | ň | 111 41471 | × ا ^م |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | _ | _ | | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Information | | | | EB | | | N | /B | | | NB | | <u> </u> | SB | |
| Approach Movement | | | L | T | R | L | | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Demand (v), veh/h | | | 168 | 164 | 201 | 102 | 18 | 83 | 108 | 151 | 391 | 76 | 54 | 781 | 145 |
| Signal Information | | | <u> </u> | | | Г | | | | | | | ĸ | | |
| Cvcle. s 60.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | | 2043 2043 | | | | | | | | \mathbf{r} | • | <u> </u> |
| Offset, s 0 | Reference Point | End | | | | | | _ | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated No | Simult, Gap E/W | On | Green | 24.8 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | | | | - |
| Force Mode Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 5 | \$ | 7 | Y |
| | · · | | | | | | | | | | | | | L | |
| Timer Results | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | WB | 3T | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | | | | | 6 | | | 2 | | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 | 0 | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | | | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 | .0 | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period, (Y+R | c), S | | | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 | 2 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Headway (A | <i>MAH</i>), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0 | | | 3.6 | | | 3.6 |
| Queue Clearance Time | (g s), s | | | | | | | | | | | 26.9 | | | 14.8 |
| Green Extension Time | (ge), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0 | | | 0.0 | | | 4.0 |
| Phase Call Probability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.43 |
| Movement Group Bes | ulte | | | ER | | | \٨/٢ | D | - | | | | | S B | |
| Approach Movement | Juits | | | Т | R | 1 | | | R | 1 | Т | R | | Т | R |
| Assigned Movement | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate (v |) veh/h | | 179 | 174 | 214 | 109 | 16 | 0 1 | 149 | 161 | 416 | 81 | 57 | 506 | 479 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flo | ow Rate (s), veh/h/li | n | 1087 | 1900 | 1610 | 1229 | 190 | 0 16 | 669 | 580 | 1900 | 1610 | 986 | 1900 | 1796 |
| Queue Service Time (d | 7 s). S | | 7.6 | 3.6 | 5.4 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 2 3 | 3.5 | 12.1 | 9.8 | 1.9 | 2.8 | 12.8 | 12.8 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance | e Time (<i>g</i> c), s | | 11.1 | 3.6 | 5.4 | 7.3 | 3.2 | 2 3 | 3.5 | 24.9 | 9.8 | 1.9 | 12.6 | 12.8 | 12.8 |
| Green Ratio (g/C) | | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.4 | 1 0. |).41 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| Capacity (c), veh/h | | | 507 | 785 | 666 | 555 | 78 | 56 | 690 | 237 | 789 | 668 | 367 | 789 | 745 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ra | tio(X) | | 0.353 | 0.222 | 0.321 | 0.195 | 0.20 | 0.2 | .216 | 0.676 | 0.528 | 0.121 | 0.156 | 0.642 | 0.642 |
| Back of Queue (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | 89.9 | 67.7 | 89.5 | 48.9 | 61. | 7 58 | 6.8 | 119.3 | 173.3 | 27.4 | 27.3 | 224 | 214.8 |
| Back of Queue (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 3.6 | 2.7 | 3.6 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 5 2 | 2.3 | 4.8 | 6.9 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 9.0 | 8.6 |
| Queue Storage Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d 1), s | /veh | | 14.9 | 11.4 | 11.9 | 13.7 | 11. | 3 1 [.] | 1.3 | 25.6 | 13.1 | 10.8 | 17.9 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Incremental Delay (d 2 |), s/veh | | 1.9 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 3 0 | 0.7 | 6.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 1.4 | 1.5 |
| 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 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/ve | eh | | 16.8 | 12.0 | 13.2 | 14.5 | 11. | 9 12 | 2.1 | 31.7 | 13.5 | 10.8 | 17.9 | 15.4 | 15.5 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | В | В | B | В | В | | В | С | В | В | В | В | В |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | /LOS | | 14.0 |) | В | 12.6 | 6 | В | | 17.6 | 5 | В | 15.6 | | В |
| Intersection Delay, s/ve | h / LOS | | | | 15 | 5.3 | | | | | | | В | | |
| Multimodal Results | | | | FR | | | \// | B | | | NR | | | SR | |
| Pedestrian LOS Score | /1.05 | | 2.29 | | B | 2 11 | | R | | 2 11 | | В | 2.29 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LO |)S | | 1.42 | 2 | A | 0.83 | 3 | A | | 1.57 | - | B | 1.35 | ; | A |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/N. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Northerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



| Approach | | Eastbound Westbound | | | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | | | |
|---|------|---------------------|--------|------|-------|---|-------|-------|----|------------|-----|---|----|---|-----|---|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | | | | | | | | | Т | | | | Т | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | 741 | | | | 733 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | o control hepoirt | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/N. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Northerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| j. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|------|---|-----|-------|-------|---|------------|---|-----|----|--|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | Westb | ound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | | | R | | | | | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | 51 | | | | | 0 | 19 | 769 | | | | 741 | 18 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | 3 | | | | | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | (|) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | N | о | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | 6.9 | | | | | | 4.1 | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | 6.96 | | | | | | 4.16 | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | 3.3 | | | | | | 2.2 | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | 3.33 | | | | | | 2.23 | | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | 55 | | | | | | 21 | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | 586 | | | | | | 795 | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | 0.09 | | | | | | 0.03 | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | 0.3 | | | | | | 0.1 | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | 11.8 | | | | | | 9.7 | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | | | | | | А | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 11 | .8 | | | | | | 0.2 | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | E | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/N. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Northerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



| Approach | | Eastbound Westbound | | | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | | | |
|---|------|---------------------|--------|------|-------|---|-------|-------|----|------------|-----|---|----|---|-----|---|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | | | | | | | | | Т | | | | Т | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | 804 | | | | 815 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/N. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Northerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|-------|--------|------|-------|------|------|---|-----|-------|-------|---|----|-------|-------|----|--|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | ound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | | | R | | | | | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | 51 | | | | | 0 | 19 | 832 | | | | 823 | 18 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | 3 | | | | | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | (|) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | N | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | 6.9 | | | | | | 4.1 | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | 6.96 | | | | | | 4.16 | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | 3.3 | | | | | | 2.2 | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | 3.33 | | | | | | 2.23 | | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | 55 | | | | | | 21 | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | 548 | | | | | | 735 | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | 0.10 | | | | | | 0.03 | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | 0.3 | | | | | | 0.1 | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | 12.3 | | | | | | 10.0 | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | | | | | | В | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 12 | 2.3 | | | | | | 0.2 | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | E | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/N. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Northerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | oound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | |
|---|------|---------|--------|------|-------|------|-------|---|----|-------|-------|---|------------|---|-----|---|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | | | | | | | | | Т | | | | Т | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | 551 | | | | 974 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | e control hepoirt | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/N. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Northerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| ,- | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | |
|---|------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|------|---|-----|-------|-------|---|------------|---|-----|----|--|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | Westb | ound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | | | R | | | | | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | 34 | | | | | 0 | 34 | 549 | | | | 945 | 32 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | 3 | | | | | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | (|) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | N | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | 6.9 | | | | | | 4.1 | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | 6.96 | | | | | | 4.16 | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | 3.3 | | | | | | 2.2 | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | 3.33 | | | | | | 2.23 | | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | 37 | | | | | | 37 | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | 490 | | | | | | 646 | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | 0.08 | | | | | | 0.06 | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | 0.2 | | | | | | 0.2 | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | 12.9 | | | | | | 10.9 | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | | | | | | В | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 12 | 2.9 | | | | | | 0.6 | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | I | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | e control hepoirt | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/N. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Northerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | ound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | |
|---|------|---------|--------|------|-------|------|------|---|----|-------|-------|---|------------|---|------|---|--|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | | | | | | | | | | Т | | | | Т | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | 620 | | | | 1065 | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | 11037 1100 1103 510 | o control hepoirt | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/N. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Northerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|-------|--------|------|-------|------|------|---|----|-------|-------|---|----|-------|-------|----|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | ound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | | R | | | | | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | 34 | | | | | 0 | 34 | 618 | | | | 1036 | 32 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | 3 | | | | | 3 | 3 | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | (|) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | N | о | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | 6.9 | | | | | | 4.1 | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | 6.96 | | | | | | 4.16 | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | 3.3 | | | | | | 2.2 | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | 3.33 | | | | | | 2.23 | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | 37 | | | | | | 37 | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | 455 | | | | | | 592 | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | 0.08 | | | | | | 0.06 | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | 0.3 | | | | | | 0.2 | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | 13.6 | | | | | | 11.5 | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | | | | | | В | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 13 | 8.6 | | | | | | | 0. | .6 | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | E | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/S. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Southerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |

Lanes



| | J | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------|---------|--------|------|-------|------|-------|------|----|-------|-------|----|----|-------|-------|----|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | oound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | LR | | | | LR | | | L | Т | TR | | L | Т | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) | | 13 | | 6 | | 10 | | 10 | 0 | 14 | 718 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 714 | 16 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | (| C | | | (| C | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 4.1 | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 4.16 | | | | 4.16 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 2.2 | | | | 2.2 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 2.23 | | | | 2.23 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | 21 | | | | 22 | | | 15 | | | | 3 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | 175 | | | | 219 | | | 817 | | | | 824 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | 0.12 | | | | 0.10 | | | 0.02 | | | | 0.00 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q_{95} (veh) | | | 0.4 | | | | 0.3 | | | 0.1 | | | | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | 28.3 | | | | 23.2 | | | 9.5 | | | | 9.4 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | D | | | | С | | | А | | | | А | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 28 | 3.3 | | | 23 | 3.2 | | | 0. | .2 | | | 0 | .0 | |
| Approach LOS | | [|) | | | (| C | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/S. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Southerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |

Lanes



| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | Westk | bound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
|---|------|---------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|----|-------|-------|----|----|-------|-------|----|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | LR | | | | LR | | | L | Т | TR | | L | Т | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) | | 41 | | 27 | | 10 | | 10 | 0 | 18 | 734 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 766 | 26 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | (| C | | | (|) | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 4.1 | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 4.16 | | | | 4.16 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 2.2 | | | | 2.2 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 2.23 | | | | 2.23 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | 74 | | | | 22 | | | 20 | | | | 3 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | 168 | | | | 195 | | | 770 | | | | 811 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | 0.44 | | | | 0.11 | | | 0.03 | | | | 0.00 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | 2.0 | | | | 0.4 | | | 0.1 | | | | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | 42.3 | | | | 25.8 | | | 9.8 | | | | 9.5 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | E | | | | D | | | А | | | | А | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 42 | 2.3 | | | 25 | 5.8 | | | 0. | 2 | | | 0 | .0 | |
| Approach LOS | | | E | | | [|) | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/S. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Southerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | oound | | | North | oound | | | South | bound | |
|---|------|---------|--------|------|-------|------|-------|------|----|-------|-------|----|----|-------|-------|----|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | LR | | | | LR | | | L | Т | TR | | L | Т | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) | | 14 | | 6 | | 11 | | 11 | 0 | 15 | 779 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 795 | 17 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | (| 0 | | | (| C | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 4.1 | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 4.16 | | | | 4.16 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 2.2 | | | | 2.2 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 2.23 | | | | 2.23 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | 22 | | | | 24 | | | 16 | | | | 3 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | 140 | | | | 185 | | | 756 | | | | 778 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | 0.15 | | | | 0.13 | | | 0.02 | | | | 0.00 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | 0.5 | | | | 0.4 | | | 0.1 | | | | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | 35.3 | | | | 27.3 | | | 9.9 | | | | 9.6 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | E | | | | D | | | А | | | | А | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 35 | 5.3 | | | 27 | 7.3 | | | 0. | 2 | | | 0 | .0 | |
| Approach LOS | | I | E | | | [|) | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/S. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Southerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



| | J | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|------|-------|------|----|-------|-------|----|----|-------|-------|----|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | LR | | | | LR | | | L | Т | TR | | L | Т | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) | | 42 | | 27 | | 11 | | 11 | 0 | 19 | 795 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 847 | 27 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | (|) | | | (|) | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undiv | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adway | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 4.1 | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 4.16 | | | | 4.16 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 2.2 | | | | 2.2 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 2.23 | | | | 2.23 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | 75 | | | | 24 | | | 21 | | | | 3 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | 136 | | | | 163 | | | 712 | | | | 766 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | 0.55 | | | | 0.15 | | | 0.03 | | | | 0.00 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q_{95} (veh) | | | 2.7 | | | | 0.5 | | | 0.1 | | | | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | 59.8 | | | | 30.8 | | | 10.2 | | | | 9.7 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | F | | | | D | | | В | | | | А | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 59 | 9.8 | | | 30 |).8 | | | 0. | 2 | | | 0 | .0 | |
| Approach LOS | | I | - | | | [|) | | | | | | | | | |

| | | псэ | / Sig | nanze | ume | FISEC | | lesu | 115 31 | | ar y | / | | | _ | |
|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--------|----------|-------------|--------|----------|--------|--------------|---------|-------------|----------|----------|---------------|---|----------------|
| | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | T | | T |
| General Inform | nation | C | | | | | | | Interse | ection | Info | ormatic | on | - 6 | 4 4 4 + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + | × 1, <u>x</u> |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Duratio | n, h | | 0.250 | | | | ۴_ |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Date | Oct 7, | 2020 | | Area T | уре | | Other | | <u>⊅</u> → | | <u>∧</u> 2- |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | with | | PHF | | | 0.92 | | ** | w ‡ e € | |
| | | | | | | Projec | t - AM | | | | | | | الا 14 | | * ~ |
| Lirban Stroot | | Cloncoo Avonuo | | Analys | ie Voor | 2026 | vemen | .5) | Analys | ic Dori | od | 1 > 7./ | 15 | | 514 | |
| Interportion | | | / Dun/ | File Ne | | 2020 | Eutur | - with | Droigot | | ou | 1 > 1.4 | -J | - 1 | * 1 ****** | * /* |
| Draiget Deserin | tion | Beene Marine | / Dwy | File Na | ame | UOAIVI | - Future | | FIOJECI | (impr | over | nems). | xus | - | | |
| Project Descrip | lion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | FB | | | W | B | | | NB | | T | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | | Т | R | 1.1 | ТТ | · F | | 1 | Т | R | 1 1 | Т | R |
| Demand (v) v | eh/h | | | 42 | 0 | 27 | 11 | |) 1 | 1 | 19 | 795 | 3 | 3 | 847 | 27 |
| Bolhana (V), V | 011/11 | | | 12 | Ū | 21 | | | , , , | | 10 | 100 | | Ū | UII | 21 |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | JE. | 5 | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | _ | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | | | 40.7 | 0.0 | | | | | _ | 1 | 2 | 3 | Y 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 00.0 3.7 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |).U) () | - | | rta | | \rightarrow |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult, Gap N/S | On | Red | 0.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) 0. | |).0).0 | | 5 | | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | 1 | | | | - 1 | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | ner Results | | | | | EBT | WB | L | WBT | | NBL | | NBT | SBL | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | | | | 4 | | | 8 | | | | 6 | | | 2 | | |
| Case Number | | | | | | 8.0 | | - | 8.0 | | | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | Case Number Phase Duration is | | | | 5 | 25.0 | | | 25.0 | | | | 65 0 | | | 65 0 |
| Change Period | (Y+R) | c). S | | | - | 5.3 | | - | 5.3 | - | | | 4.4 | | | 4.4 |
| Max Allow Hear | dway (/ | MAH)s | | | | 3.3 | | - | 3.3 | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | $\alpha(\alpha_s)$ s | | | | 5.5 | | - | 3.0 | - | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (g;),c | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | hability | (ge), s | | | | 1.00 | | - | 1.00 | - | | _ | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | <u> </u> | | 00 | | - | 0.00 | - | | | | | | |
| Max Out 100a | onity | | | | | 5.00 | | | 0.00 | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | WE | } | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | | - | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 1 | | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |), veh/h | | | 75 | | | 24 | <u> </u> | 2 | 1 | 434 | 433 | 3 | 478 | 472 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | | 1510 | | | 153 | 2 | 60 | 0 | 1900 | 1897 | 648 | 1900 | 1879 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | | | 2.2 | | | 0.0 | | 1. | 4 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 0.2 | 9.9 | 9.9 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (q c), s | | | 3.5 | | | 1.0 | | 11 | .3 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 8.9 | 9.9 | 9.9 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | 0.22 | | | 0.22 | 2 | 0.6 | 67 | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.67 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | | 395 | | | 395 | ; | 41 | 8 | 1279 | 1278 | 454 | 1279 | 1265 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acitv Ra | itio (X) | | | 0.190 | | | 0.06 | 0 | 0.0 | 49 | 0.339 | 0.339 | 0.007 | 0.373 | 0.373 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) |) | | 60 | | | 18.5 | 5 | 8. | 9 | 145.5 | 145.3 | 1.3 | 165.6 | 163.9 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/ln (95 th percenti | le) | | 2.4 | | | 0.7 | | 0. | 4 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 0.1 | 6.6 | 6.6 |
| | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | tile) | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 |) | 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay | (d_1) s | /veh | | | 28.8 | | | 27.8 | 2 | 8 | a l | 6.2 | 6.2 | 8.1 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
| Incremental De | lav (d o |) s/veh | | | 0.1 | | | 0.0 | · | 0. | 2 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Initial Oueue Da | | | 0.1 | | | 0.0 | - | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (| | | 28.8 | | | 27 (| 2 | 0. | 1 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 8.1 | 73 | 73 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | 20.0 | | | 21.3 | , | 9. | | 0.9 A | 0.9 A | 0.1 A | A 1.5 | 1.5 A |
| Approach Delay, s/yeb / LOS | | | | 20 0 | | C | 27.0 | | <u> </u> | | 7.0 | A | | A 70 | A | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 20.0 | | 0 | 27.8 | | U | | 1.0 | | А | /.3 ^ | | A |
| intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 8 | .∠ | | | | | | | H | | |
| Vultimodal Results | | | | | FR | | | | 3 | | | NR | | | SR | |
| Multimodal Results Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | | | | 2 20 | | B | 2.20 | | R | - | 1 72 | | B | 1 70 | | B |
| Ricycle I OS So | | | | 0.61 | | Δ | 0.53 | 2 | Δ | - | 1.72 | | Δ | 1.72 | | Δ |
| | | | | 0.01 | | ~ | 0.00 | · | Л | | | | ~ | 1.27 | | ~ |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/S. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Southerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |

Lanes



| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
|----------------------------------|------|---------|--------|-------|-------|------|-------|------|----|-------|-------|----|----|-------|-------|----|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | LR | | | | LR | | | L | Т | TR | | L | Т | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) | | 71 | | 32 | | 6 | | 6 | 0 | 41 | 474 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 913 | 51 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | (|) | | | (| C | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undiv | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 4.1 | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 4.16 | | | | 4.16 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 2.2 | | | | 2.2 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 2.23 | | | | 2.23 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | 112 | | | | 13 | | | 45 | | | | 11 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | 126 | | | | 232 | | | 654 | | | | 1030 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | 0.89 | | | | 0.06 | | | 0.07 | | | | 0.01 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q_{95} (veh) | | | 5.7 | | | | 0.2 | | | 0.2 | | | | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | 118.5 | | | | 21.4 | | | 10.9 | | | | 8.5 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | F | | | | С | | | В | | | | А | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 11 | 8.5 | | | 21 | 1.4 | | | 0. | .9 | | | 0 | .1 | |
| Approach LOS | | I | F | | | (| 2 | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/S. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 9/1/2020 | East/West Street | Southerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
|----------------------------------|------|-------|--------|-------|-------|------|-------|------|----|-------|-------|----|----|-------|-------|----|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | LR | | | | LR | | | L | Т | TR | | L | Т | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) | | 69 | | 31 | | 6 | | 6 | 0 | 38 | 498 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 910 | 64 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | (|) | | | (|) | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undiv | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 4.1 | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 4.16 | | | | 4.16 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 2.2 | | | | 2.2 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 2.23 | | | | 2.23 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | 109 | | | | 13 | | | 41 | | | | 11 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | 124 | | | | 227 | | | 648 | | | | 1007 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | 0.88 | | | | 0.06 | | | 0.06 | | | | 0.01 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q_{95} (veh) | | | 5.5 | | | | 0.2 | | | 0.2 | | | | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | 116.7 | | | | 21.9 | | | 10.9 | | | | 8.6 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | F | | | | С | | | В | | | | А | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 11 | 6.7 | | | 21 | .9 | | | 0. | 8 | | | 0 | .1 | |
| Approach LOS | | I | F | | | (| 2 | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/S. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Southerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
|---|------|-------|--------|------|-------|------|-------|------|----|-------|-------|----|----|-------|-------|----|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | LR | | | | LR | | | L | Т | TR | | L | Т | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) | | 75 | | 34 | | 6 | | 6 | 0 | 44 | 538 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 1000 | 54 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | (| C | | | (| C | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 4.1 | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 4.16 | | | | 4.16 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 2.2 | | | | 2.2 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 2.23 | | | | 2.23 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | 118 | | | | 13 | | | 48 | | | | 12 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | 99 | | | | 188 | | | 600 | | | | 969 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | 1.19 | | | | 0.07 | | | 0.08 | | | | 0.01 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | 8.0 | | | | 0.2 | | | 0.3 | | | | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | 230.9 | | | | 25.5 | | | 11.5 | | | | 8.8 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | F | | | | D | | | В | | | | А | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 23 | 0.9 | | | 25 | 5.5 | | | 0 | .9 | | | 0 | .1 | |
| Approach LOS | | I | F | | | [|) | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/S. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Southerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
|----------------------------------|-------|---------|--------|-------|-------|------|-------|------|----|-------|-------|----|----|-------|-------|----|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | LR | | | | LR | | | L | Т | TR | | L | Т | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) | | 73 | | 33 | | 6 | | 6 | 0 | 41 | 562 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 997 | 67 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | (|) | | | (|) | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undiv | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adway | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 4.1 | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 4.16 | | | | 4.16 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 2.2 | | | | 2.2 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 2.23 | | | | 2.23 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | 115 | | | | 13 | | | 45 | | | | 12 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | 98 | | | | 184 | | | 594 | | | | 947 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | 1.18 | | | | 0.07 | | | 0.08 | | | | 0.01 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q_{95} (veh) | | | 7.7 | | | | 0.2 | | | 0.2 | | | | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | 227.0 | | | | 26.1 | | | 11.5 | | | | 8.8 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | F | | | | D | | | В | | | | А | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 22 | 7.0 | | | 26 | 5.1 | | | 0. | .8 | | | 0 | .1 | |
| Approach LOS | | I | - | | | [|) | | | | | | | | | |

| | | псэ | 7 Sig | nanze | a me | 1360 | | lesu | its Sui | iiiiai | У | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|------------------------|--------|----------|---------|----------|-----------|---------------|------------|----------|---------|-------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | | | | | • . | | | | | ter die Kerdier Ve | |
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | \rightarrow | Intersec | tion Inf | ormatic | on | | 4444 | ¦≫ l _{sk} |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | eers | | | | Duration | , h | 0.250 | | - | | R_ |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Date | Oct 7, | 2020 | | Area Typ | e | Other | | <u>⊅</u> → | | <u>≯</u> |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e with | | PHF | | 0.92 | | ** | w‡e 8 | |
| | | | | | | Projec | ct - PM | te) | | | | | الم 14 | | * |
| Lirban Street | | Glencoe Avenue | | Analys | ie Voar | 2026 | venien | .3) | Analysis | Period | 1> 17 | ·00 | | ግተኮ | |
| Intersection | | Glencoe/N Dwy-V/ | | | | 08PM | - Eutur | a with | Project (I | mprove | mente) | .00 VIIS | | াৰ্শ ↑ 💠 পশ 1 | * 1 |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | , DWy | The The | | | - T dtdiv | | | mprove | monto). | 703 | - | | |
| T Toject Descrip | lion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | NB | | T | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 73 | 0 | 33 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 41 | 562 | 11 | 11 | 997 | 67 |
| | | | | | | | | 1. | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | 14 | | _ | | | | | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 542 | i∰ è | - T | | | | | | | _ | - |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 60.6 | 19.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | 2 | 3 | <u> </u> |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 512 | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 0.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | 0 | | | | | | 0 | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | WBT | NBI | - | NBT | SBI | - | SBT | | |
| Assigned Phase | | | | 4 | | | 8 | | | 6 | | | 2 | | |
| Case Number | | | | 8.0 | | | 8.0 | | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 | | |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 25.0 | | | 25.0 | | | 65.0 | | | 65.0 |
| Change Period | , (Y+R) | c), S | | | | 5.3 | | | 5.3 | | | 4.4 | | | 4.4 |
| Max Allow Head | dway(A | <i>MAH</i>), s | | | | 3.3 | | | 3.3 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | 7.7 | | | 2.5 | | | | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (g _e), s | | | | 0.2 | | | 0.2 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | · | 1.00 | | | 1.00 | | | | | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | (| 0.00 | | | 0.00 | | | | | | |
| Movement Gra | un Boo | ulto | | | ED | | | \//D | | | ND | | | CD. | |
| Approach Move | mont | ouits | | | ED | P | | T | P | 1 | | P | 1 | т | P |
| Approach Move | mont | | | | 1 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 19 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 5 | - 1 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |) veh/h | | - / | 115 | 14 | | 13 | 10 | 1 | 312 | 310 | 12 | 585 | 572 |
| Adjusted Satur | tion Ele | y, ven/n | n | | 1/07 | | | 15/1 | | 40/ | 1000 | 1887 | 81/ | 1000 | 1857 |
| | Time ((| π_{α}) s | | | 1497 | | | 0.0 | | 434 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 0.5 | 13.1 | 13.1 |
| | learance | $a = Time(a_c) = s$ | | | 5.7 | | | 0.5 | | 17.3 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 6.3 | 13.1 | 13.1 |
| Green Ratio (a | \sqrt{C} | c mic (g c), s | _ | | 0.7 | | | 0.0 | | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.67 |
| Capacity (c) | /eh/h | | | | 395 | | | 397 | | 341 | 1279 | 1271 | 576 | 1279 | 1251 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | tio (X) | | | 0 291 | | | 0.033 | 3 | 0 131 | 0 244 | 0 244 | 0.021 | 0.457 | 0.457 |
| Back of Queue | (Q) ft/ | (In (95 th percentile) | | | 95.1 | | | 10 | , | 23 | 96.3 | 95.8 | 4.2 | 212 7 | 209.4 |
| Back of Queue | (Q) ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | 3.8 | | | 0.4 | | 0.9 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 0.2 | 8.5 | 84 |
| | Ratio (| RO) (95 th percent | tile) | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay | (d_1) s | /veh | | | 29.6 | | <u> </u> | 27.7 | | 11.0 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 7.0 | 6.9 | 6.9 |
| Incremental De | lav (d 2 |) s/veh | | | 0.2 | | <u> </u> | 0.0 | | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Initial Queue De | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (| | | 29.8 | | | 27.7 | | 11.8 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 7.0 | 8.1 | 8.1 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | _0.0 | | | C | | B | A | A | A | A | A |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 29.8 | | С | 27 7 | | C | 66 | | A | 81 | | A |
| Intersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | 20.0 | | <u>م</u> | .0 | | <u> </u> | 5.0 | | | A | | |
| intersection Delay, siven / LOG | | | | | | 5 | | | | | | | • | | |
| Multimodal Results | | | | | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | | | |) | В | 2.29 |) | В | 1.72 | 2 | В | 1.72 | 2 | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | edestrian LOS Score / LOS icycle LOS Score / LOS | | | | 3 | А | 0.51 | | А | 1.04 | | А | 1.45 | 5 | А |

| | | | Ū | | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------|----------|-----------|---------|----------|----------|-----------|---------|-------------|---------|-------|------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | ersect | ion Info | ormatio | on | | ~ ~~~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ | × l <u>a</u> |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Du | ration, | h | 0.250 | | 1 | 4+7 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Date | Aug 1 | 3, 2020 | | Are | ea Typ | е | Other | | 4 | | <u>∼</u> |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existir | ng - AM | | PH | IF | | 0.96 | | $\Rightarrow - $ | w | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | is Yea | r 2020 | 0 | | Ana | alysis | Period | 1> 7:4 | 45 | | | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/Glencoe | | File Na | ame | 09AM | - Existi | ng.xu | JS | | | | | | 545 | |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | <u> </u> | | | | | | | ▲ ↑ 4 * 171 | × (* |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | ٧ | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | | Т | R |
| Demand (<i>v</i>), v | eh/h | | | 73 | 138 | 454 | 45 | 2 | 03 | 14 | 429 | 585 | 84 | 8 | 384 | 105 |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | - | | | | | | | | K | | |
| | | Poforonco Phaso | 2 | | | eta. | в | | | | | | | \rightarrow | | ት |
| Offset s | 90.0 | Reference Point | Z End | | | | 7 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult Gap E/W | On | Green | 44.6 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | _ | | |
| Eorce Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Ped | 3.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | _ | Ð " | 7 | Y. |
| T OFCE MODE | TIXCU | olindit. Cap N/C | OII | Ticu | 1.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 10. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | Ŭ | | , | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | _ | EBT | WB | L | W | /BT | NBL | | NBT | SBI | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 6 | | | 2 | 2 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | \neg | 6 | 6.0 | | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | | | | | | 50.0 | | | 50 | 0.0 | | | 40.0 | | | 40.0 |
| Change Period, ($Y+Rc$), s | | | | | | 5.4 | | | 5 | 5.4 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Head | dway (<i>I</i> | MAH), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0 | 0.0 | | | 3.5 | | | 3.5 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (<i>g</i> s), s | | | | | | | | | | | 36.9 | | | 15.5 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0 |).0 | | | 0.0 | | | 4.8 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.11 |
| Manager | | - 14 - | | _ | ED | | _ | 14/ | P | _ | | ND | | | 00 | |
| Approach Mayo | oup Res | suits | | | EB | D | 1 | VV T | в | Р | | | Р | | 5B T | Р |
| Approach Move | mont | | | | 6 | 16 | | 2 | + | 12 | L 2 | Q | 19 | | 1 | <u>к</u> |
| Adjusted Flow | |) voh/h | | 76 | 111 | 10 | 47 | 2 11 | 1 | 12 | 3 | 356 | 2/1 | 7 | 4 | 247 |
| Adjusted Flow I | | y, ven/n | n | 1172 | 1000 | 473 | 47 | 100 | 4)0 / | 1957 | 447 004 | 1000 | 1916 | 760 | 1000 | 1760 |
| | Time (/ | π_{α}) s | | 31 | 37 | 18.9 | 1204 | 20 | a | 2.9 | 904 25.9 | 12 7 | 12 7 | 0.8 | 8.8 | 9.0 |
| | learance | $g = Time(\alpha_{a}) = s$ | | 63 | 3.7 | 18.9 | 5.6 | 2. | a | 2.0 | 34.0 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 13.5 | 8.8 | 9.0 |
| Green Ratio (| | e fille (<i>g c</i>), s | | 0.5 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.5 | 9 10 | 0.50 | 0 39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.0 | 9.0 0.39 |
| Capacity (c) y | /O) /eh/h | | | 623 | 942 | 798 | 654 | 94 | 2 | 920 | 340 | 737 | 704 | 267 | 737 | 682 |
| Volume-to-Can | acity Ra | tio (X) | | 0.122 | 0 153 | 0.593 | 0.072 | 0.13 | 21 (| 0 122 | 1 313 | 0 483 | 0 484 | 0.031 | 0.356 | 0.362 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | (In (95 th percentile) | | 42.5 | 73.6 | 295.3 | 25.8 | 57 | 7 | 56.7 | 892.7 | 233 | 225.5 | 6.1 | 171.2 | 161.9 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 1.7 | 2.9 | 11.8 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 3 | 2.3 | 35.7 | 9.3 | 9.0 | 0.2 | 6.8 | 6.5 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | , | 13.9 | 12.4 | 16.2 | 13.9 | 12. | 2 | 12.2 | 35.1 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 25.9 | 19.6 | 19.6 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | 0.4 | 0.3 | 3.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.3 | 160.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Initial Queue De | elay (d | у), 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 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | 14.3 | 12.7 | 19.4 | 14.1 | 12. | .4 | 12.5 | 195.5 | 20.9 | 21.0 | 25.9 | 19.7 | 19.7 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | В | В | В | В | | В | F | С | С | С | В | В |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 17.5 | 5 | В | 12.7 | 7 | Ē | В | 89.2 | 2 | F | 19.8 | | В |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 48 | 3.7 | | | | | | | D | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Aultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.30 | | В | 2.30 |) | E | В | 2.13 | | В | 2.30 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS So | ore / LC | DS | | 1.63 | 5 | В | 0.71 | | ŀ | A | 1.43 | | А | 0.91 | | A |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS™ Streets Version 7.8.5

| | | | 5 | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------|--------|------------|----------|----------------|----------|---------------|-----------|----------|---------|--------|---------------|------------------|-------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Interse | ction In | formati | on | K | * | به اي |
| Agency | lation | Linscott Law & Gre | ensnan | Engine | opre | | | | Duratio | n h | 0 250 |) | | 444 | |
| Analyst | | | enopun | | is Date | | 3 2020 | | | ne | Othe | , r | | | ₹ |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time | Pariod | Evictir | 3, 2020 | | | pe | 0.06 | | → _^ +> | w‡e | ▲ ↓ ◆ |
| Junsaletion | | | | | enou | Projec | t - AM | | | | 0.90 | | | | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | sis Year | 2020 | | | Analys | s Period | 1> 7: | 45 | | K & Ł | <u>~</u> |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/Glencoe | | File Na | ame | 09AM | - Existi | ng wi | th Proje | t.xus | | | | / / | *) * |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | ^ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | N | /B | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | L | Т | R | L | | T R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 85 | 146 | 508 | 45 | 2 | 06 14 | 442 | 2 585 | 84 | 8 | 384 | 110 |
| Cignal Informa | tion | | | . <u> </u> | | - 6 : | Ē | | 1 | _ | | | - | 1 | |
| | | Reference Dhase | 2 | | 1.7 3 | 213 | 6 | | | | | | \rightarrow | | ተ |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Priase | Z | | | - SA | 2 | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uliset, s | | Reference Point | Ena | Green | 44.6 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 0.0 | 0.0 | | | A | | Ŷ |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.8 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | 5 | Y 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timor Posults | | EBI | | EBT | W/B | | W/BT | NIE | | NBT | SBI | | SBT | | |
| Accigned Phase | | | - | 6 | | - | 2 | | <u>"_</u> | | 30 | - | 4 | | |
| Caso Number | | | | 5.0 | | - | 6.0 | - | | 6.0 | | | 4 | | |
| Bhose Duration | | | | 50.0 | | \rightarrow | 50.0 | | | 40.0 | | | 0.0 | | |
| Phase Duration | , s (V D | | | <u> </u> | _ | 50.0 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 50.0 | - | | 40.0 | <u> </u> | | 40.0 |
| Change Period, | (Y+R | c), S | | | | 5.4 | | - | 5.4 | | | 5.1 | | _ | 5.1 |
| | iway (7 | ИАН), S | | | _ | 0.0 | | \rightarrow | 0.0 | - | _ | 3.0 | | _ | 3.0 |
| Queue Clearan | | e (g s), s | | | _ | 0.0 | <u> </u> | - | 0.0 | | | 36.9 | <u> </u> | | 15.5 |
| Green Extensio | | (ge), s | | <u> </u> | _ | 0.0 | | \rightarrow | 0.0 | - | | 0.0 | <u> </u> | _ | 4.9 |
| Phase Call Pro | Dability | | | <u> </u> | _ | | <u> </u> | - | | | | 1.00 | <u> </u> | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probal | oility | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.12 |
| Movement Gro | up Res | sults | | | EB | | | W | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | | 89 | 152 | 529 | 47 | 11: | 5 114 | 460 | 356 | 341 | 8 | 265 | 249 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | 1170 | 1900 | 1610 | 1255 | 190 | 0 1857 | 900 | 1900 | 1816 | 760 | 1900 | 1755 |
| Queue Service | Time (d | q s), S | | 4.0 | 4.0 | 22.2 | 1.9 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 25.8 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 0.8 | 8.9 | 9.1 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (g c), s | | 6.9 | 4.0 | 22.2 | 5.9 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 34.9 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 13.5 | 8.9 | 9.1 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.5 | 0 0.50 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 |
| Capacity (c), v | eh/h | | | 621 | 942 | 798 | 647 | 942 | 2 920 | 338 | 737 | 704 | 267 | 737 | 680 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | atio(X) | | 0.143 | 0.162 | 0.663 | 0.072 | 0.12 | 22 0.12 | 1.363 | 0.483 | 0.484 | 0.031 | 0.360 | 0.366 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft | /In (95 th percentile) |) | 50.1 | 78.3 | 341.4 | 26 | 58 | 57.5 | 970.9 | 233 | 225.5 | 6.1 | 173.5 | 163.7 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), Ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 2.0 | 3.1 | 13.7 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 3 2.3 | 38.8 | 9.3 | 9.0 | 0.2 | 6.9 | 6.5 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| d 1), s | /veh | | 14.1 | 12.4 | 17.1 | 14.1 | 12. | 2 12.2 | 35.2 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 25.9 | 19.6 | 19.7 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 | e), s/veh | | 0.5 | 0.4 | 4.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 3 0.3 | 181.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Initial Queue Delay (<i>d</i> 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 (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | 14.5 | 12.8 | 21.4 | 14.3 | 12. | 5 12.5 | 216.5 | 20.9 | 21.0 | 25.9 | 19.7 | 19.8 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | В | С | В | В | В | F | С | С | С | В | В |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 18.9 |) | В | 12.8 | 3 | В | 98 | 8 | F | 19.8 | 3 | В |
| Intersection Del | Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | 52 | 2.4 | | | | | | D | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Iultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LOS | | 2.30 |) | В | 2.30 |) | В | 2.1 | 3 | В | 2.30 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 1.76 | 6 | В | 0.72 | 2 | А | 1.4 | 4 | А | 0.92 | 2 | А |

| | | | Ū | | | | | | | | - | , | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------|----------------|-------|-----------|-----------------|----------|---------|----------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|--|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Int | tersect | ion Info | ormatio | on | 2 | 4241 | s l <u>s</u> | |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | eers | | | | Du | iration. | h | 0.250 | | | ₄↓५ | | |
| Analvst | | JAS | <u> </u> | Analys | is Dat | te Aua 1 | 3. 2020 | | Are | ea Tvp | e | Other | | | | ₹ | |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e - AM | | PH | IF | | 0.96 | | \rightarrow \rightarrow | whe | | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | sis Yea | ar 2026 | | | An | Analysis Period | | | 45 | | | | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/Glencoe | | File Na | ame | 09AM | - Future | ə.xus | 3 | , | | | | | 5 4 17 | <u>~</u> _ | |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | - 5 | [1 1 1 1 1 | * /* | |
| , , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | ۷ | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 87 | 159 | 9 496 | 50 | 2 | 18 | 15 | 467 | 624 | 96 | 9 | 419 | 113 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | 245 | _ | | | | | | | Ð− | | \mathbf{A} | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase 2 | | | Ħ٧ | 1 SA | 7 | | | | | | 1 | ▲ 2 | 3 | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 44.6 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | ~ | | ~ | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | <u> </u> | | N | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.8 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | _ | | | | _ | |
| Timer Results | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | W | VBT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | | SBT | | |
| Assigned Phase | | | | \rightarrow | 6 | | $ \rightarrow$ | | 2 | | | 8 | <u> </u> | | 4 | | |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6 | 5.0 | | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 | |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | \rightarrow | 50.0 | | _ | 50 | 0.0 | | | 40.0 | | <u>_</u> _ | 40.0 | |
| Change Period | , (Y+R | c), S | | | | 5.4 | | | | 5.4 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 | |
| Max Allow Head | dway(/ | MAH), s | | | \rightarrow | 0.0 | | | 0 |).0 | | 3.6 | | | | 3.6 | |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | | | | | | 36.9 | | | 16.9 | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0 |).0 | | | 0.0 | | | 5.4 | |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.19 | |
| Movement Gro | | aulte | | | EB | | | \٨/ | 'B | | | NB | _ | | SB | _ | |
| Approach Move | mont | Suits | | | Т | P | 1 | vv | · | P | 1 | Т | P | 1 | т | P | |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | + | 12 | L 3 | 8 | 18 | | 1 | 14 | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Pote (v |) veh/h | | 01 | 166 | 517 | 52 | 12 | 2 | 12 | 186 | 38/ | 366 | 7 | | 268 | |
| Adjusted Satur | tion Ele |), vch/hl w Rate (s) veh/h/l | n | 1155 | 100 | 1610 | 1230 | 100 | 2 | 1857 | 868 | 1000 | 1811 | 723 | 1000 | 1761 | |
| | Time () | σ_{s}) s | | 4 1 | 43 | 21.5 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 3.2 | 25.0 | 1300 | 14.0 | 0.9 | 9.8 | 99 | |
| | learanc | g(x) | | 73 | 43 | 21.5 | 6.5 | 3 | 1 | 3.2 | 34.9 | 13.9 | 14.0 | 14.9 | 9.8 | 9.0 | |
| Green Ratio (a | $\frac{1}{2}$ | e fille (g t), s | | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.5 | 50 | 0.50 | 0 3 9 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.0 | |
| Capacity (c) | /eh/h | | | 612 | 942 | 798 | 634 | 94 | 2 | 920 | 321 | 737 | 702 | 248 | 737 | 683 | |
| Volume-to-Can | acity Ra | utio (X) | | 0.148 | 0 176 | 3 0 648 | 0.082 | 0.1 | 2 30 (| 0 131 | 1.516 | 0.521 | 0.522 | 0.038 | 0.388 | 0.393 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q) ft | (In (95 th percentile) | | 51.8 | 86 | 330.7 | 29.3 | 61 | .6 | 61 | 1182 | 251.8 | 243 | 7 | 189.3 | 178.3 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), V | eh/ln (95 th percenti | le) | 2.1 | 3.4 | 13.2 | 1.2 | 2 | 5 | 2.4 | 47.3 | 10.1 | 9.7 | 0.3 | 7.6 | 7.1 | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 |)0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delav | (d1).s | /veh | , | 14.2 | 12.5 | 16.9 | 14.3 | 12 | .2 | 12.2 | 35.6 | 21.1 | 21.1 | 26.9 | 19.9 | 19.9 | |
| Incremental Delay (d 2), s/veh | | | 0.5 | 0.4 | 4.0 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 3 | 0.3 | 247.5 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | | |
| Initial Queue Delay (<i>d</i> ₂), 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 | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (<i>d</i> 3), s/veh | | | 14.7 | 13.0 | 20.9 | 14.6 | 12 | .5 | 12.5 | 283.1 | 21.4 | 21.5 | 26.9 | 20.0 | 20.0 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | В | B | C | В | B | | В | F | C | C | C | B | C | | |
| Approach Delay s/veh / LOS | | | | - 18.5 | 5 | В | 12.9 | | | B | 124 4 | 1 | F | 20.1 | | C | |
| Intersection De | lav, s/ve | h / LOS | | 10.0 | | - 63 | 3.9 | | | - | | | • | E | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | L | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | W | B | | | NB | NB | | SB | | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LOS | | 2.30 |) | В | 2.30 | | В | | 2.13 | | В | 2.30 |) | В | |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 1.76 | ; | В | 0.73 | 3 | | A | 1.51 | | В | 0.95 | 5 | А | |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS™ Streets Version 7.8.5

| | | | | | | | | | | | - | , | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|--------|----------|---|---------|-----------|------|------|---------|------------|---------|-------|----------------|------------------|---------------|--|--|--|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | ersect | tion Infe | ormatio | on | 2 | 474+1 | ⊾ Ļ_ | | | |
| Agency | | Linscott. Law & Gre | enspan | . Engine | eers | | | | Du | ration. | h | 0.250 | | | 444 | | | | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Dat | e Aua 1 | 3, 2020 | | Are | a Tvp | e | Other | | | | <u>₹</u> | | | |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e with | | PH | IF | | 0.96 | | ראייץ + ר | W + E | ≮ ↓ ↓ | | | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | sis Yea | r 2026 | st - Aivi | | Ana | alysis | Period | 1> 7:4 | 45 | - ⁻ | K & L | <u>م</u> م | | | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/Glencoe | | File Na | ile Name 09AM - Future with Project.xus | | | | | | | | | ካ ተ የተተኛ ሶ | | | | | |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | J | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | N | ∕B | | | NB | | | SB | | | | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | - | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | | | |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 99 | 167 | 550 | 50 | 2 | 21 | 15 | 480 | 624 | 96 | 9 | 419 | 118 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | -215 | | | | | | | | Ð_ | | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase 2 | | | HE ! | 1 54 | 7 | | | | | | 1 | ¥ _ | 3 | († x | | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point End | | Green | 44.6 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | 2 | 5 | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W On | | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | <u> </u> | | 512 | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.8 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | Y 6 | 7 | 8 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | - | EBT | WB | L | W | /BT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT | | | |
| Assigned Phase | е | | | | | 6 | | | 2 | 2 | | | 8 | | | 4 | | | |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6. | 5.0 | | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 | | | |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 50.0 | | | 50 | 0.0 | | | 40.0 | | 4 | 40.0 | | | |
| Change Period | , (Y+R) | c), S | | | | 5.4 | | | 5. | 5.4 | | 5.1 | | | | 5.1 | | | |
| Max Allow Head | dway(/ | <i>MAH</i>), s | | | | 0.0 | | | | 0.0 | | | 3.6 | | | 3.6 | | | |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (<i>g</i> s), s | | | | | | | | | | | 36.9 | | | 16.9 | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (g e), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0. | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 5.5 | | | |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 | | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | D.19 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | | | | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | | | |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 | | | |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate(<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | 103 | 174 | 573 | 52 | 124 | 4 | 122 | 500 | 384 | 366 | 9 | 289 | 271 | | | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1152 | 1900 | 1610 | 1230 | 190 | 0 1 | 1857 | 864 | 1900 | 1811 | 723 | 1900 | 1756 | | | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | | 4.8 | 4.6 | 25.1 | 2.2 | 3.2 | 2 | 3.2 | 24.9 | 13.9 | 14.0 | 0.9 | 9.9 | 10.0 | | | |
| Cycle Queue C | learance | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 8.0 | 4.6 | 25.1 | 6.8 | 3.2 | 2 | 3.2 | 34.9 | 13.9 | 14.0 | 14.9 | 9.9 | 10.0 | | | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.50 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | | | |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 610 | 942 | 798 | 627 | 942 | 2 | 920 | 319 | 737 | 702 | 248 | 737 | 681 | | | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | tio(X) | | 0.169 | 0.185 | 0.718 | 0.083 | 0.13 | 31 0 | 0.133 | 1.569 | 0.521 | 0.522 | 0.038 | 0.392 | 0.397 | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | 59.9 | 90.8 | 381.3 | 29.4 | 62. | 4 | 62 | 1264. 2 | 251.8 | 243 | 7 | 191.2 | 180.1 | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 2.4 | 3.6 | 15.3 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 5 | 2.5 | 50.6 | 10.1 | 9.7 | 0.3 | 7.6 | 7.2 | | | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | , | 14.4 | 12.6 | 17.8 | 14.5 | 12. | 2 | 12.3 | 35.7 | 21.1 | 21.1 | 26.9 | 19.9 | 19.9 | | | |
| Incremental Delay (d_{2}) , s/veh | | | | 0.6 | 0.4 | 5.5 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.3 | 271.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | | | |
| Initial Queue Delay (d_2), siven | | | 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 (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | 15.0 | 13.0 | 23.3 | 14.7 | 12. | 5 | 12.6 | 306.7 | 21.4 | 21.5 | 26.9 | 20.0 | 20.1 | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | В | В | С | В | В | + | В | F | С | С | С | С | С | | | | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 20.2 | | С | 12.9 | | E | В | 135. | 5 | F | 20.2 | 2 | С | | | |
| Intersection De | lav. s/ve | h / LOS | | | | 68 | 3.1 | | | | | | | 20.2 C | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 5. | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | NB | | SB | | | | |
| Pedestrian LOS | S Score | / LOS | | 2.30 |) | В | 2.30 |) | E | В | 2.13 | ; | В | |) | В | | | |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC |)S | | 1.89 |) | В | 0.73 | 3 | ŀ | A | 1.52 | | В | 0.96 | ; | А | | | |

 $Copyright @ {\tt 2020} \ University \ of \ Florida, \ All \ Rights \ Reserved.$

| | | 1103 | 7 Sig | nanze | u mu | ersec | | 1631 | 111.5 | Sun | iiiiai | y | | | _ | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|--------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|--------|-------|----------|----------|--------------|-------|-----------|----------|--------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | F = 5 | | | | | |
| General Inform | nation | <u></u> | | | | | | | Inte | ersect | ion Info | ormatio | on | - 1 | | × 1.4 | |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | i, Engine | eers | | | | Dura | ation, | h | 0.250 | | | | R_ | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | • Oct 6, | 2020 | | Area | а Тур | e | Other | | × | | Å | |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e with | | PHF | F | | 0.96 | | | w∔e s | - + + | |
| | | | | | | (Impro | ovemeni | ts) | | | | | | ار الح | | 국 고 | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | sis Year | 2026 | | , | Anal | alvsis | Period | 1> 7:4 | 15 | | ግተዮ | | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/Glencoe | | File Na | ame | 09AM | - Future | e with | Proie | iect (l | mprove | ments) | xus | - 1 | | × (* | |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | 1 110 110 | | 007 111 | - ddar | o ma | | Joor (II | mprovo | inorito). | Ado | - | | | |
| T Tojoot Booonp | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | Т | N | /B | | | NB | | | SB | | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Τ- | Г | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 99 | 167 | 550 | 50 | 22 | 21 | 15 | 480 | 624 | 96 | 9 | 419 | 118 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | Ê. | _ | |
| Signal Information | | | | | | | 215 | | | | | | | Ð- | K . | \mathbf{L} | |
| Cycle, s | Cycle, s 90.0 Reference Phase 2 | | | | HE * | N 511 | z sa | 2 | | | | | 1 | ¥ _ | ו (ו | († X | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | Green | 36.0 | 21.6 | 17.9 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 2 | | N | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | Red | 1.8 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| | | | | _ | _ | | _ | | | | | _ | _ | | | _ | |
| Timer Results | | | | | - | EBT | WB | L | WB | BT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | | SBT | |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 6 | | | 2 | 2 | 3 | | 8 | | | 4 | |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | _ | 6.0 | 0 | 1.0 | | 4.0 | | | 6.3 | |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 41.4 | | | 41. | .4 | 25.6 | | 48.6 | | | 23.0 | |
| Change Period | , (Y+R - | c), S | | | | 5.4 | | | 5.4 | | 4.0 | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 | |
| Max Allow Head | dway(/ | <i>MAH</i>), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0 | 3.2 | | 3.2 | | | 3.2 | |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | | | | 20.5 | | 13.8 | | | 15.1 | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | 0.0 | | _ | 0.0 | 0 | 1.1 | | 2.8 | | | 2.8 | |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | |
| Movement Gro | un Res | aults | | | FB | | | W/F | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | 1 | Т | R | 1 | Т | | R | 1 | Т | R | | Т | R | |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |) veh/h | | 103 | 174 | 573 | 52 | 124 | 1 1 | 122 | 500 | 384 | 366 | 9 | 289 | 271 | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s) veh/h/l | n | 1152 | 1900 | 1610 | 1230 | 190 | 0 18 | 857 | 1810 | 1900 | 1811 | 723 | 1900 | 1756 | |
| Queue Service | Time (a | σ_s) s | | 5.7 | 5.4 | 17.9 | 2.6 | 3.8 | | 3.8 | 18.5 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 0.9 | 12.9 | 13.1 | |
| Cvcle Queue C | learanc | e Time (a c), s | | 9.5 | 5.4 | 17.9 | 8.1 | 3.8 | | 3.8 | 18.5 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 0.9 | 12.9 | 13.1 | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | - ····· (3 ·), - | _ | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.64 | 0.40 | 0.4 | 0 0 | 0.40 | 0.46 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | |
| Capacity (c), y | /eh/h | | | 492 | 759 | 1030 | 497 | 759 | 97 | 742 | 560 | 919 | 876 | 224 | 379 | 350 | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acitv Ra | ntio(X) | | 0.210 | 0.229 | 0.556 | 0.105 | 0.16 | 63 0. | .165 | 0.893 | 0.417 | 0.418 | 0.042 | 0.762 | 0.773 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) |) | 74.3 | 113 | 259.1 | 36.5 | 77. | 7 7 | 77.2 | 303.4 | 211.3 | 204 | 7.4 | 249 | 237.5 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q). Ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 3.0 | 4.5 | 10.4 | 1.5 | 3.1 | 3 | 3.1 | 12.1 | 8.5 | 8.2 | 0.3 | 10.0 | 9.5 | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ;ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay | (d1). s | /veh | , | 20.4 | 17.8 | 9.1 | 20.5 | 17. | 3 1 | 17.4 | 20.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 29.2 | 34.0 | 34.1 | |
| Incremental Delay (d_2) s/veh | | | | 1.0 | 0.7 | 2.2 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 5 (| 0.5 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 1.4 | |
| Initial Queue Delay (d_3), siveh | | | | | 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 | | | | | 18.6 | 11.2 | 20.9 | 17. | 8 1 | 17.8 | 22.1 | 15.1 | 15.2 | 29.3 | 35.2 | 35.5 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | С | В | В | С | В | - | В | С | В | В | С | D | D | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 14.0 |) | B | 18,4 | 1 | В | 3 | 17.9 | | B | 35.3 | - | D | |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | h / LOS | | | | 20 |).2 | | | | | | | C | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | W | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.30 |) | В | 2.30 |) | В | | 2.13 | | В | 2.30 |) | В | |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 1.89 |) | В | 0.73 | 3 | А | 1 | 1.52 | | В | 0.96 | ; | А | |

| | | | Ū | | | | | | | | - | , | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|--------|----------|---------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-------|-----------------------------|-------|---------------|--|--|
| General Inform | ation | | | | | | | | Int | tersect | tion Infe | ormatio | on | | 4241 | يد لي | | |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | eers | | | | Du | uration. | h | 0.250 |) | | 444 | | | |
| Analvst | | JAS | | Analys | is Da | te Aua 1 | 3. 2020 | | Are | ea Tvp | e | Other | - | | | <i>د</i> 4 | | |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existin | Existing - PM | | | HF // | | 0.94 | | \rightarrow \rightarrow | WÌE | | | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | sis Yea | ar 2020 | 2020 | | | | Period | 1> 17 | 2:00 | | | | | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/Glencoe | | File Na | ame | 09PM | - Existi | na xi | IS | | | <u> </u> | | | KAL | | | |
| Project Descript | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | .9 | | | | | | ካ ∢ ነ∳ቀነኘ ኩ /* | | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | E | | ; | | ٧ | WB | | T | NB | | T | SB | 3B | | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | | |
| Demand (v), ve | eh/h | | | 133 | 213 | 3 616 | 122 | 2 | 15 | 27 | 225 | 346 | 45 | 10 | 514 | 96 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | 245 | | | | | | | | Ð- | | \mathbf{L} | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase 2 | | 😫 | | * 1 54 | 2 | , | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 44.6 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | - | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | <u>a</u> | | √ > | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | Red | 1.8 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | | |
| | | | | | 1 | | _ | _ | | _ | | _ | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | W | VBT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT | | | |
| Assigned Phase | | | | _ | 6 | | | | 2 | | | 8 | | | 4 | | | |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6 | 5.0 | | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 | | |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 50.0 | | | 50 | 0.0 | | | 40.0 | | · | 40.0 | | |
| Change Period, | (Y+R | c), S | | | | 5.4 | | | | 5.4 | | | | | | 5.1 | | |
| Max Allow Head | dway(<i>I</i> | ИАН), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0 | 0.0 | | 3.5 | | | | 3.5 | | |
| Queue Clearand | ce Time | e (<i>g</i> s), s | | | | | | | | | | | 36.9 | | | 13.8 | | |
| Green Extension | n Time | (ge),s | | | _ | 0.0 | | \rightarrow | 0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 3.5 | | |
| Phase Call Prob | bability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 | | |
| Max Out Probat | oility | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.03 | | |
| Movement Gro | | ulte | | | EB | | | \٨/ | B | | | NB | _ | | SB | _ | | |
| Approach Move | mont | | | | Т | R | 1 | Т | | R | | Т | R | | Т | R | | |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | + | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 | | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |) veh/h | | 141 | 227 | 655 | 130 | 13 | 0 | 128 | 239 | 211 | 205 | , 11 | 333 | 316 | | |
| Adjusted Satura | tion Flo | w Rate (s) veh/h/li | 1 | 1140 | 1900 | 1610 | 1172 | 190 | 0 | 1826 | 795 | 1900 | 1823 | 986 | 1900 | 1796 | | |
| Queue Service | Time ((| γ_{s}) s | | 6.9 | 6 1 | 31.2 | 6.4 | 3 | 3 | 3.4 | 23.1 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 0.7 | 11 7 | 11.8 | | |
| Cycle Queue Cl | earanc | e Time (a_c) s | | 10.3 | 6.1 | 31.2 | 12.6 | 3 | 3 | 3.4 | 34.9 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 7.7 | 11.7 | 11.8 | | |
| Green Ratio (a | /C.) | o milo (g c), o | | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.50 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | | |
| Capacity (c) y | eh/h | | | 602 | 942 | 798 | 581 | 94 | 2 | 905 | 284 | 737 | 707 | 386 | 737 | 696 | | |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | tio (X) | | 0.235 | 0.24 | 1 0 821 | 0.223 | 0.1 | - 38 (| 0 141 | 0.842 | 0.286 | 0.290 | 0.028 | 0 451 | 0.454 | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | (In (95 th percentile) | | 86.1 | 122. | 1 473.9 | 83 | 66 | 3 | 64.9 | 276.3 | 133.3 | 129.9 | 7 | 218.4 | 210 | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/ln (95 th percentil | e) | 3.4 | 4.9 | 19.0 | 3.3 | 2 | 6 | 2.6 | 11.1 | 5.3 | 5.2 | 0.3 | 8.7 | 8.4 | | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | le) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | |
| Uniform Delay (| d 1), s | /veh | / | 15.1 | 13.0 | 19.3 | 16.6 | 12 | .3 | 12.3 | 35.1 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 21.6 | 20.4 | 20.5 | | |
| Incremental Delay (d 2) s/veh | | | 0.9 | 0.6 | 9.3 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.3 | 19.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | | | |
| 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 | 0.0 | | | |
| Control Delay (d 3), s/veh | | | 16.0 | 13.6 | 28.6 | 17.5 | 12 | .6 | 12.6 | 54.1 | 19.1 | 19.1 | 21.7 | 20.6 | 20.6 | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | B | B | C | В | B | - | В | D | В | В | С | C | C | | |
| Approach Delay s/veh / LOS | | | | 23.5 | ; | C | 14 2 | | | B | 31.9 |) | C | 20.6 | | C | | |
| Intersection Del | av. s/ve | h / LOS | | 20.0 | | - 23 | 3.5 | | | - | 0110 | | - | C | | - | | |
| | | | | | | 20 | | | | | | | | - | | | | |
| Multimodal Results | | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | NB | | SB | | | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.30 |) | В | 2.30 |) | | В | 2.13 | 3 | В | 2.30 | | В | | |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC |)S | | 2.18 | 3 | В | 0.8 | | | A | 1.03 | 3 | А | 1.03 | ; | А | | |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS[™] Streets Version 7.8.5

| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inter | rsect | ion Infe | ormatio | on | 2 | *7**1 | يد لي | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|--------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-----------|---------|-----------|--------------------------|--------|-----------|--|--|
| Agency | | Linscott. Law & Gre | enspan | . Engine | eers | | | | Dura | ation. | h | 0.250 | | | 417 | | | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Dat | e Aua 1 | 3, 2020 | | Area | | e | Other | | | | ₹ | | |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existin | ng with | | PHF | | - | 0.94 | | ראיץ קייאיץ קייאיץ | W + E | | | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | sis Yea | r 2020 | CL - PIM | | Anal | lysis | Period | 1> 17 | :00 | - ⁻ | 5 4 6 | * * | | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/Glencoe | | File Na | ame | 09PM | - Existi | ng wi | th Pro | ject. | xus | | | | 1 | × (* | | |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | _ | | W | ′B | | | NB | _ | T | SB | | | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Τ- | - | R | | Т | R | L | Т | R | | |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 132 | 213 | 613 | 122 | 2' | 19 | 27 | 238 | 346 | 45 | 10 | 514 | 101 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | | HE P | - • | 2 | | | | | | | Y | | ф Т | | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | | 34.9 | | | | 0.0 | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | 512 | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.8 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -) | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 7 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | - | EBT | WB | L | WB | BT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | | SBT | | |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 6 | | | 2 | | | | 8 | | | 4 | | |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 |) | | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 | | |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 50.0 | | | 50.0 | 0 | | | 40.0 | | | 40.0 | | |
| Change Period, | (Y+R | c), S | | | | 5.4 | | | | 1 | | 5.1 | | | | 5.1 | | |
| Max Allow Head | dway(<i>I</i> | <i>MAH</i>), s | | | | 0.0 | | | | 0.0 | | 3.5 | | | | 3.5 | | |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | | | | | | 36.9 | | | 13.9 | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |) | | | 0.0 | | | 3.6 | | |
| Phase Call Prob | bability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 | | |
| Max Out Probal | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.03 | | |
| | | - | | 1 | | | | | | _ | | | | | | _ | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | 1 - | | WE | 3 | _ | | NB | | | SB | | | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | | R | L | | H | R | L | I | R | | | R | | |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 | | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | | 140 | 227 | 652 | 130 | 132 | 2 13 | 30 | 253 | 211 | 205 | 11 | 336 | 318 | | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | 1135 | 1900 | 1610 | 1172 | 190 | 0 18 | 827 | 791 | 1900 | 1823 | 986 | 1900 | 1791 | | |
| Queue Service | lime (g | g s), s — ()) | | 6.9 | 6.1 | 30.9 | 6.4 | 3.4 | . 3 | 3.5 | 23.0 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 0.7 | 11.8 | 11.9 | | |
| Cycle Queue C | | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 10.4 | 6.1 | 30.9 | 12.6 | 3.4 | 3 | 5.5 | 34.9 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 1.1 | 11.8 | 11.9 | | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | J U. | .50 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | | |
| Capacity (c), v | eh/h | ·· · /) /) | | 599 | 942 | 798 | 581 | 942 | 2 90 | 05 | 282 | 737 | 707 | 386 | /3/ | 695 | | |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | | | 0.234 | 0.241 | 0.817 | 0.223 | 0.14 | 0 0.1 | 143 | 0.898 | 0.286 | 0.290 | 0.028 | 0.456 | 0.459 | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q),π/ | /in (95 th percentile) | | 85.5 | 122.1 | 469.8 | 83 | 67. | 1 60 | 6.2 | 309.6 | 133.3 | 129.9 | / | 220.3 | 211.4 | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), Ve | PO(95 th percent) | ile) | 3.4 | 4.9 | 18.8 | 3.3 | 2.7 | 2 | 2.0 | 12.4 | 5.3 | 5.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| Queue Storage | | (95 in percent | lie) | 15 1 | 12.0 | 10.00 | 16.6 | 12 | J = 0. | .00 | 25.0 | 10.00 | 10.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | |
| Unitorm Delay (d 1), s/veh | | | | | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.3 | | 2.5 | 28.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 21.0 | 20.3 | 20.3 | | |
| Initial Queue Delay (d 2), s/ven | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | | |
| Control Delay (d) s/veh | | | | 16.1 | 13.6 | 28.3 | 17.5 | 12.0 | 3 10 | 27 | 64 1 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 21.7 | 20.7 | 20.7 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | 13.0 P | 20.3 | R R | | | 2.7 R | 64.1 E | R | 19.1 R | 21.1 C | 20.1 | 20.1 C | | |
| Level of Service (LUS) | | | | | | <u> </u> | 14.0 | | | J | 26.1 | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 0 | 15 | - | D | | 30.1 | | | 20.7 C | | | | |
| Intersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | | | 24 | T.U | l.5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | WE | /B | | | NB | | | SB | | | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LOS | | 2.30 |) | В | 2.30 |) | В | | 2.13 | ; | В | 2.30 | | В | | |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC |)S | | 2.17 | 7 | В | 0.81 | | А | | 1.04 | | А | 1.04 | | А | | |

| | | _ | 5 | | | | | | | | | , | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|--------------------------|-------|-----------|-----------------------------|----------|---------|--------|-----|----------|----------|---------|-------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Int | tersect | ion Info | ormatio | 2 | 4244 | بد لي | | | | | |
| Agency | | Linscott. Law & Gree | nspan | . Engine | ers | | | | Du | uration. | h | 0.250 | | | 444 | | | | | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Dat | te Aua 1 | 3 2020 | | Are | ea Tvo | e | Other | | | | <u>₹_</u> &_ | | | | |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e, 2020 | | PH | HF | - | 0.94 | | → <u>_</u> * + → | w‡e | ▲ ↓ ↓ | | | | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | sis Yea | ar 2026 | | | An | nalvsis | Period | 1> 17 | ·00 | | | + * | | | | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/Glencoe | | File Na | File Name 09PM - Future.xus | | | | | | | | | | KAL | <u>~</u> | | | | |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | 1 110 110 | | | - acar | 0.7(0) | | | | | | <u>ነ</u> ነ ተቀጥፉ ለ | | | | | | |
| · · •j•••• | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | E | | | | V | | | | NB | | SE | | | | | | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | | | | |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 147 | 233 | 3 673 | 140 | 2 | 42 | 30 | 251 | 385 | 54 | 12 | 561 | 112 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | _ | _ | | 11 | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | 245 | | | | | | | | $\overline{\bullet}$ | | \mathbf{A} | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase 2 | | | B. | ` | 7 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 44.6 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 4 | | _ √ Z | | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.8 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | 5 | Y 6 | 7 | 8 | | | | |
| | | | _ | | _ | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | | N | VBT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | | SBT | | | | |
| Assigned Phase | 9 | | | | \rightarrow | 6 | | _ | | 2 | | | 8 | | \rightarrow | 4 | | | | |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6 | 5.0 | | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 | | | | |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 50.0 | | _ | 5 | 0.0 | | _ | 40.0 | | | 40.0 | | | | |
| Change Period, | (Y+R | c), S | | | | 5.4 | | | | 5.4 | | | 5.1 | | 5.1 | | | | | |
| Max Allow Head | dway(/ | ИАН), s | | | \rightarrow | 0.0 | | | C | 0.0 | | 3.6 | | | \rightarrow | 3.6 | | | | |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), S | | | \rightarrow | | | | | | | | 36.9 | | | 15.3 | | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | \rightarrow | 0.0 | | _ | C | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | \rightarrow | 4.1 | | | | |
| Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | + | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 | | | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.07 | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | W | 'B | | | NB | | | SB | | | | | |
| Approach Move | ment | | _ | L | Т | R | L | Т | · T | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | | | | |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 | | | | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | _ | 156 | 248 | 716 | 149 | 14 | -6 | 143 | 267 | 237 | 230 | 13 | 368 | 348 | | | | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s), veh/h/ln | | 1107 | 1900 |) 1610 | 1150 | 190 | 00 | 1827 | 747 | 1900 | 1818 | 940 | 1900 | 1790 | | | | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | _ | 8.1 | 6.8 | 36.3 | 7.8 | 3. | 8 | 3.9 | 21.6 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 0.9 | 13.2 | 13.3 | | | | |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (g c), s | | 12.0 | 6.8 | 36.3 | 14.6 | 3. | 8 | 3.9 | 34.9 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 8.8 | 13.2 | 13.3 | | | | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | _ | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.5 | 50 | 0.50 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | | | | |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 581 | 942 | 798 | 563 | 94 | 2 | 905 | 259 | 737 | 705 | 361 | 737 | 694 | | | | |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | tio(X) | | 0.269 | 0.263 | 3 0.897 | 0.265 | 0.1 | 55 | 0.158 | 1.030 | 0.322 | 0.326 | 0.035 | 0.499 | 0.501 | | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | (In (95 th percentile) | | 98.6 | 135.4 | 4 567.3 | 99.3 | 74 | .8 | 73.7 | 397.3 | 152.4 | 147.9 | 8.6 | 240.8 | 230.8 | | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percentile |) | 3.9 | 5.4 | 22.7 | 4.0 | 3. | 0 | 2.9 | 15.9 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 0.3 | 9.6 | 9.2 | | | | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percentile | e) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | |
| Uniform Delay (| d 1), s | /veh | | 15.7 | 13.2 | 20.6 | 17.4 | 12 | .4 | 12.4 | 37.5 | 19.3 | 19.3 | 22.4 | 20.9 | 20.9 | | | | |
| Incremental Delay (d 2), s/veh | | | 1.1 | 0.7 | 14.9 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 4 | 0.4 | 63.9 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | | | | | |
| Initial Queue Delay (<i>d z</i>), 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 (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | 16.8 | 13.9 | 35.5 | 18.5 | 12 | .8 | 12.8 | 101.4 | 19.4 | 19.4 | 22.4 | 21.1 | 21.2 | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | В | D | В | В | ; | В | F | В | В | С | С | С | | | | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 28.1 | | С | 14.7 | 7 | | В | 49.2 | 2 | D | 21.2 | 2 | С | | | | |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | h / LOS | | | _ | 29 | 9.6 | | | | | | | С | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | W | WB | | | NB | NB | | SB | | | | | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LOS | | 2.30 |) | В | 2.30 |) | В | | 2.13 | | В | 2.30 |) | В | | | | |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 2.34 | 1 | В | 0.85 | 5 | | A | 1.09 | | А | 1.09 |) | А | | | | |
| | | | Ū | | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------|----------|----------|---------|----------|---------------|-----------------|-----------|----------|---------|-------|------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inter | rsect | ion Inf | ormatio | on | 2 | 4241 | s l <u>s</u> |
| Agency | | Linscott. Law & Gre | enspan | . Engine | eers | | | | Durat | ation. | h | 0.250 | | 1 | 444 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | e Aua 1 | 3. 2020 | | Area | | 9 | Other | | | | ~ |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e with | | PHF | | | 0.94 | | | w ‡ e | ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | sis Year | · 2026 | | | Analy | lysis I | Period | 1> 17 | :00 | | ኻቀቱ | <u>بر</u> م |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/Glencoe | | File Na | ame | 09PM | - Future | e with | n Proje | ect.xu | IS | | | 1 | [국 1 다 약 1 | * (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | T - | Г | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 146 | 233 | 670 | 140 | 24 | 46 | 30 | 264 | 385 | 54 | 12 | 561 | 117 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | 215 | | | | | | | ~ | A- | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | ₩* | 1 sa | 2 | | | | | | 1 | ¥ 2 | 3 | († x |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 44.6 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | ~ | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 (| 0.0 | 0.0 | | | <u>a</u> | | 512 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.8 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 (| 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | Y 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | _ | | _ | _ | | _ | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | - | EBT | WB | | WB ⁻ | BT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 6 | | _ | 2 | | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 |) | | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 50.0 | | \rightarrow | 50.0 | 0 | | | 40.0 | | · | 40.0 |
| Change Period, | , (Y+R | c), S | | | | 5.4 | | | 5.4 | 1 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Head | dway(/ | VAH), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |) | | | 3.6 | | | 3.6 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | | | | | | 36.9 | | | 15.4 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |) | | | 0.0 | | | 4.2 |
| Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.08 |
| Movement Gra | | ulte | | | EB | | | \٨/٢ | 2 | _ | | NR | | | S B | |
| Approach Move | mont | Suits | | 1 | ED T | D | | | , | D | 1 | | D | | т | D |
| Assigned Move | mont | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 2 | Q | 10 | | 1 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow | Doto (v |) voh/h | | 155 | 249 | 712 | 140 | - 2 | 2 1/ | 12 | 0 201 | 227 | 230 | 12 | 4 | 350 |
| Adjusted Flow P | tion Ele |), ven/n w Rate (s) veh/h/l | n | 1103 | 1000 | 1610 | 149 | 100 | 0 18 | 4J 828 | 7/3 | 1000 | 1818 | 040 | 1000 | 1786 |
| | Time () | | | 8 1 | 6.8 | 36.1 | 7.8 | 3.8 | 2 3 | 320 | 21.5 | 7 0 | 8.0 | 0 9 | 13.0 | 13.4 |
| | learanc | e Time (a_c) s | | 12.0 | 6.8 | 36.1 | 14.6 | 3.6 | 3 3 | 39 | 34.9 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 8.8 | 13.4 | 13.4 |
| Green Ratio (a | /C) | o milo (g o), o | | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.5 | 0 0. | .50 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 |
| Capacity (c) , y | /eh/h | | | 578 | 942 | 798 | 563 | 942 | 2 90 | 06 | 257 | 737 | 705 | 361 | 737 | 692 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | atio (X) | | 0.269 | 0.263 | 0.893 | 0.265 | 0.15 | 57 0.1 | 160 | 1.092 | 0.322 | 0.326 | 0.035 | 0.504 | 0.506 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft | /In (95 th percentile) | | 98.1 | 135.4 | 561.7 | 99.3 | 76. | 1 74 | 4.8 | 453.8 | 152.4 | 147.9 | 8.6 | 242.9 | 232.5 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), v | eh/ln (95 th percenti | le) | 3.9 | 5.4 | 22.5 | 4.0 | 3.0 |) 3. | 3.0 | 18.2 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 0.3 | 9.7 | 9.3 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0.0 | .00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | , | 15.7 | 13.2 | 20.5 | 17.4 | 12. | 4 12 | 2.4 | 37.6 | 19.3 | 19.3 | 22.4 | 21.0 | 21.0 |
| Incremental De | ncremental Delay (d_2), s/veh | | | | 0.7 | 14.5 | 1.1 | 0.4 | I 0. |).4 | 82.9 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Initial Queue De | nitial Queue Delay (d ȝ), 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 |
| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | 16.9 | 13.9 | 35.0 | 18.5 | 12. | 8 12 | 2.8 | 120.5 | 19.4 | 19.4 | 22.4 | 21.2 | 21.2 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | В | D | В | В | E | В | F | В | В | С | С | С |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 27.8 | 3 | С | 14.7 | 7 | В | | 57.4 | | E | 21.2 | 2 | С |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 31 | 1.6 | | | | | | | С | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | timodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LOS | | 2.30 |) | В | 2.30 |) | В | | 2.13 | ; | В | 2.30 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 2.33 | 3 | В | 0.85 | 5 | Α | | 1.10 |) | А | 1.09 | | А |

| | | псэ | / Sig | nalize | amu | ersec | | test | iiis a | Sun | nmar | y | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|------------------------|--------|-----------|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----------|---------------|--|------------|
| | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| General Inforn | nation | | | | | | | | Inter | rsect | ion Inf | ormatio | on | _ | 4 24 44 1 1 | ايد ايد |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | eers | | | | Dura | ation, | h | 0.250 | | _ | 7 * 4 | <u></u> ₹_ |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | e Oct 7, | 2020 | | Area | а Тур | е | Other | | | | ≛ _55 |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e with | | PHF | - | | 0.94 | | \Rightarrow | W = E | ← |
| | | | | | | Projec | t - PM | ta) | | | | | | 14 | | * |
| Linken Otre et | | | | Anabia | ie Veer | | overnen | ls) | Anal | husia | Denied | 45.47 | .00 | | ኻተቅ | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | | sis rear | 2026 | F | | Anai | | Period | > / | :00 | - 1 | 41491 | *) * |
| | | Mindanao/Giencoe | | File Na | ame | U9PM | - Future | e witr | n Proje | ect (I | mprove | ments). | xus | - | | |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | |
| Domand Inform | nation | | | | ER | | | ١٨ | /B | | 1 | NR | | T | SB | |
| Approach Move | mont | | | | Т | R | 1 1 | - | | R | | Т | R | 1 | Т | R |
| Demand (v) v | oh/h | | | 146 | 233 | 670 | 140 | 2 | 16 | 30 | 264 | 385 | 54 | 12 | 561 | 117 |
| Demand (V), V | en/n | | | 140 | 233 | 070 | 140 | 2. | +0 | 50 | 204 | 505 | 54 | 12 | 301 | 117 |
| Signal Informa | ation | | | | | п | | | | | T | | | ĸ | | |
| Cvcle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | 1 | 4 2 | | 7 FA | | | | | | | ┢─ | <u>, </u> | Φ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | | | | | ĨĻ, | _ | | | _ | 1 | 2 . | J 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult, Gap F/W | On | Green | 41.7 | 12.5 | 21.3 | 0. | | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | | _ | | -+- |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.8 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 5 | € 。 | 7 | Y |
| | Тіхоч | onnuit. Oup 11/0 | on | - tou | 1.0 | 0.0 | | 0. | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | - | | |
| Timer Results | _ | | | FBI | | FBT | WB | | WB | 3T | NBI | | NBT | SBI | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 6 | | - | 2 | | 3 | | 8 | 000 | - | 4 |
| Case Number | <u> </u> | | | | | 5.0 | | - | 6.0 | n | 1.0 | | 4 0 | | | 63 |
| Phase Duration | | | | | | 17 1 | - | - | 17 | 1 | 16.5 | | 42.0 | | | 26.4 |
| Change Period | (V+R) | a) e | | | 54 | | \rightarrow | 5.4 | 1 | 10.0 | , , | 5 1 | | <u> </u> | 5 1 | |
| Max Allow Hear | $\frac{1}{2}$ | (), S (/// H) e | | | 0.0 | | - | 0.0 | | 3.2 | | 3.2 | | | 3.7 | |
| | co Timo | y(MAH),s ïme(as)s | | | | 0.0 | | - | 0.0 | | 12 0 | | 0.6 | | | J.Z |
| Croop Extensio | ce fille | $(g_s), s$ | | <u> </u> | | 0.0 | | \rightarrow | 0.0 | 0 | 0.5 | , | 9.0 | | | 2.5 |
| Green Extensio | | (<i>g</i> e), s | | <u> </u> | _ | 0.0 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 0.0 | | 0.5 | | 2.5 | | \rightarrow | 2.5 |
| Phase Call Pro | | | | | | | | - | | _ | 1.00 | , | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Proba | DIIILY | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 |) | 0.00 | | | 0.00 |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | W | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |), veh/h | | 155 | 248 | 713 | 149 | 148 | 3 1 | 145 | 281 | 237 | 230 | 13 | 371 | 350 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | 1103 | 1900 | 1610 | 1150 | 190 | 0 18 | 828 | 1810 | 1900 | 1818 | 940 | 1900 | 1786 |
| Queue Service | Time (d | (s). S | | 8.6 | 7.2 | 28.4 | 8.3 | 4.1 | 4 | 4.2 | 10.0 | 7.5 | 7.6 | 0.9 | 16.7 | 16.8 |
| Cvcle Queue C | learanc | e Time (q c). s | | 12.8 | 7.2 | 28.4 | 15.5 | 4.1 | 4 | 4.2 | 10.0 | 7.5 | 7.6 | 0.9 | 16.7 | 16.8 |
| Green Ratio (o | /C) | (3) | | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.60 | 0.46 | 0.4 | 6 0. | .46 | 0.40 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.24 |
| Capacity (c), y | /eh/h | | | 540 | 881 | 970 | 520 | 88 | 1 8 | 347 | 369 | 797 | 763 | 302 | 449 | 422 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | itio (X) | _ | 0.288 | 0.281 | 0.735 | 0.286 | 0.16 | . c | 172 | 0.762 | 0.298 | 0.301 | 0.042 | 0.826 | 0.830 |
| Back of Queue | (Q) ft | (In (95 th percentile) | | 105.9 | 146 7 | 398.8 | 107.3 | 82 | 2 E | 81 | 187.2 | 142.5 | 138.3 | 9.5 | 305 | 291.8 |
| Back of Queue | $(\mathbf{Q}), \mathbf{R}$ | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 4 2 | 5.9 | 16.0 | 4.3 | 3.3 | 3 | 32 | 7.5 | 5.7 | 5.5 | 0.4 | 12.2 | 11 7 |
| | Ratio (| RO (95 th percent | ilo) | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | | 0.2 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay | ue Storage Ratio (<i>RQ</i>) (95 th percentile) | | | | 1/ 0 | 12.8 | 10.00 | 1/ | | 1 1 | 22.0 | 17.3 | 17.3 | 26.6 | 32.6 | 32.6 |
| Incremental De | niform Delay (d ː), s/veh | | | | 0.8 | 12.0 | 1.1 | 0. | | I 0. 4 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 20.0 | 1.5 | 1.6 |
| Incremental Delay (d ₂), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 | | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | 10.0 | 15.7 | 17.7 | 21.1 | 14 | 5 1 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 17.4 | 17.4 | 26.6 | 3/ 1 | 34.2 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | 19.1 P | 13.7 P | П./ Р | 21.1 | 14. P | 5 12 | 4.5 D | 23.3 | 17.4 P | 17.4 P | 20.0 | 04.1 | 54.5 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | B 47.4 | В | Р | 40- | | | в | | В | В | | | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 17.4 | | D | 16.7 | | В | | 19.6 |) | D | 34.1 | | U |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 2' | 1.9 | | | | | _ | | | | |
| Multimodal Results | | | | | FR | | | \// | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian I OG | Itimodal Results | | | | | B | 230 | | R | | 2 1 3 | | В | 2 30 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | core / I C |)5 | .05 | | | B | 0.85 | , ; | Δ | | 1 10 | , , | A | 1 00 | , — — | A |
| | | | | 2.00 | | _ | 5.50 | | | - | | | •• | | | •• |

| | | | | | | | | | | 0 0111 | | , | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------|--------|----------|---------|----------|----------|-------|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|--|-----------|-----------------|---------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inter | react | ion Inf | ormatio | n | | | ية ل <u>ي</u> |
| | ation | Linecott Law & Gre | onenan | Engine | ore | | | | Dura | tion | h | 0 250 | <i>,</i> ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | | 4 1 1 | |
| Agency | | | enspan | | | Aug 2 | 1 2020 | | Araa | | | Othor | | <u>_</u> | | ۲. ۲. |
| | | | 1 | Analys | | Aug 3 | 1, 2020 | | Area | атуре | 9 | Other | | | | |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles Caltrans | / | Time F | eriod | Existii | ng - AM | | РНЕ | | | 0.93 | | 1 41 Pres | 8 W+F | ז זיי זי≰ זיי |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Westbound | | Analys | is Year | 2020 | | | Anal | lysis I | Period | 1> 8:0 | 00 | | 5 † † | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 W | ′В | File Na | ame | 10AM | - Existi | ng.xı | IS | | | | | Υ. | 숙 ↑ 슉 딱 1 | * (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Τ. | Г | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | /eh/h | | | | | | 665 | 12 | 268 | 709 | 7 | 547 | | | 863 | 23 |
| | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | ation | | | | | 11 | 5 | | | | | | | • | | <u>A</u> |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 54 | • | Ŭ, | | | | | | | T | | ×. |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 1/ 0 | 24.8 | 33.7 | | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | _ | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | WB | BT | NBL | - | NBT | SBI | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phas | е | | | | | | | | 4 | | 5 | | 2 | | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | | | | 9.0 |) | 2.0 | | 4.0 | | | 8.3 |
| Phase Duration | 1, S | | | | | | | | 40.0 | 0 | 20.0 |) | 50.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period | , (Y+ R | c), S | | | | | | | 6.3 | 3 | 5.1 | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Hea | ax Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | | | | 3.0 |) | 3.2 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ax Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s ueue Clearance Time (<i>g</i> s), s | | | | | | | | 35.7 | 7 | 2.3 | | | | | |
| Green Extensio | on Time | (ge),s | | | | | | | 0.0 |) | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 0 | 1.00 |) | | | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 0 | 0.00 |) | | | | |
| Manager 4 Ore | | | | | | | | 10/ | <u> </u> | _ | | | | | 0.0 | |
| Approach Move | oup Res | Suits | | | EB | D | | | 5 | D | 1 | | D | | <u>5в</u> | D |
| Approach Move | ement | | | <u> </u> | 1 | ĸ | | | | | L F | 1 | ĸ | <u> </u> | | <u>к</u> |
| Assigned wove | ement Dete () | · | | | | | / | 4 | | 14 | 5 | 2 | | | 0 | 10 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rale (V |), ven/n | | | | <u> </u> | 479 | 159 | | 6Z | 8 | 588 | | | 038 | 315 |
| Adjusted Satura | | bw Rate (s), ven/n/i | n | | | | 1810 | 188 | | 010 | 1810 | 1809 | <u> </u> | | 1900 | 1874 |
| Queue Service | Time (🤅 | gs), s a Tima (a) a | | | _ | | 20.3 | 33. | 1 3. 7 31 | 3.1 | 0.3 | 8.8 | | | 13.2 | 13.2 |
| | | e filme (<i>g</i> c), s | | | | | 20.3 | 33. | 7 0 | 3.7 | 0.3 | 0.0 | | <u> </u> | 13.2 | 13.2 |
| Green Ralio (g | $\frac{1}{0}$ | | | | _ | | 678 | 1/1 | 7 U. 3 G | .37 | 200 | 1901 | <u> </u> | | 0.20 | 0.20 516 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | atio (X) | | | | | 070 | 141 | $\frac{3}{22}$ 1 (| 264 | 0.025 | 0 327 | | | 0.609 | 0.610 |
| Back of Queue | (Ω) ft | /In (95 th percentile) | | | _ | | 330 | 969 | 8 12 | 204 | 6.2 | 158 | <u> </u> | | 257.8 | 267.8 |
| | (((), 10 | | | | | | 000 | 505 | .0 12 | 5 | 0.2 | 100 | | | 207.0 | 207.0 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | | | 13.2 | 38. | 8 50 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 6.3 | | | 10.3 | 10.7 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | tile) | | | | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0. | .00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay | Uniform Delay (<i>d</i> 1), s/veh | | | | | | 24.0 | 28. | 2 28 | 8.2 | 31.5 | 13.6 | | | 28.4 | 28.4 |
| Incremental Delay (<i>d</i> ₂), s/veh | | | | | _ | | 2.9 | 68. | 8 13 | 31.9 | 0.0 | 0.5 | | | 2.6 | 5.3 |
| Initial Queue Delay (d_3), s/veh | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 |) 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | | | | 26.8 | 97. | 0 16 | 60.0 | 31.5 | 14.0 | | | 31.0 | 33.7 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | С | F | | F | С | В | | | С | С |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 0.0 | | | 102. | 1 | F | | 14.3 | 5 | В | 31.9 |) | С |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 74 | 4.9 | | | | | | | E | | |
| Multimodal Results | | | | | FB | | | W/ | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian I OS | Iultimodal Results | | | | | B | 230 |) | R | | 2 13 | | B | 1 70 |) | В |
| Bicycle I OS Sc | core / I C |)S | | 2.70 | | 5 | 2.83 | 3 | C C | | 0.98 | ; | A | 1.01 | | A |
| 2.0, 3.0 200 00 | | | | | | | 2.00 | - | ~ | | 0.00 | | | 1.0 | | |

| | | - | J | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|----------|---------|---------|------------|-------|---------------|----------|---------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intersed | tion Inf | ormatio | on | | 4241 | يد لي |
| Agency | | Linscott. Law & Gre | enspan | . Enaine | ers | | | | Duration | . h | 0.250 | | | -4 ↓ ↓ | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Dat | e Aua 3 | 31, 2020 | | Area Tvr |)e | Other | | | | د_ گ |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | / | Time F | Period | Existi | ng with | | PHF | | 0.93 | | 1 7 4 4 7 | w ∔ e e | ┑╅ ┙╵┿┿┞╹ |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Westbound | | Analys | sis Yea | ar 2020 | | | Analysis | Period | 1> 8:0 | 00 | | | <u>م</u> |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 W | В | File Na | ame | 10AN | 1 - Existi | ng wi | th Project | .xus | | | |]]]] 지수야 []] | × (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | 1 7 | | |
| | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | Ν | /B | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | - | T R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | | | | 665 | 12 | 277 718 | 7 | 551 | | | 917 | 23 |
| _ | | | | 1/ | _ | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | L | | 9 | | | | | | | ð- |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 51 | 1 | . ₽ | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 14.9 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0. | 0 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | 5 | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0. | 0 0.0 | 0.0 | | $\langle \mathbf{A} \rangle$ | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0. | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | WBT | NB | L | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | Э | | | | | | | | 4 | 5 | | 2 | | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | | | | 9.0 | 2.0 | | 4.0 | | | 8.3 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | | | | 40.0 | 20.0 |) | 50.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period, | nge Period, (Y+R c), s | | | | | | | | 6.3 | 5.1 | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Head | Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | | | | 3.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | | 35.7 | 2.3 | | | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (g _e), s | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 1.00 |) | | | | |
| Max Out Probal | bility | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 0.00 |) | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | W | B | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | | Т | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 5 | 2 | | | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | | | | 479 | 160 | 9 772 | 8 | 592 | | | 677 | 334 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | | | | 1810 | 188 | 1610 | 1810 | 1809 | | | 1900 | 1875 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | gs), s | | | | | 20.3 | 33. | 7 33.7 | 0.3 | 8.9 | | | 14.1 | 14.1 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | | | | 20.3 | 33. | 7 33.7 | 0.3 | 8.9 | | | 14.1 | 14.1 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | | | 0.37 | 0.3 | 7 0.37 | 0.17 | 0.50 | | | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| Capacity (<i>c</i>), v | eh/h | | | | | | 678 | 141 | 3 603 | 300 | 1801 | | | 1047 | 517 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | itio(X) | | | | | 0.707 | 1.13 | 39 1.281 | 0.025 | 0.329 | | | 0.646 | 0.647 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | | | | 330 | 990 | .5 1296. 3 | 6.2 | 159.6 | | | 274.1 | 286.2 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | | | 13.2 | 39. | 6 51.9 | 0.2 | 6.4 | | | 11.0 | 11.4 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | _ | | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | | | | | 24.0 | 28. | 2 28.2 | 31.5 | 13.6 | | | 28.7 | 28.7 |
| Incremental De | ncremental Delay ($d r$), s/veh | | | | | | 2.9 | 71. | 6 138.6 | 0.0 | 0.5 | | | 3.1 | 6.1 |
| Initial Queue Delay (d 3), s/veh | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | | | | 26.8 | 99. | 7 166.8 | 31.5 | 14.1 | | | 31.8 | 34.9 |
| Level of Service | Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | С | F | F | С | В | | | С | С |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 0.0 | | | 105. | 6 | F | 14.3 | 3 | В | 32.8 | 3 | С |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 7 | 6.9 | | | | | | E | | |
| , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Multimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | В | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.46 | 6 | В | 2.30 |) | В | 2.13 | 3 | В | 1.70 |) | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | | | | 2.85 | 5 | С | 0.98 | 3 | А | 1.04 | - | A |

| | | nee | r olg | nanzo | | 01000 | | | | innai j | y | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|--------|----------|----------|----------|------------|-----------|---------------|----------|----------|----------------|---------|--------------------|------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intersec | tion Inf | ormatio | n | | ** | <u>د اړ</u> |
| | lation | Linscott Law & Gre | onenan | Engine | ore | | | | Duration | b | 0 250 | /// | | 4 4 4 | |
| Apolyet | | | enspan | | ic Date | | 1 2020 | | | , 11 | Othor | | 1 | | <u>گ</u> |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | 1 | Time P | Period | Future | e - AM | | PHF | | 0.93 | | - → | w ∔ E | |
| Lirban Streat | | Caltrans | | Analya | ia Vaar | 2026 | | _ | Analysia | Dariad | 1 > 0.0 | 0 | - 4 | | ب به د |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Westbourid | | | is rear | 2020 | F t | | Analysis | Penou | 12 0.0 | 0 | | 511 | |
| | | Windanao/SR-90 W | В | File Na | ime | TUAIM | - Future | e.xus | | | | | - | 4 1 47 17 1 | × [₩] |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | В | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | | | | 720 | 13 | 55 762 | 7 | 592 | | | 943 | 24 |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | <u> </u> | Γ | IJ | | | | | | | | | ĸ |
| Cycle s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | 1 | | * | E P | 7 | | | | | 1 | | |
| Offset s | 0 | Reference Point | End | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u>1</u> | 8 | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult Gap E/W | On | Green | 14.9 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 3.0 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | _ | ` 」₅ ≝◀ | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| T OFCE MODE | TIXCU | oindit. Oup N/O | OII | Tteu | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | - | | - |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | | EBT | WB | L | WBT | NB | _ | NBT | SBI | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phas | е | | | | | | | | 4 | 5 | | 2 | | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | | | | 9.0 | 2.0 | | 4.0 | | | 8.3 |
| Phase Duration | i, s | | | | | | | | 40.0 | 20.0 |) | 50.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period | , (Y+R | c), S | | | | | | | 6.3 | 5.1 | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Hea | x Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | | | | 3.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ax Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s ieue Clearance Time (<i>g</i> s), s | | | | | | | | 35.7 | 2.3 | | | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 1.00 |) | | | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 0.00 |) | | | | |
| Movement Gro | | ulte | | | EB | | | \//F | 1 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | Suits | | | T | R | | | R | | T | R | | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | _ | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 5 | 2 | | _ | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |) veh/h | | | | | 519 | 171: | 2 819 | 8 | 637 | | | 696 | 344 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | | | | 1810 | 188 | 7 1610 | 1810 | 1809 | | | 1900 | 1875 |
| Queue Service | Time (d | 7 s) S | | | | | 22.6 | 33 7 | 33.7 | 0.3 | 97 | | | 14.6 | 14.6 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>q</i> c), s | | | | | 22.6 | 33.7 | 33.7 | 0.3 | 9.7 | | | 14.6 | 14.6 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.17 | 0.50 | | | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | | | | 678 | 1413 | 3 603 | 300 | 1801 | | | 1047 | 517 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | itio(X) | | | | | 0.766 | 1.21 | 2 1.359 | 0.025 | 0.353 | | | 0.665 | 0.665 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) |) | | _ | | 369.5 | 1222 9 | 2. 1525. 8 | 6.2 | 174 | | | 282.9 | 295.5 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | | | 14.8 | 48.9 | 61.0 | 0.2 | 7.0 | | | 11.3 | 11.8 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | tile) | | _ | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay | (d 1), s | /veh | | | | | 24.7 | 28.2 | 2 28.2 | 31.5 | 13.8 | | | 28.9 | 28.9 |
| Incremental Delay (<i>d</i> ₂), s/veh | | | | | | | 4.7 | 102. | 3 172.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 | | | 3.3 | 6.6 |
| Initial Queue Delay (<i>d</i> ₃), s/veh | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | | | | 29.4 | 130. | 4 200.3 | 31.5 | 14.3 | | | 32.2 | 35.6 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | С | F | F | С | В | | | С | D |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 0.0 | | | 132. | 0 | F | 14.5 | 5 | В | 33.3 | 3 | С |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 94 | 1.4 | | | | | | F | | |
| Multimodal Results | | | | | EP | | | | | | | | | QP | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Multimodal Results | | | | | B | 230 | | R | 2 13 | | B | 1 70 | | B |
| Bicycle I OS Sc | core / I C |)S | | 2.40 | | 5 | 3.00 | · + | C. | 1.03 | , , | A | 1.00 | , } | A |
| 210,010 200 00 | | | | | | | 0.00 | | 5 | 1.02 | - | · · · | 1.00 | | |

| | | - | - 5 | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|----------|---------|---------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|---------|------|--------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intersec | tion Inf | ormatio | on | * | *** | بد آير |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | Engine | ers | | | | Duration | . h | 0.250 | | | -4 ↓ ↓ | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Date | e Aug 3 | 1.2020 | | Area Tvp | e | Other | | | | <u>,</u> |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | / | Time F | Period | Future | e with | _ | PHF | | 0.93 | | <u></u> ₩₩ 1 | W ↓ E e | 1 1 1 1 4 1 |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Westbound | | Analys | is Year | · 2026 | | | Analysis | Period | 1> 8:(| 00 | | * * * | <u>د</u> |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 W | В | File Na | ame | 10AM | - Future | e with | Project.x | us | | | |)]]]] Tatata | × (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | 1 - | | |
| , , , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | В | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | | | | 720 | 13 | 64 771 | 7 | 596 | | | 997 | 24 |
| | | | | | | | _ | | | _ | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | 14 | | <u> </u> | | | | | • | | ð- |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 51 | 1 t | 2 | Γ | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 14.9 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | • • | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | < 🛛 | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | WBT | NB | _ | NBT | SBI | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | | | | 4 | 5 | | 2 | | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | | | | 9.0 | 2.0 | | 4.0 | | | 8.3 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | | | | 40.0 | 20.0 |) | 50.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period, | nge Period, (Y+R c), s | | | | | | | | 6.3 | 5.1 | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Head | Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | | | | 3.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | | 35.7 | 2.3 | | | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 1.00 |) | | | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 0.00 |) | | | | |
| Margaret Or | | | | | | | | | ` | _ | | | | 0.0 | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | SUITS | | | | | 1 | | 5 D | _ | | Р | | SB T | Р |
| Approach Move | mont | | | <u> </u> | 1 | ĸ | | 1 | <u></u> П | | - 1 | ĸ | <u> </u> | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow | |) | | | _ | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 5 | 2 | | | 705 | 10 |
| Adjusted Flow F | kale (V |), ven/n | | | | | 519 | 1/2 | 2 829 | 8 | 041 | | | 1000 | 303 |
| Aujusted Satura | | | n | | | | 1010 | 100 | 7 1010 | 1010 | 1609 | | | 1900 | 1070 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | ys), s a Tima (a) a | | | | | 22.0 | 33.1 | 7 33.7 | 0.3 | 9.7 | | | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| | | e filme (<i>g</i> c), s | | | | | 22.0 | 33.1 | 7 0.07 | 0.3 | 9.7 | | | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| Green Ralio (g | /C) | | | | | | 679 | 141 | 0.37 | 200 | 1901 | | | 1047 | 0.28 |
| Volume to Con | en/n | tio (X) | | | | | 070 | 141 | 0 1 275 | 300 | 0.256 | | | 0 702 | 0 702 |
| Pook of Quoup | | $(10 (\Lambda))$ | | | _ | | 260.5 | 1.21 | 9 1.375 | 6.2 | 175.0 | | <u> </u> | 200.2 | 215.1 |
| Dack of Queue | (Q), II/ | in (95 in percentile) | | | | | 309.5 | 124 | 6 1573. 6 | 0.2 | 175.2 | | | 300.2 | 315.1 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | | | 14.8 | 49.8 | 3 62.9 | 0.2 | 7.0 | | | 12.0 | 12.6 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | | | | | 24.7 | 28.2 | 2 28.2 | 31.5 | 13.8 | | | 29.3 | 29.3 |
| Incremental De | ncremental Delay ($d z$), s/veh | | | | | | 4.7 | 105. | 2 179.1 | 0.0 | 0.6 | | | 3.9 | 7.8 |
| nitial Queue Delay (<i>d</i> ₃), s/veh | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | | | | 29.4 | 133. | 3 207.2 | 31.5 | 14.3 | | | 33.2 | 37.0 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | С | F | F | С | В | | | С | D |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 0.0 | | | 135. | 7 | F | 14.5 | 5 | В | 34.5 | 5 | С |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 90 | 5.3 | | | | | | F | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Results | | | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | trian LOS Score / LOS | | | | | В | 2.30 |) | В | 2.13 | 3 | В | 1.70 |) | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | | | 3.02 | 2 | С | 1.02 | 2 | А | 1.09 |) | А | |

| | | | , eig | | • • | | tion | | | men | , | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|------------|----------|---------|--------|-----------|---------------|----------|----------|----------|-------------|----------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Gonoral Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intersor | tion Inf | ormatic | n | | 4,44,4 | þ. lu |
| | lation | Linscott Law & Gre | onenan | Engine | ore | | | | Duration | b | 0 250 | <i>/</i> // | | 411 | |
| Agency | | | enspan | | | Aug 2 | 1 2020 | | | , 11 | Othor | | 1 | | ۲. ۲. |
| Analyst | | JAO City of Los Angelos | 1 | Time D | | Evicti | DA DM | | | | | | | w Ťe | |
| Junsalction | | Caltrans | / | | enou | Existi | ig - Pivi | | PHF | | 0.90 | | 4 4 | | ⁴ 1 ~ |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Westbound | | Analys | is Year | 2020 | | | Analysis | Period | 1> 17 | :00 | | 5 † † | <u></u> _ |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 W | 'B | File Na | me | 10PM | - Existi | ng.xu | s | | | | | । । । । ব ↑ क Ÿ ′ | ۳ <u></u> ۲ |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | 7 | | |
| | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | /B | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | r R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | | | | 552 | 99 | 90 346 | 17 | 449 | | | 1394 | 42 |
| | tion | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | _ |
| Signal morma | | Deference Dhase | 2 | | | 14 | E St | Ħ | | | | | Ť | | \rightarrow |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | Z | | 17 | 1 1 | × | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| | 0 | | End | Green | 14.9 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | _ | | | |
| Uncoordinated | NO | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | \ < | l | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | | EBT | W/B | | WBT | NB | | NRT | SB | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | <u>م</u> | | | | - | | | | 4 | 5 | - | 2 | | | 6 |
| Case Number | <u> </u> | | | <u> </u> | - | | | \rightarrow | 9.0 | 2.0 | | 4.0 | | | 83 |
| Phase Duration | | | | | | | | | 40.0 | 2.0 | | 50.0 | | _ | 30.0 |
| Change Duration | nge Period, ($Y+R_c$), s | | | | - | | | \rightarrow | 40.0 | 20.0 | , | 5.2 | | | 50.0 |
| Max Allow Hoo | nge Period, (Y+R c), s Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 2.0 | 2.1 | | 0.0 | <u> </u> | _ | 0.0 |
| | uway (<i>1</i> | иап), s | | <u> </u> | | | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 3.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 | <u> </u> | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | $(g_s), s$ | | | _ | | | \rightarrow | 28.9 | 2.7 | | 0.0 | | _ | 0.0 |
| Green Extensio | | (<i>g</i> e), s | | <u> </u> | _ | | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 2.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | <u> </u> | | 0.0 |
| Max Out Droke | | | | | _ | | | | 0.75 | 1.00 | , , | | | _ | |
| Max Out Proba | DIIILY | | | | | | | | 0.75 | 0.00 |) | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 5 | 2 | | | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |), veh/h | | | | | 385 | 122 | 1 360 | 18 | 468 | | | 1002 | 493 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | | | | 1810 | 188 | 6 1610 | 1810 | 1809 | | | 1900 | 1870 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), s | | | | | 15.2 | 26. | 9 16.2 | 0.7 | 6.7 | | | 23.4 | 23.4 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (g c), s | | | | | 15.2 | 26. | 9 16.2 | 0.7 | 6.7 | | | 23.4 | 23.4 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | | | 0.37 | 0.3 | 7 0.37 | 0.17 | 0.50 | | | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | | | | 678 | 141 | 2 603 | 300 | 1801 | | | 1047 | 515 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | itio(X) | | | - | | 0.569 | 0.86 | 5 0.598 | 0.059 | 0.260 | | | 0.957 | 0.957 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | (In (95 th percentile) |) | | | | 251.9 | 442 | .1 243.7 | 14.6 | 120.6 | | | 478.2 | 520.3 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | | | 10.1 | 17. | 7 9.7 | 0.6 | 4.8 | | | 19.1 | 20.8 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | , tile) | | | | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | | | | | 22.4 | 26. | 0 22.7 | 31.6 | 13.0 | | | 32.1 | 32.1 |
| ncremental Delay ($d z$), s/veh | | | | | | | 0.7 | 5.6 | 5 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 | | | 19.3 | 30.4 |
| Initial Queue De | nitial Queue Delay (d ȝ), s/veh | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 |) 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | | | | 23.1 | 31. | 6 23.8 | 31.7 | 13.4 | | | 51.3 | 62.4 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | С | С | С | С | В | | | D | E |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 0.0 | | | 28.5 | 5 | С | 14.1 | 1 | В | 55.0 |) | E |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 36 | 5.8 | | | | | | D | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Aultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | S Score | / LOS | | 2.46 | | В | 2.30 |) | В | 2.13 | 3 | В | 1.70 |) | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | | | | 2.11 | | В | 0.89 |) | А | 1.31 | 1 | A |

| | | | - 5 | | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------|----------|---------|----------|----------|---------------|---------|--------|----------|---------|---------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|---------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inter | rsect | ion Infe | ormatio | on | | 1424t, | يه اي |
| Agency | | Linscott Law & Gre | ensnan | Engine | ers | | | | Durat | ation | h | 0 250 | | | 4 4 4 | |
| Analyst | | | chopan | | ie Date | | 1 2020 | | Area | Type | | Other | - | | | . * |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | 1 | Time D | | Fvicti | n, 2020 | | | турс | | 0.06 | | → | N w∔e | ~_ ↓ ↓ |
| Junsaletion | | Caltrans | 1 | | enou | Projec | t - PM | | | | | 0.90 | | 4 4 | | * ↓ |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Westbound | | Analys | is Year | 2020 | | | Analy | ysis F | Period | 1> 17 | 2:00 | | 5 4 4 | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 W | В | File Na | me | 10PM | - Existi | ng wi | th Proj | ject.> | kus | | | | 1 ↑ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ | *) * |
| Project Descript | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | 7 | | |
| | | • | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | N | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Г | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | | | | 552 | 10 | 00 3 | 356 | 17 | 452 | | | 1391 | 42 |
| | 4 1010 | | | r | 1 | | | <u> </u> | | _ | _ | | | | | _ |
| Signal Informa | | Deference Dhees | 0 | | | 14 | |) | | | | | | † | | \rightarrow |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 17 | 1 1 | × | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 14.9 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0. | 0 (| 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0. | 0 (| 0.0 | 0.0 | | $ \leq \boldsymbol{\zeta} $ | 1 | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0. | 0 (| 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timer Desults | | | | EDI | | FDT | | 1 | \A/D | т | NDI | | NDT | CD | | ODT |
| Assisted Dhase | | | | EDL | | EDI | VVD | | | 1 | | - | | 30 | - | |
| Assigned Phase | 9 | | | | _ | | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 4 | | 5 | _ | 2 | | _ | 6 |
| | | | | | _ | | <u> </u> | - | 9.0 |) | 2.0 | | 4.0 | <u> </u> | _ | 8.3 |
| Phase Duration | , S | ``` | | <u> </u> | _ | | <u> </u> | - | 40.0 | 0 | 20.0 | | 50.0 | | _ | 30.0 |
| Change Period, | je Period, (Y+R c), s llow Headway (MAH), s | | | | | | | _ | 6.3 | 3 | 5.1 | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Head | dway(/ | MAH), s | | | | | | _ | 3.0 |) | 3.2 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | _ | 29.3 | 3 | 2.7 | | | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | | | _ | 2.4 | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prob | bability | | | | | | | _ | 1.00 | 0 | 1.00 | | | | | |
| Max Out Probal | bility | | | | | | | | 0.80 | 0 | 0.00 | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | un Res | aults | | | FB | | | \//F | 3 | _ | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | 1 | т | R | 1 | Т | F | R | 1 | Т | R | 1 | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | | | | 7 | 4 | 1 | 14 | 5 | 2 | | | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |) veh/h | | | | <u> </u> | 385 | 123 | 1 37 | 71 | 18 | 471 | | | 1000 | 492 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo |), ven/n w Rate (s) veh/h/l | n | | | <u> </u> | 1810 | 188 | 6 16 | 310 | 1810 | 1809 | | | 1900 | 1870 |
| | Time ((| σ_{s}) s | | | | | 15.2 | 27 | 3 16 | 6.8 | 0.7 | 6.8 | | | 23.3 | 23.3 |
| Cycle Queue Cl | learanc | e Time (a c), s | | | | | 15.2 | 27 | 3 16 | 6.8 | 0.7 | 6.8 | | | 23.3 | 23.3 |
| Green Ratio (a | /C) | | | | | | 0.37 | 0.3 | 7 0.3 | .37 | 0.17 | 0.50 | | | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| Capacity (c), y | /eh/h | | | | | <u> </u> | 678 | 141 | 2 60 | 03 | 300 | 1801 | | | 1047 | 515 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acitv Ra | ntio(X) | | | | <u> </u> | 0.569 | 0.87 | 2 0.6 | 615 | 0.059 | 0.261 | | | 0.955 | 0.955 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) | | | | | 251.9 | 449 | 9 25 | 52.5 | 14.6 | 121.7 | | | 476.1 | 518 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/ln (95 th percenti | le) | | | <u> </u> | 10.1 | 18. | 0 10 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 4.9 | - | | 19.0 | 20.7 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | | | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0.0 | .00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| d 1). s | /veh | | | | | 22.4 | 26. | 1 22 | 2.9 | 31.6 | 13.0 | | | 32.1 | 32.1 |
| Incremental Del | ncremental Delay (d_2), s/ven | | | | | | 0.7 | 6.0 |) 1. | .4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | | | 18.9 | 30.0 |
| Initial Queue De | nitial Queue Delay (d 3), s/veh | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 |) 0. | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | | | <u> </u> | 23.1 | 32. | 1 24 | 4.3 | 31.7 | 13.4 | | | 51.0 | 62.0 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | <u> </u> | C | С | (| С | С | B | | | D | E |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 0.0 | | | 28.9 | | C | - | 14.1 | _ | В | 54 6 | 3 | |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 0.0 | | 36 | 5.8 | | | | | | _ | D | | _ |
| | | | | II | | | - | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Multimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | LOS Score / LOS | | | | | В | 2.30 |) | В | | 2.13 | | В | 1.70 |) | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | | | | 2.13 | 3 | В | | 0.89 | | А | 1.3 | 1 | А |

| | | nee | r olg | nunze | u int | 01000 | | 1050 | | innai j | , | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|------------------|----------|------------|---------|----------|--------------------|--------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intersec | tion Inf | ormatio | n | | at 22 ata 1 . | به لړ |
| | lation | Lincott Low & Cro | ononon | Enging | oro | | | | Duration | <u>ь</u> | 0 250 | <i></i> | - 1 | 4 4 4 | |
| Agency | | LINSCOLL, LAW & GIE | enspan | , Engine | | A | 1 0000 | | | , 11 | 0.250 | | | | K |
| Analyst | | JAS City of Los Annalas | 1 | | is Dale | Aug 3 | T, 2020 | | Агеа тур | e | Other | | | wÌr | |
| Jurisaiction | | City of Los Angeles Caltrans | / | l lime P | erioa | Future | e - Pivi | | PHF | | 0.96 | | 4 4 4 | ** T = 8 | * <mark>*</mark> * |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Westbound | | Analys | is Year | 2026 | | | Analysis | Period | 1> 17 | :00 | | <u> </u> | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 W | 'B | File Na | ime | 10PM | - Future | e.xus | | | | | | 414Y | * 1 * |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | _ | | | _ | | - | - | | | _ | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | <u> </u> | W | B | <u>.</u> | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | <u> </u> | | R | L | | R | L | 1 | R | | 1 | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | | | | 635 | 112 | 20 384 | 18 | 496 | | | 1521 | 47 |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | IJ | 1 | | Γ | | | | | | ĸ |
| Cvcle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | 1 | . | | E E | 7 | | | | | 1 | | 7 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | | <u> </u> | L T | <u> </u> | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult, Gap F/W | On | Green | 14.9 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | _ | | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 4.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | _ | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | TIXOU | olinial. Cup 14/C | on | | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Timer Results | _ | | | EBL | . | EBT | WB | L | WBT | NB | _ | NBT | SBI | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | | | | 4 | 5 | | 2 | | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | | | | 9.0 | 2.0 | | 4.0 | | | 8.3 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | | | | 40.0 | 20.0 |) | 50.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period, | nge Period, (Y+R c), s | | | | | | | | 6.3 | 5.1 | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Head | Allow Headway (MAH), s | | | | | | | | 3.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | | 34.7 | 2.8 | | | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 1.00 |) | | | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 0.00 |) | | | | |
| | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | <u> </u> | EB | | <u> </u> | WB | | <u> </u> | NB | | <u> </u> | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | | 1 | R | | | R | | | R | <u> </u> | 1 | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | <u> </u> | | | _ | ļ | 7 | 4 | 14 | 5 | 2 | | | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v | '), veh/h | | | | <u> </u> | 443 | 1385 | 5 400 | 19 | 517 | | | 1095 | 539 |
| Adjusted Satura | | ow Rate (s), ven/n/i | n | | | <u> </u> | 1810 | 1886 | 5 1610 7 10 0 | 1810 | 1/18 | | <u> </u> | 1900 | 1869 |
| Queue Service | learanc | g_s , s | | | | | 10.3 | 32.7 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 8.0 | | | 20.4 | 24.0 24.8 |
| Green Ratio (a | | e nine (<i>g</i> ;), s | | | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 10.0 2 0.37 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| | | | | | | | 678 | 1/11 | 2 603 | 300 | 1711 | | | 1047 | 515 |
| Volume to Can | acity Ra | atio (X) | | | | | 0.654 | 0.08 | 1 0 663 | 0.063 | 0.302 | | | 1 045 | 1.046 |
| Back of Oueue | (0) ft | /In (95 th percentile) | | | | | 207.5 | 594 | 9 277 | 15 / | 136.0 | | | 607 | 650.1 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), R | eh/ln (95 th percenti | le) | | | | 11 9 | 23.8 | 3 277 | 0.6 | 5.5 | | | 24.3 | 26.0 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | tile) | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| Queue Storage Ratio (<i>RQ</i>) (95 th percentile) | | | | | | 23.3 | 27.8 | 3 23.4 | 31.7 | 13.4 | | | 32.6 | 32.6 |
| Incremental Delay ($d = 1$), siven | | | | | | | 1.8 | 19.4 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.5 | | | 40.4 | 52.1 |
| Initial Queue Delay (d 3), s/veh | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | | | | 25.1 | 47.2 | 2 25.6 | 31.7 | 13.8 | | | 73.0 | 84.7 |
| Level of Service | Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | С | D | С | С | В | | | F | F |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 0.0 | | | 38.9 | | D | 14.4 | 1 | В | 76.9 |) | E |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 50 |).0 | | | | | | D | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Results | | | | | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | strian LOS Score / LOS | | | | | В | 2.30 |) | В | 2.13 | 3 | В | 1.70 |) | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | | | | 2.33 | 3 | В | 0.93 | 3 | А | 1.39 |) | А |

| | | _ | - 5 | | | | | | | | | , | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|--------|---------------|----------|----------------|---|--------------|---------|------|----------|------|---------------------|-------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inters | secti | ion Infe | ormatio | on | | J. | 4241 | s L |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | Engine | ers | | | | Durati | ion. | h | 0.250 |) | | | 4 1 1 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Date | Aug 3 | 1 2020 | | Area T | Tvpe | <i>د</i> | Other | - | | | | بر ک ^ر |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | / | Time P | eriod | Future | e with | | PHF | .,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | - | 0.96 | | | | w ^N € | ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ |
| Lirban Street | | Caltrans | | Analys | ie Voar | Projec | ct - PM | | Analy | ie E | Pariod | 1> 17 | ·•00 | ر الح | | | چ ج |
| | | Mindonao/SD 00 W | | | is real | 2020 | E utur | o veritk | Droiod | SIS F | | 1-11 | .00 | _ | | <u>5</u> †† | |
| Dreis et Deserini | 4: | Deese Marine | D | File Na | me | TUPIN | - Future | | rFiojec | ci.xu | 15 | | | _ | ľ | *1 1 ***Y11 | ۲ (۲ |
| Project Descrip | uon | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | FB | | | M | /B | | | NB | | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | 1 | Т | R | | - | т | R | | Т | R | | 1 | Т | R |
| Demand (v) v | eh/h | | | | <u> </u> | | 635 | 11 | 30 3 | 394 | 18 | 499 | | + | - | 1518 | 47 |
| Bomana (V), V | UN/II | | | | | | 000 | | 00 0 | | 10 | 100 | | | | 1010 | 17 |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | 11 | 5 | | | | Τ | | | | | | <u>×</u> |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | 1 | 54 | 1 A | l 2 | 7 | | | | | | 1 | | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Croon | 14.0 | | 227 | | 0 0 | 0 | 0.0 | _ | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 37 | 4.8 | 0. | | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | 1 | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0. | 0 0 |).0 | 0.0 | | 5 | • | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | R. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | | EBT | WB | L | WBT | Г | NBL | - | NBT | | SBL | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | Э | | | | | | | | 4 | | 5 | | 2 | | | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | | | | 9.0 | | 2.0 | | 4.0 | | | | 8.3 |
| Phase Duration | uration, s Period (Y+R c) s | | | | | | | | 40.0 | | 20.0 |) | 50.0 | | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period, | e Period, (Y+R c), s | | | | | | | | 6.3 | | 5.1 | | 5.2 | | | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Head | dway(<i>I</i> | <i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | | | 3.0 | | 3.2 | | 0.0 | | | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | | 35.1 | | 2.8 | | | | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | | | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | 1.00 |) | | | | | |
| Max Out Probal | bility | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | 0.00 |) | | | | | |
| | | | | 1 | = 0 | | | | _ | | | | | | | 0.0 | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | <u> </u> | EB | | <u> </u> | | 5 | | | NB | | ╇ | | SB | - |
| Approach Move | ement | | | | 1 | R | | | R | < | L | 1 | R | ┢ | L | 1 | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | <u> </u> | | | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 4 | 5 | 2 | | ╇ | | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow H | Rate (v |), veh/h | | | | | 443 | 139 | 15 41 | 0 | 19 | 520 | | ┢ | | 1093 | 538 |
| Adjusted Satura | | w Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | | | | 1810 | 188 | | 10 | 1810 | 1/18 | | ┢ | | 1900 | 1869 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S a Tima (a.) a | | | | | 18.3 | 33. | 1 19. | .3 | 0.8 | 8.1 | | ┢ | _ | 26.3 | 24.8 |
| Cycle Queue C | | e nme (<i>g c</i>), s | | | | | 18.3 | 33. | 1 19. 7 0.2 | .3 | 0.8 | 8.1 | | ┢ | | 20.3 | 24.8 |
| Green Ralio (g. | /C) | | | | | | 0.37 | 0.3 | 1 0.3 | 57 | 0.17 | 0.50 | | ┢ | _ | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| Capacity (c), v | en/n | tic (X) | | | | | 678 | 141 | 2 60 | 04 | 300 | 1711 | | ⊢ | | 1047 | 515 |
| Volume-to-Capa | | llio (X) //n (OE the nemeratile) | | | | | 0.654 | 0.98 | | 81 | 0.063 | 0.304 | | ┢ | | 1.043 | 1.044 |
| Back of Queue | (Q),π/ | in (95 th percentile) | | | | | 297.5 | 609 | .9 280 | 5.4 | 15.4 | 138.1 | | ┢ | | 003.5 | 646.8 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), Ve | RO) (95 th percent | ie) ile) | | | | 0.00 | 24.4 | 4 11. | .5 10 | 0.0 | 5.5 | | ┢ | | 24.1 | 25.9 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d_1) s | /veh | lic) | | | | 23.3 | 27 | 9 23 | 6 | 31.7 | 13.4 | | t | | 32.6 | 32.6 |
| Incremental Del | niform Delay (d 1), s/veh cremental Delay (d 2), s/veh | | | | | | 1.8 | 21. | 0 2.6 | 6 | 0.0 | 0.5 | | ┢ | | 39.8 | 51.5 |
| Initial Queue De | itial Queue Delay (<i>d</i> ₂), s/veh | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 |) 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | T | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | | | | 25.1 | 48 | 9 26 | .2 | 31.7 | 13.8 | | + | | 72.4 | 84.1 |
| _evel of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | C | D | C | | С | B | | | | F | F |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 0.0 | | | 40 1 | | | | 14 5 | | B | ┢ | 76.3 | · | F |
| Intersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | 0.0 | | 50 |).3 | | | + | 11.0 | | | D | 10.0 | | - |
| | | | | | | | - | | | أي | | | | - | | | |
| Multimodal Re | imodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | T | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LOS | 2.46 | | В | 2.30 |) | В | | 2.13 | ; | В | | 1.70 | | В | |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | | | | 2.34 | 1 | В | T | 0.93 | ; | А | Г | 1.38 | | А |

| | | or org | manze | a m | 000 | | | anto | oun | innar <u>-</u> | , | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|----------|-----------|-------|------|----------|----------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|----------|--------------------|
| General Information | n | | | | | | | Inte | ersecti | ion Infe | ormatio | on | | 4741 | s l <u>s</u> |
| Agency | Linscott, Law & 0 | Greenspan | . Engine | ers | | | | Du | ration. | h | 0.250 | | | ++ L L | |
| Analyst | JAS | | Analys | is Date | e Sep 1 | 2020 | | Are | a Type | <i>د</i> | Other | | | | ار ا |
| Jurisdiction | City of Los Angel | es/ | Time F | Period | Existi | ng - AM | | PH | IF | | 0.98 | | 1 ↓ ↓ 1 ↓ ↓ | w∔e s | 4.4 |
| Urban Street | SR-90 Eastboun | d | Analys | is Yea | r 2020 | | | Ana | alvsis F | Period | 1> 8:0 | 00 | | | |
| Intersection | Mindanao/SR-90 | EB | File Na | ame | 11AM | - Existir | ıa.xı | JS | | | | | | 기지 [| |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 " | | |
| , , | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Demand Informatio | n | | | EB | | | ۷ | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Movemen | t | | L | Т | R | L | Т | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), veh/h | | | 30 | 1226 | 5 20 | | | | | | 527 | 752 | 487 | 1043 | |
| | | | 1- | _ | | | | | - | | | | | | |
| Signal Information | | | | | 17 | a | | | | | l | | + - | | _ |
| Cycle, s 90. | 0 Reference Phas | e 2 | | ľ 🕇 | 7 | Ŕ | | | | | | > | 2 | 3 | € ₄ |
| Offset, s 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 14.8 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | | | |
| Uncoordinated No | Simult. Gap E/W | / On | Yellow | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Force Mode Fixe | ed Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | _ | | | | | | | _ | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | EBL | | EBI | WBI | - | VV | ві | NBL | - | NBI | SBL | - | SBI |
| Assigned Phase | | | | \rightarrow | 4 | | _ | | _ | | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | 10.0 | | | | _ | | | 7.4 | 2.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | | | | | 40.0 | | | | _ | | | 20.0 | 30.0 |) : | 50.0 |
| Change Period, (Y+ | -R c), s | | | \rightarrow | 6.3 | | | | | | \rightarrow | 5.2 | 5.2 | _ | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Headway | w Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s Clearance Time (<i>q</i> s) s | | | | 3.0 | | | | _ | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | _ | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearance III | ue Clearance Time (g_s), s | | | | 30.4 | <u> </u> | | | | | _ | 0.0 | 12.7 | / | 0.0 |
| Green Extension Tin | ne (ge), s | | | + | 1.2 | | _ | | - | | + | 0.0 | 3.9 | <u> </u> | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probabili | ly | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 1.00 | , | |
| Max Out Probability | | | | | 0.93 | | | | | | | | 0.10 | | |
| Movement Group R | Results | | | EB | | | W | 'B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Movemen | t | | L | Т | R | L | Т | · | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Movement | t | | 7 | 4 | 14 | | | | | | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | |
| Adjusted Flow Rate | (<i>v</i>), veh/h | | 31 | 637 | 634 | | _ | | | | 791 | 514 | 497 | 1064 | |
| Adjusted Saturation | Flow Rate (s), veh | /h/ln | 1810 | 1900 | 1889 | | | | | | 1807 | 1610 | 1757 | 1809 | |
| Queue Service Time | e (g s), s | | 1.0 | 28.4 | 28.4 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 10.7 | 18.8 | |
| Cycle Queue Cleara | nce Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 1.0 | 28.4 | 28.4 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 10.7 | 18.8 | |
| Green Ratio (g/C) | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | | | | | | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.50 | |
| Capacity (c), veh/h | | | 678 | 711 | 707 | | | | | | 594 | 265 | 968 | 1801 | |
| Volume-to-Capacity | Ratio (X) | | 0.045 | 0.896 | 0.896 | | | | | | 1.331 | 1.942 | 0.513 | 0.591 | |
| Back of Queue (Q) | , ft/ln (95 th percent | ile) | 17.3 | 518.7 | 517.7 | | | | | | 760.8 | 1498. 1 | 197.3 | 304.5 | |
| Back of Queue (Q) | , veh/ln (95 th perce | entile) | 0.7 | 20.7 | 20.7 | | | | | | 30.4 | 59.9 | 7.9 | 12.2 | |
| Queue Storage Ratio | o(<i>RQ</i>)(95 th perc | entile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay (d 1) | | 17.9 | 26.5 | 26.5 | | | | | | 37.6 | 37.6 | 27.5 | 16.1 | | |
| Incremental Delay (| | 0.0 | 13.6 | 13.8 | | | | | | 160.2 | 437.3 | 0.2 | 1.4 | | |
| Initial Queue Delay (d ₃), s/veh | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | 17.9 | 40.1 | 40.3 | | | | | | 197.8 | 474.9 | 27.7 | 17.5 | |
| Level of Service (LO | | В | D | D | | | | | | F | F | С | В | | |
| Approach Delay, s/v | | 39.7 | | D | 0.0 | | | | 307. | 0 | F | 20.8 | 3 | С | |
| Intersection Delay, s | | | | 11 | 6.3 | | | | | | | F | | | |
| Multimodal Results | | | FR | | | \/\/ | ′B | | | NR | | | SB | | |
| Pedestrian I OS Sco | Itimodal Results | | | | B | 2 47 | , | - | B | 1 70 | | В | 1 94 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Score / | LOS | .0S | | | B | , | | | | 1.56 | | B | 1.78 | 3 | B |

 $Copyright @ {\tt 2020} \ University \ of \ Florida, \ All \ Rights \ Reserved.$

| | | nee | . e.g | | | | | | anto | ean | iiiiai j | , | | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|-------------------|-----------|---------|-------|------------|----------|---------|---------|--------------------|-------------|---------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | arsact | ion Inf | ormativ | n | | *** | ، ل <u>،</u> |
| Agency | lation | Linscott Law & Gre | ensnan | Engine | aars | | | | Dur | ration | h | 0 250 | <i></i> | | ++ , , | |
| Apolyet | | | спэрап | | ie Dat | o Son 1 | 2020 | | Aro | a Type | | Other | | _3 _3 | | <u>م</u> |
| lurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | / | Time F | Deriod | E Sep i Evisti | , 2020 | | PHI | атурс Е | - | 0 98 | | → <u></u> _* -> | N w‡e | <u>}</u> ∳ |
| | | Caltrans | | | chou | Proje | ct - AM | | L | | | 0.30 | | 1 4 M | | 7 4 1 |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Eastbound | | Analys | sis Yea | r 2020 | | | Ana | alysis I | Period | 1> 8: | 00 | | 141 | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 El | 3 | File Na | ame | 11AM | - Existir | ng wi | th Pr | oject.x | us | | | ĥ | * 1 ***** 1 | ۲ ۲ ۳ |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | ٧ | ٧B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Τ | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 30 | 1226 | 3 20 | | | | | | 531 | 752 | 531 | 1052 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | 1 I | 16 | 7 | | | | | l | | | | _ |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 1 1 | ~ ľ | Ŕ | | | | | | | | 3 | -€ ₄ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 14.8 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | 5 | — |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | _ | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WBI | - | W | BT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phas | e | | | | | 4 | <u> </u> | _ | | | | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 10.0 | | | | | | | 7.4 | 2.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | i, s | | | | | 40.0 | | | | | | | 20.0 | 30.0 | | 50.0 |
| Change Period | , (Y+ R | c), S | | | | 6.3 | | | | | | | 5.2 | 5.2 | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Hea | Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s arance Time (a s) s | | | | | 3.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | e Clearance Time (g s), s | | | | | 30.4 | | | | | | | | 13.9 | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 1.2 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 3.9 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.93 | | | | | | | | 0.21 | | |
| Mayamant Cra | un Dee | | | | ГР | | | \\/ | D | | | ND | | | CD. | |
| Approach Move | mont | Suits | | | ED | D | | VV T | | D | 1 | | D | | о Т | D |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | | 1 | 14 | | 1 | | IX I | <u> </u> | 2 | 12 | L 1 | 6 | IX. |
| Adjusted Flow | Pato (v |) voh/h | | 7 | 637 | 634 | | | | | | 705 | 514 | 542 | 1073 | |
| Adjusted Flow I | tion Ele |), ven/n w Poto (c) vob/b/l | n | 1910 | 1000 | 1990 | | | - | | | 190 | 1610 | 1757 | 1900 | |
| | | | 11 | 1010 | 28.4 | 28.4 | | | | | | 14.9 | 14.9 | 11.0 | 1003 | |
| | learance | g(x), s | | 1.0 | 28.4 | 20.4 | | | - | | | 14.0 | 14.0 | 11.9 | 19.1 | |
| Green Ratio (| | c mile (<i>gt</i>), 3 | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | | | | - | | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.50 | |
| | /oh/h | | | 678 | 711 | 707 | | | - | | | 505 | 265 | 968 | 1801 | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | atio (X) | | 0/0 | 0.896 | 0.896 | | | | - | | 1 337 | 1 9/2 | 0.560 | 0 596 | |
| Back of Oueue | (0) ft | /In (95 th percentile) | | 17.3 | 518.7 | 517.7 | | | | | | 770 1 | 1/08 | 21/ 8 | 307.3 | |
| Dack of Queue | (((), 11/ | in (95 in percentile) | | 17.5 | 510.7 | 517.7 | | | | | | 770.1 | 1490. | 214.0 | 507.5 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 0.7 | 20.7 | 20.7 | | | | | | 30.8 | 59.9 | 8.6 | 12.3 | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay (d_1), s/veh | | | | 17.9 | 26.5 | 26.5 | | | | | | 37.6 | 37.6 | 27.9 | 16.1 | |
| Incremental Delay (<i>d</i> ₂), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | 13.6 | 13.8 | | | | | | 163.0 | 437.3 | 0.4 | 1.5 | |
| Initial Queue Delay (d 3), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | 17.9 | 40.1 | 40.3 | | | | | | 200.6 | 474.9 | 28.4 | 17.6 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | D | D | | | | | | F | F | С | В | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 39.7 | 7 | D | 0.0 | | | | 308. | 3 | F | 21.2 | | С |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 11 | 5.8 | | | | | | | F | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Aultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | S Score | / LOS | 2.32 | 2 | В | 2.47 | · | E | 3 | 1.70 | | В | 1.94 | | В | |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | OS | | | | | | | | 1.57 | | В | 1.82 | | В |

| | | 1100 | i oig | nanze | a m | | | 103 | unto | oun | innar <u>.</u> | y | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|----------|------------|---------|----------|----------|-------|----------|----------|----------------|---------|------------|--|---------------|------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | ersect | ion Inf | ormatio | on | k | 4241. | × l _a |
| Agency | | Linscott. Law & Gre | enspan | . Engine | eers | | | | Du | ration. | h | 0.250 | | | + + L L | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Dat | e Sep 1 | 2020 | | Are | a Type | <u>,</u> | Other | | - <u>-</u> 7 - 4 | | <u>بر</u> |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | / | Time F | Period | Futur | e - AM | | PH | IF | | 0.98 | | → ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ | w ‡ e | *** |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Eastbound | | Analys | sis Yea | r 2026 | | | Ana | alvsis I | Period | 1> 8:(| 00 | | | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 El | В | File Na | ame | 11AM | - Future | e.xus | <u> </u> | | | | | | ۱۴۲ ۱۳۴۰ ۲ | × (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | ٧ | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 36 | 1348 | 3 21 | | | | | | 567 | 808 | 534 | 1131 | |
| Cinnel Informe | | | | . <u> </u> | 5 1 | <u> </u> | Г | - | | 1 | _ | | | | | |
| | | Reference Dhase | 2 | | + | 10 | 2 | | | | | Ļ | | ta | | X |
| Offect o | 90.0 | Reference Pridse | Z End | | 1 | 7 | R | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult Con E/W | On | Green | 14.8 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| | Tixed | Simult Cap N/S | On | Yellow | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | | | - | 0 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | Un | Rea | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 1 | 8 |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | W | /BT | NBI | - | NBT | SBI | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | е | | | | | 4 | | | | | | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 10.0 | | | | | | | 7.4 | 2.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | i, S | | | | | 40.0 | | | | | | | 20.0 | 30.0 |) | 50.0 |
| Change Period | ange Period, (Y+R c), s | | | | | 6.3 | | | | | | | 5.2 | 5.2 | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Head | ax Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 3.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ax Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s Jeue Clearance Time (<i>g</i> s), s | | | | | 34.9 | | | | | | | | 14.0 |) | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 0.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 4.1 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 0.24 | | |
| Movement Gro | | sulte | | | ER | | | ١٨/ | 'R | - | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | Suits | | | Т | R | | Т | · | R | 1 | T | R | <u> </u> | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | _ | | + | | _ | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |) veh/h | | .37 | 700 | 697 | | | - | | | 851 | 552 | 545 | 1154 | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1890 | | | - | | | 1807 | 1610 | 1757 | 1809 | |
| Queue Service | Time (a | α_s) s | | 1.2 | 32.8 | 32.9 | | | | | _ | 14.8 | 14.8 | 12.0 | 21.2 | |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>q</i> _c), s | | 1.2 | 32.8 | 32.9 | | | + | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 12.0 | 21.2 | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | | | | | | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.50 | |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 678 | 711 | 708 | | | | | | 594 | 265 | 968 | 1801 | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | atio(X) | | 0.054 | 0.984 | 0.985 | | | | | | 1.431 | 2.086 | 0.563 | 0.641 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) |) | 20.9 | 668.3 | 668.1 | | | Τ | | | 902.7 | 1683. 9 | 215.8 | 336.3 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 0.8 | 26.7 | 26.7 | | | | | | 36.1 | 67.4 | 8.6 | 13.5 | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | tile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | | 18.0 | 27.9 | 27.9 | | | | | | 37.6 | 37.6 | 28.0 | 16.7 | |
| Incremental Delay (d 2), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | 29.6 | 29.9 | | | | | | 203.6 | 501.5 | 0.5 | 1.8 | |
| Initial Queue Delay (d ȝ), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | 18.0 | 57.4 | 57.8 | | | | | | 241.2 | 539.1 | 28.4 | 18.4 | |
| Level of Service | | В | Е | E | | | | | | F | F | С | В | | | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 56.6 | 6 | Е | 0.0 | | | | 358. | 5 | F | 21.6 | 6 | С |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 13 | 6.9 | | | | | | | F | | |
| Multimodal Ba | | | ED | | | 10 | 'B | | | NP | | | Q P | | | |
| Pedestrian LOS | | 2.20 | | P | 2.47 | , | יי | B | 1 70 | | B | 1.04 | 36 | B | | |
| Ricycle I OS So | destrian LOS Score / LOS | | | | 7 | B | 2.47 | | E | | 1.70 | | B | 1.94 | | B |
| 2.0,000000 | | | | 1.07 | | | | | | | 1.00 | | - | 1.00 | | - |

| | | nee | l eig | Indineo | or inte | 01000 | | | anto | ean | innar j | , | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|------------|-------------------|--------|-------|----------|---------|---------|------------|-----------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | orsact | ion Inf | ormatio | n n | | *** | ۰ L |
| | auon | Lincott Low & Gro | onenan | Engin | ore | | | | | ration | | 0 250 | <i></i> | | ↓↓↓↓ | |
| Apolyot | | | enspan | | | Son 1 | 2020 | | Are | | | Othor | | 1 | | ۲ <u>.</u> ۲ |
| Analyst | | City of Los Angeles | 1 | Time | oriod | | , 2020 | | | за туре | ; | | | →_^ * | w↓e | 2- |
| Junsaiction | | Caltrans | | Time F | Penod | Proje | e with ct - AM | | | | | 0.96 | | 4 M | | 1 1 1 |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Eastbound | | Analys | sis Yea | r 2026 | | | Ana | alysis I | Period | 1> 8:0 | 00 | | 1 10 7 | × |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 El | 3 | File Na | ame | 11AM | - Future | e witl | h Pro | oject.xu | s | | | ĥ | 4 1 4 17 1 | ▼ [₹] |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Г | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | /eh/h | | | 36 | 1348 | 8 21 | | | | | | 571 | 808 | 578 | 1140 | |
| | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Signal Informa | ation | | | | I I | 17 | | Τ | | Γ | | | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | | , | ĸ | | | | | | | P | _ | - |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 14 8 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | 1 | 2 | 3 | ¥ 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | W | /BT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phas | е | | | | | 4 | | | | | | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 10.0 | | | | | | | 7.4 | 2.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | 1, S | | | | | 40.0 | | | | | | | 20.0 | 30.0 |) : | 50.0 |
| Change Period | ige Period, (Y+ <i>R c</i>), s Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 6.3 | | | | | | | 5.2 | 5.2 | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Hea | Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 3.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | x Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s eue Clearance Time (<i>g</i> s), s | | | | | 34.9 | | | | | | | | 15.2 | 2 | |
| Green Extensio | ieue Clearance Time (g s), s een Extension Time (g e), s | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 4.0 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 0.32 | 2 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | W | 'B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | · | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | | | | | | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate(<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | 37 | 700 | 697 | | | | | | 855 | 552 | 590 | 1163 | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1890 | | | | | | 1808 | 1610 | 1757 | 1809 | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | | 1.2 | 32.8 | 32.9 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 13.2 | 21.4 | |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 1.2 | 32.8 | 32.9 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 13.2 | 21.4 | |
| Green Ratio (g | ı/C) | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | | | | | | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.50 | |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 678 | 711 | 708 | | | | | | 595 | 265 | 968 | 1801 | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | itio(X) | | 0.054 | 0.984 | 0.985 | | | | | | 1.438 | 2.086 | 0.609 | 0.646 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) | | 20.9 | 668.3 | 668.1 | | | | | | 912.2 | 1683. 9 | 233.9 | 339.2 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q) Ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 0.8 | 26.7 | 26.7 | | | | | | 36.5 | 67.4 | 94 | 13.6 | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | _ | + | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay | (d_1) s | /veh | | 18.0 | 27.9 | 27.9 | | | - | | | 37.6 | 37.6 | 28.4 | 16.7 | |
| Incremental De | $(\mathbf{d}_{1}), \mathbf{d}_{2}$ |) s/veh | | 0.0 | 29.6 | 29.9 | | | - | | | 206.4 | 501.5 | 0.8 | 1.8 | |
| Initial Queue D | Incremental Delay (d ₂), s/veh | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | _ | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Initial Queue Delay (d 3), s/veh | | | | 18.0 | 57.4 | 57.8 | | | | | | 244 0 | 539 1 | 29.2 | 18.5 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | R | F | 57.0 F | | _ | | _ | | E | F | 20.2 C | R | |
| Level of Service (LOS) Approach Delay, s/yeb / LOS | | | | 56.6 | | F | 0.0 | | | | 350 | ч Э | F | 22.1 | | C |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 00.0 | | 12 | 63 | | _ | _ | 009. | | 1 | F | | 0 |
| | ntersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | 13 | 5.0 | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | lultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | 'B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | destrian LOS Score / LOS | | | | 2 | В | 2.47 | , | E | в | 1.70 | | В | 1.94 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS So | odal Results ian LOS Score / LOS LOS Score / LOS | | | | / | В | | | | | 1.65 | | В | 1.93 | | В |

| | | | | | | | | | | • • | | , | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|-------------------|---------|---------|------------|-----------|-------|------|------------------------|--------------------|---------|------------|-----------|----------------------|--------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | orsocti | ion Infr | ormatio | n | | ** | s l <u>s</u> |
| | ation | Linscott Law & Gre | onenan | Engine | ore | | | | | ration | b | 0 250 | | | ++ L L | |
| Apolyot | | | спэрап | | | Son 1 | 2020 | | Are | | \ | Othor | | 1 | | ۲. ۲. |
| Analyst | | City of Los Angeles | / | Time | | Evicti | , 2020 | | | атуре ⊏ | 5 | | | ** | w↓e | 2- * |
| Junsaiction | | Caltrans | | | Penod | Exisu | ig - Pivi | | | г | | 0.96 | | 14 Yr | | 1 1 |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Eastbound | | Analys | sis Yea | r 2020 | | | Ana | alysis F | Period | 1> 16 | :45 | | 1 10 7 | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 El | 3 | File Na | ame | 11PM | - Existir | ıg.xı | ls | | | | | 1 | 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 | * (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | /eh/h | | | 18 | 1177 | 18 | | | | | | 476 | 681 | 727 | 1154 | |
| | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | - 0. | |
| Signal Informa | ation | | | | ↓ | 16 | 7 | | | | | | | | | _ |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 1 🕇 | , 1 | ĸ | | | | | | | N | - | - € , |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 14.8 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WBI | - | W | BΤ | NBL | - | NBT | SBI | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phas | е | | | | | 4 | | | | | | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 10.0 | | | | | | | 7.4 | 2.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | 1, S | | | | | 40.0 | | | | | | | 20.0 | 30.0 |) | 50.0 |
| Change Period | nange Period, (Y+R c), s | | | | | 6.3 | | | | | | | 5.2 | 5.2 | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Hea | ax Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 3.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ax Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s ueue Clearance Time (<i>g</i> s), s | | | | | 28.7 | | | | | | | | 19.4 | L I | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | 1.5 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 3.0 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.57 | | | | | | | | 0.72 | 2 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | | | | | | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate(<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | 18 | 611 | 608 | | | | | | 715 | 466 | 742 | 1178 | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1890 | | | | | | 1807 | 1610 | 1757 | 1809 | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | gs), s | | 0.6 | 26.7 | 26.7 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 17.4 | 21.8 | |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 0.6 | 26.7 | 26.7 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 17.4 | 21.8 | |
| Green Ratio (g | ı∕C) | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | | | | | | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.50 | |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 678 | 711 | 708 | | | | | | 594 | 265 | 968 | 1801 | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | itio(X) | | 0.027 | 0.859 | 0.859 | | | | | | 1.203 | 1.758 | 0.766 | 0.654 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) | | 10.3 | 474.6 | 473 | | | | | | 587.7 | 1261. 5 | 303.4 | 344.5 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q). Ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 0.4 | 19.0 | 18.9 | | | - | | | 23.5 | 50.5 | 12.1 | 13.8 | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | _ | + | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay | (d_1) s | /veh | | 17.8 | 26.0 | 26.0 | | | | _ | | 37.6 | 37.6 | 29.9 | 16.8 | |
| Incremental De | lav (<i>d</i> 2 |) s/veh | | 0.0 | 99 | 10.0 | | | + | | | 106.8 | 356.4 | 34 | 19 | |
| Initial Queue D | _ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | + | | _ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | 17.8 | 35.0 | 35.0 | | | | | | 144 / | 394.0 | 33.3 | 18.7 | |
| Level of Sorvior | | R | - 00.9 | - л | | | | | | г тт.4 Е | 55 4 .0 | ° | R | | | |
| Approach Dolog | | 25.6 | | | 0.0 | | | | 242 | 2 | F | 24.3 | | C | | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 35.0 | , | 0 | 7.0 | | | | 242.0 | 5 | F | 24.3 E | , | U |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | ð | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Multimodal Re | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | | | |
| Pedestrian LOS | edestrian LOS Score / LOS | | | | | В | 2.47 | · | E | 3 | 1.70 | | В | 1.94 | - | В |
| Bicycle LOS So | ore / LC | DS | | 1.51 | | В | | | | | 1.46 | | А | 2.07 | 7 | В |

| | | | - 5 | | - | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|----------|-----------|------|--------|----------|----------|---------|------------|---|------------|------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | ersect | ion Info | ormatio | on | | 4 7 40 1 1 | ι L _k |
| Agency | | Linscott Law & Gre | enspan | Engin | eers | | | | Dur | ration | h | 0 250 |) | | ∔∔⊾⊾ | |
| Analyst | | JAS | onopun | Analys | sis Dat | e Sen í | 2020 | | Are | a Type | ر ۱۰ | Othe | - - | 24 | | <u>بر</u> لا |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | 1 | Time F | Period | Existi | ng with | | PH | F | , | 0.98 | | \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ | w ∲ E | ↓ ↓ ↓ |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Eastbound | | Analys | sis Yea | r 2020 | UL - FIVI | | Ana | alysis I | Period | 1> 16 | 6:45 | - <u>-</u> | | 1 |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 El | 3 | File Na | ame | 11PM | - Existir | na w | ith Pr | roiect.x | us | | | - | | ₹ (* |
| Proiect Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | 5 | | , | | | | 1 " | | |
| ····,···· | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | ٧ | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 18 | 1177 | 7 18 | | | | | | 479 | 681 | 725 | 1154 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | _ | | 1 | II. | 2 | Т | | | | | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 1 | , | ĸ | | | | | | | N | _ | ÷ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 14.8 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | 1 | | 3 | X 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | - | EBT | WBI | - | W | 'BT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | е | | | | | 4 | | | | | | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 10.0 | | | | | | | 7.4 | 2.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | i, s | | | | | 40.0 | | | | | | | 20.0 | 30.0 |) : | 50.0 |
| Change Period | eriod, (Y+R c), s Headway (MAH) s | | | | | 6.3 | | | | | | | 5.2 | 5.2 | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Head | v Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 3.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s ue Clearance Time (<i>g</i> s), s | | | | | 28.7 | | | | | | | | 19.4 | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 1.5 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 3.0 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.57 | | | | | | | | 0.71 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | · | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | | | | | | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate(<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | 18 | 611 | 608 | | | | | | 718 | 466 | 740 | 1178 | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1890 | | | | | | 1807 | 1610 | 1757 | 1809 | |
| Queue Service | Time (🤉 | g s), s | | 0.6 | 26.7 | 26.7 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 17.4 | 21.8 | |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 0.6 | 26.7 | 26.7 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 17.4 | 21.8 | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | | | | | | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.50 | |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 678 | 711 | 708 | | | | | | 594 | 265 | 968 | 1801 | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | atio(X) | | 0.027 | 0.859 | 0.859 | | | | | | 1.208 | 1.758 | 0.764 | 0.654 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft | /In (95 th percentile) | | 10.3 | 474.6 | 473 | | | | | | 594.2 | 1261. 5 | 302.5 | 344.5 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 0.4 | 19.0 | 18.9 | | | | | | 23.8 | 50.5 | 12.1 | 13.8 | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1).s | /veh | , | 17.8 | 26.0 | 26.0 | | | | | | 37.6 | 37.6 | 29.9 | 16.8 | |
| Incremental De | Jniform Delay (d 1), s/veh | | | 0.0 | 9.9 | 10.0 | | | + | | | 108.7 | 356.4 | 3.3 | 1.9 | |
| Initial Queue De | ncremental Delay (d ₂), s/veh nitial Queue Delay (d ȝ), s/veh | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | 17.8 | 35.9 | 35.9 | | | | | | 146.3 | 394.0 | 33.2 | 18.7 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | D | D | | _ | | | | F | F | С | В | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 35.6 | | | 0.0 | | | | 243 | 7 | F | 24.3 | - | С |
| Intersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | | | 8 | 7.4 | | | | | | - | F | | - |
| | tersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | | 5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Iltimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | n LOS Score / LOS | | | | 2 | В | 2.47 | ' | E | 3 | 1.70 | | В | 1.94 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 1.51 | 1 | В | | | | | 1.46 | ; | А | 2.07 | · _ | В |

| | | nee | r org | manize | | .01000 | | 00 | unto | oun | iiiiai j | , | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------|------------|----------|--------|------------|-------|-------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------------------|-------|---------------------------|--------------|
| Gonoral Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Int | orcoct | ion Infr | ormativ | nn - | | 4.441 | يد لي |
| | ation | Lincott Low & Gro | onenan | Engin | ore | | | | | ration | | 0 250 | | | 11 L L | |
| Apolyot | | | enspan | | | Son 1 | 2020 | | Arc | | | Othor | | 1 | | ۲. بر |
| Analyst | | JAO City of Loo Angoloo | 1 | Time | oriod | | , 2020 | | | за туре | ; | | | | w↓e | |
| Junsaiction | | Caltrans | / | | enou | Fulur | | | | | | 0.90 | | *** | | 4 → 12 |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Eastbound | | Analys | sis Yea | r 2026 | | | Ana | alysis F | Period | 1> 16 | :45 | | 44.8 | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 El | В | File Na | ame | 11PM | l - Future | e.xus | 3 | | | | | 5 | 1 야 [] | * (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | • | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | | | Т | R | | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 20 | 1280 |) 19 | | | | | | 523 | 772 | 794 | 1297 | |
| | 4 1010 | | | . <u> </u> | N | 5 11 | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | | Deference Dhase | 2 | | • | 10 | 2 | | | | | ļ | | tz. | | ~ |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Priase | Z End | | 1 | 7 | F | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Unseed stad | U | Simult Can 5/M | Enu | Green | 14.8 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| | INO Fixed | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | | _ | 0 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Rea | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timer Results | | | | FBI | | FBT | WB | | W | /BT | NBI | | NBT | SBI | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | | | | | | 4 | | - | | | | | 2 | 1 | - | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 10.0 | | | | | | | 74 | 2.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | s | | | <u> </u> | | 40.0 | | | | | | | 7. 4 20.0 | 30.0 | | -4.0 50.0 |
| Change Period | hange Period, ($Y+R_c$), s | | | | | 63 | - | | | | | | 5.2 | 5.2 | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Hear | hange Period, ($Y+Rc$), s ax Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 3.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| | ax Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 32.3 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 21.5 | | 0.0 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 0.6 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 2.2 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | babilitv | (3) | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 1.00 | , | |
| Max Out Proba | bilitv | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 0.99 | , | |
| - | , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | - | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | | | | | | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate(<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | 20 | 664 | 661 | | | | | | 794 | 528 | 810 | 1323 | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1890 | | | | | | 1805 | 1610 | 1757 | 1809 | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | | 0.6 | 30.3 | 30.3 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 19.5 | 26.1 | |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 0.6 | 30.3 | 30.3 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 19.5 | 26.1 | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | | | | | | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.50 | |
| Capacity (<i>c</i>), v | reh/h | | | 678 | 711 | 708 | | | | | | 594 | 265 | 968 | 1801 | |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | itio(X) | | 0.030 | 0.934 | 0.934 | | | | | | 1.337 | 1.993 | 0.837 | 0.735 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | 11.5 | 574.1 | 573.4 | | | | | | 768.5 | 1564. | 343.2 | 403.2 | |
| Back of Output | (0) | ah/In (95 th paraanti | (ما | 0.5 | 23.0 | 22.0 | | | - | | | 30.7 | 62.6 | 13.7 | 16.1 | |
| | Patio (| PO(0.5 th percent) | | 0.0 | 23.0 | 22.9 | | | - | _ | | 0.00 | 02.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Liniform Delay (| | /veb | | 17.8 | 27.1 | 27.1 | | | - | | | 37.6 | 37.6 | 30.7 | 17.0 | |
| Incremental De | | 0.0 | 10.1 | 10.3 | | | | | | 162.8 | 460.2 | 6.1 | 27 | | | |
| Initial Queue De | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.5 | | | - | | | 0.0 | 400.2 | 0.1 | 2.7 | | | |
| Control Delay (| | 17.8 | 46.2 | 46.3 | | | _ | | | 200 / | 407 R | 36.8 | 20.6 | | | |
| Level of Service | | R | -70.2 | | | _ | | _ | | 200.4 | -57.0 | л П | 20.0 C | | | |
| Approach Delay | | 15 9 | | | 0.0 | | | | 310 (| 2 | F | 26.9 | | C | | |
| Intersection Do | | 40.0 | , | 11 | 2.6 | | | | 019.4 | - | 1 | 20.0 F | | 0 | | |
| Intersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | | | | 2.0 | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | | | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | | | | | В | 2.47 | , | E | в | 1.70 | | В | 1.94 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 1.60 |) | В | | | | | 1.58 | | В | 2.25 | ; | В |

| | | | - 5 | | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------|--------|---------|----------|----------|------------|-------|---------------|---------------|----------|---------|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Int | ersect | ion Info | ormatio | on | | 474+1 | × l <u>x</u> |
| Agency | | Linscott Law & Gre | ensnan | Engine | ers | | | | | iration | h | 0 250 | | | ↓↓↓↓ | |
| Analyst | | JAS | onopun | Analys | sis Date | Sen 1 | 2020 | | Are | ea Tyne | ر ۱۰ | Other | | 25 | | ۲. ۲. |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | 1 | Time F | Period | Future | e with | | PH | IF | , | 0.98 | | ר ק ק ק ק ק ק | w ∲ E | 2 |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Eastbound | | Analys | sis Yea | r 2026 | JL - F IVI | | An | alysis F | Period | 1> 16 | :45 | - ^x | | 7 |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 El | 3 | File Na | ame | 11PM | - Future | e wit | h Pro | j piect.xu | s | | | | | - ([₹] |
| Proiect Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | , | | | | 1 - | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | /eh/h | | | 20 | 1280 |) 19 | | | | | | 526 | 772 | 792 | 1297 | |
| | | | | | | | - | | | | | _ | | | | |
| Signal Informa | ation | | - | | ↓ ↓ | 12 | 2 | | | | | ļ | | † | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | Î 🕇 | 7 | R | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | ♣ ₄ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 14.8 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | • | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | | FRT | W/BI | 1 | ١٨ | /BT | NRI | | NRT | SBI | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | 0 | | | | - | | | - | | | NDL | | 2 | 1 | - | 6 |
| Case Number | 6 | | | | | 10.0 | | | | | | + | 7.4 | 2.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | | | | | | 40.0 | | | | - | | | 20.0 | 2.0 | | 4.0 50.0 |
| Change Duration | (V+D | -) C | | | | 63 | | - | | - | | + | 20.0 5.2 | 50.0 | , <u> </u> | 50.0 |
| Max Allow Heat | nange Period, (Y+ <i>R c</i>), s ax Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 3.0 | | | | - | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ax Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s ueue Clearance Time (<i>q</i> s), s | | | | | 32.3 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 21.5 | 5 | 0.0 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 0.6 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 2.2 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 0.98 | 3 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | W | 'B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | | | \rightarrow | | | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |), veh/h | | 20 | 664 | 661 | | | \rightarrow | | | 797 | 528 | 808 | 1323 | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1890 | | | \rightarrow | | | 1805 | 1610 | 1757 | 1809 | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), s | | 0.6 | 30.3 | 30.3 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 19.5 | 26.1 | |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (g c), s | | 0.6 | 30.3 | 30.3 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 19.5 | 26.1 | |
| Green Ratio (g | ı/C) | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | | | \rightarrow | | | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.50 | |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 678 | 711 | 708 | | | \rightarrow | _ | | 594 | 265 | 968 | 1801 | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | atio (X) | | 0.030 | 0.934 | 0.934 | | | \rightarrow | | | 1.342 | 1.993 | 0.835 | 0.735 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) | | 11.5 | 574.1 | 573.4 | | | | | | 775.4 | 1564. 6 | 341.7 | 403.2 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 0.5 | 23.0 | 22.9 | | | | | | 31.0 | 62.6 | 13.7 | 16.1 | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay | (d1), s | /veh | | 17.8 | 27.1 | 27.1 | | | | | | 37.6 | 37.6 | 30.7 | 17.9 | |
| Incremental Delay (<i>d</i> 1), s/ven | | | | 0.0 | 19.1 | 19.3 | | | | | | 164.9 | 460.2 | 6.0 | 2.7 | |
| Initial Queue Delay (d 3), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Control Delay (| | 17.8 | 46.2 | 46.3 | | | | | | 202.5 | 497.8 | 36.7 | 20.6 | | | |
| Level of Service | | В | D | D | | | | | | F | F | D | С | | | |
| Approach Dela | | 45.8 | 3 | D | 0.0 | | | | 320.2 | 2 | F | 26.7 | · | С | | |
| Intersection De | | | | 11 | 3.0 | | | | | | | F | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | | | EB | | | W | B | | | NB | | | SB | | | |
| Pedestrian LOS | S Score | /LOS | | 2.32 | 2 | В | 2.47 | ' | | В | 1.70 | | В | 1.94 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | core / LC | DS | | 1.60 |) | В | | | | | 1.58 | | В | 2.25 | 5 | В |

| | | | Ŭ | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|----------|---------------|---------|---------|-----------|---------------|----------|-----------|--------|-------|--------------|--------------|---------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Interse | ction Inf | ormati | on | 2 | 4241 | × Ļ |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Duration | ո, h | 0.250 |) | | 444 | |
| Analvst | | JAS | <u> </u> | Analvs | is Date | Aug 1 | 4. 2020 | | Area Tv | pe | Othe | ~ | | | ۲. ا |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existir | na - AM | | PHF | | 0.96 | | -> -\$-\$ | whe | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | is Yea | 2020 | .9 / | | Analysis | Period | 1> 7: | 45 | | | ₹ |
| Intersection | | , Mindanao/La Villa N | Iarina | File Na | ame | 12AM | - Existir | na.xu | s | | | | | 5 4 17 | |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | 1 | | | | | | | - 5 | 11r বাকপা | * (* |
| , , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | /B | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | r r | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 17 | 1 | 10 | 64 | (|) 150 | 6 23 | 1079 | 9 54 | 61 | 965 | 27 |
| | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | 215 | el l'a | . 3 4 | 4 | | | | | | | _ |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | • | 51 | Ř | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | € ₄ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 10.1 | 50.6 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | 5 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | ∇ | | 7 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.3 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | I | | | | _ | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | | WBT | NB | | NBT | SBL | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 4 | | \rightarrow | 8 | | | 6 | 5 | | 2 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 8.0 | | \rightarrow | 8.0 | | | 6.3 | 1.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 20.0 | | \rightarrow | 20.0 | | | 55.0 | 15.0 |) | 70.0 |
| Change Period, | nge Period, (Y+R c), s : Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 5.3 | | \rightarrow | 5.3 | | | 4.4 | 4.9 | | 4.4 |
| Max Allow Head | IX Allow Headway (MAH), s | | | | | 3.4 | | \rightarrow | 3.4 | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ueue Clearance Time (g_s), s | | | | | 3.3 | | _ | 14.8 | | | | 3.0 | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 0.5 | | \rightarrow | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | \rightarrow | 1.00 | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | 1.00 | | | | 0.00 |) | _ |
| Movement Gro | un Res | aults | | | FB | | | V/F | 3 | | NB | _ | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | | Т | R | | Т | R | 1 | Т | R | | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |) veh/h | | · · | 29 | | | 229 | 3 | . 24 | 595 | 585 | 64 | | 514 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s) veh/h/l | n | | 1168 | | | 157 | 4 | 555 | 1900 | 1868 | 1810 | 1900 | 1881 |
| Queue Service | Time ((| γ_{s}) s | | | 0.0 | | | 10 | 3 | 1.8 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 10 | 92 | 92 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (a_c) s | | | 1.3 | | | 12 | 8 | 1.8 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 1.0 | 9.2 | 9.2 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | 5 mile (g c), c | | | 0.16 | | | 0.1 | 6 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.70 | 0.73 | 0.73 |
| Capacity (c) y | /eh/h | | | | 255 | | | 309 | 2 7 | 392 | 1068 | 1050 | 458 | 1385 | 1371 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acitv Ra | tio (X) | | | 0,114 | | | 0.74 | 12 | 0.061 | 0.557 | 0.557 | 0.139 | 0.375 | 0.375 |
| Back of Queue | (Q) ft/ | (In (95 th percentile) | | | 24.6 | | | 236 | .9 | 10.6 | 302.9 | 299.3 | 14.1 | 139.4 | 138.1 |
| Back of Queue | (Q) ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | 1.0 | | | 9.5 | 5 | 0.4 | 12.1 | 12.0 | 0.6 | 5.6 | 5.5 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | 0.00 | | | 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1).s | /veh | , | | 32.0 | | | 36. | 8 | 9.0 | 12.6 | 12.6 | 6.8 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Incremental De | lay (d 2 |), s/veh | | | 0.1 | | | 8.2 | 2 | 0.3 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Initial Queue De | Incremental Delay (d ₂), s/veh Initial Queue Delay (d ȝ), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | | 32.1 | | | 45. | 0 | 9.3 | 14.7 | 14.7 | 6.9 | 5.3 | 5.3 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | С | | | D | | Α | В | В | Α | Α | A |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 32.1 | | С | 45.0 | | D | 14.0 | 3 | В | 5.4 | | A |
| Intersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | | | 13 | 3.6 | | _ | | | | B | | |
| | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Iultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LOS | | 2.30 | | В | 2.30 |) | В | 1.7 | 1 | В | 1.71 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 0.54 | | А | 0.87 | ' | А | 1.48 | 3 | А | 1.39 |) | A |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS™ Streets Version 7.8.5

| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | | Intersec | tion Inf | ormati | on | 2 | 4441 | × Ļ |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------|----------------|----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|-------|-----------|----------|--------|----------|------------------|--|-------------|
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | | Duration | , h | 0.250 |) | | 4 + 4 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Dat | e Aug ' | 14, 2 | 2020 | | Area Typ | e | Othe | - | 4 | | 4 |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existi Proje | ing w ct - A | vith AM | | PHF | | 0.96 | | 4 1 4 | w∔e 8 | ∲ ∲ * |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | is Yea | r 2020 | | | | Analysis | Period | 1> 7: | 45 | | K A A . | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/La Villa N | <i>l</i> arina | File Na | ame | 12AN | 1 - E | xistin | g wit | h Project | .xus | | | | <u>]</u>]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]] | * (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | - | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | | W | В | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 17 | 1 | 10 | | 64 | 0 | 156 | 23 | 1083 | 3 54 | 61 | 974 | 27 |
| | 4! | | | | F 111 | E DE | | | _ | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | | Deference Dhase | 0 | 1 | 245 | ¥¥ | B | a≩ | = | | | | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | Z | | [| - [<u>5</u> 1 | rt. | 3 | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | ↔ 4 |
| Unseerdingtod | U | Simult Cap 5/M | Ena | Green | 10.1 | 50.6 | 1 | 4.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | 5 |
| Uncoordinated | INO Fixed | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | Y | Ψ. | _ | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.3 | 0.7 | | ./ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 1 | 8 |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | | EBT | | WBL | | WBT | NBI | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | Э | | | | | 4 | Г | | | 8 | | | 6 | 5 | | 2 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 8.0 | Г | | | 8.0 | | | 6.3 | 1.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 20.0 | | | | 20.0 | | | 55.0 | 15.0 |) . | 70.0 |
| Change Period, | nge Period, ($Y+Rc$), s | | | | | 5.3 | T | | | 5.3 | | | 4.4 | 4.9 | | 4.4 |
| Max Allow Head | nge Period,(Y+R c), s : Allow Headway(<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 3.4 | Г | | | 3.4 | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (gs), s | | | | 3.3 | \square | | | 14.8 | | | | 3.0 | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | 0.5 | Г | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | | 1.00 | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Probal | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | | 1.00 | | | | 0.00 |) | |
| | | • | | | | | _ | | | | | | | 1 | | _ |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | | WB | 5 | <u> </u> | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | | 1 | R | | L | 1 | R | | | R | L | | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | <u> </u> | | / | 4 | 14 | - | 3 | 8 | 18 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow F | |), ven/n | | | 29 | | ⊢ | - | 229 | 4 | 24 | 597 | 587 | 64 | 524 | 519 |
| Adjusted Satura | | | n | | 1168 | | ⊢ | - | 1574 | 4 | 550 | 1900 | 1868 | 1810 | 1900 | 1882 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | J_{s}), S | | | 1.2 | | ⊢ | | 10.3 | | 1.8 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 1.0 | 9.3 | 9.3 |
| Croop Patia (a | | e fille (<i>g c</i>), s | | | 0.16 | + | H | - | 0.16 | 2 | 0.56 | 10.1 | 0.56 | 1.0 | 9.3 | 9.3 |
| Green Ralio (g | /C) | | | | 0.10 | | ⊢ | | 200 | | 0.50 | 1069 | 1050 | 0.70 | 0.73 | 0.73 |
| Valume to Car | en/n | tio (X) | | | 255 | | ⊢ | - | 309 | 2 | 389 | 0.550 | 1050 | 457 | 1385 | 1372 |
| Back of Oueue | (0) ft | $(10 (\Lambda))$ | | | 24.6 | | ⊢ | - | 236 (| 2 0 | 10.6 | 303.8 | 300.7 | 14 1 | 140.7 | 130.5 |
| Back of Queue | $(\mathbf{Q}), \mathbf{u}$ | ah/In (95 th percentie) | (ما | | 1.0 | | H | - | 250. | 3 | 0.4 | 12.2 | 12.0 | 0.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | tile) | | 0.00 | | H | | 0.00 |) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d_1) s | /veh | | | 32.0 | - | t | | 36.8 | 3 | 9.0 | 12.6 | 12.6 | 6.9 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Incremental De | Uniform Delay (d 1), s/veh | | | | | - | t | | 8.2 | , | 0.3 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Initial Queue De | ncremental Delay (d 2), s/ven nitial Queue Delay (d 3), s/veh | | | | | - | t | | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | | - | t | | 45.0 |) | 9.3 | 14.7 | 14.7 | 6.9 | 5.4 | 5.4 |
| Level of Service | | | C | | | | D | | A | В | В | A | A | A | | |
| Approach Delay | | 32.1 | Ť | С | | 45.0 | | D | 14.6 | } | B | 5.4 | | A | | |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | - 1 | 3.6 | | | _ | | | | B | | |
| | The section Delay, siven / LOS | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | ultimodal Results | | | | | | | | WB | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.30 | | В | | 2.30 | | В | 1.71 | | В | 1.71 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 0.54 | | А | | 0.87 | | А | 1.48 | 3 | A | 1.40 |) | A |

| | | | Ŭ | | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|--|---|---|-----------------|----------|--------|--------------|----------|-------|--------------|----------|----------|-------------|-------------|------------------|--------|-----------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Int | tersect | ion Infe | ormatio | on | | 4441 | يه لي |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Du | uration, | h | 0.250 | | 1 | 444 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Dat | e Aug | 14, 2020 |) | Are | ea Typ | е | Other | | | | <u>ل</u> |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Futur | e - AM | | PH | -IF | | 0.96 | | ♦ | W↓E | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | is Yea | ır 2026 | | | An | nalysis | Period | 1> 7:4 | 15 | 4 | | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/La Villa N | <i>l</i> larina | File Na | ame | 12AN | 1 - Futu | e.xus | ; | | | | | | ኻተቱ | |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | 5 | 414991 | × (* |
| | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | VB | | | NB | | | SB | 1 |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (<i>v</i>), v | eh/h | | | 18 | 1 | 11 | 68 | | 0 | 166 | 24 | 1163 | 57 | 65 | 1048 | 29 |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | b | b 115 | _ | 5 | | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | Deference Dhase | 2 | | 215 | ■4.7 | 8 | ¥. | | | | | | | | |
| | 90.0 | Reference Phase | Z End | | | - 1 | r E | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| Unseerdingtod | No | Simult Con E/M | On | Green | 10.1 | 50.6 | 14.7 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ [| | | | A |
| Earco Modo | Fixed | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ ` | | \mathbf{Y}_{i} | 7 | ¥. |
| Porce Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | OII | Reu | 1.5 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 3 | 0 | 1 | |
| Timer Results | | | | FBI | | FRT | W/F | RI 🛛 | ١٨ | VBT | NBI | | NRT | SBI | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | <u></u> | | _ | | - | 4 | | | | 8 | | - | 6 | 5 | | 2 |
| Case Number | <u> </u> | | | | + | 8.0 | | - | 8 | 3.0 | | | 63 | 1.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | s | | | | | 20.0 | - | - | 20 | 0.0 | | | 55.0 | 15.0 |) . | 70.0 |
| Change Period | (Y+R) | c). S | | | | 5.3 | - | | 5 | 5.3 | | | 4.4 | 4.9 | | 4.4 |
| Max Allow Head | x Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 3.4 | | | 3 | 3.4 | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ax Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s ueue Clearance Time (<i>g</i> s), s | | | | | 3.4 | | | 1: | 5.8 | | | | 3.1 | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 0.5 | | | 0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1. | .00 | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | 1. | .00 | | | | 0.00 |) | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | \downarrow | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | | 18 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |), veh/h | | | 31 | | <u> </u> | 24 | 4 | | 25 | 640 | 631 | 68 | 564 | 558 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | | 1122 | | | 157 | /2 | | 510 | 1900 | 1868 | 1810 | 1900 | 1882 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | | | 0.0 | | <u> </u> | 11. | 5 | | 2.0 | 20.0 | 20.1 | 1.1 | 10.3 | 10.3 |
| Cycle Queue C | learance | e Tîme (<i>g c</i>), s | | | 1.4 | | | 13. | .8 | | 2.0 | 20.0 | 20.1 | 1.1 | 10.3 | 10.3 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | 0.16 | | | 0.1 | 6 | | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.70 | 0.73 | 0.73 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | | 247 | | | 30 | 8 | | 367 | 1068 | 1050 | 433 | 1385 | 1372 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | tio (X) //= (05 the second section) | | | 0.126 |) | | 0.7 | 90 | | 0.068 | 0.599 | 0.600 | 0.156 | 0.407 | 0.407 |
| Back of Queue | $(Q), \pi/$ | iii (95 in percentile) | | | 20.4 | | - | 20 | | | 11.2 | 332.4 | 328.7 | 15.1 | 100.3 | 155 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), Ve | PO(05 th percent) | ie) | | 1.1 | | | 10. | .4 | | 0.4 | 13.3 | 13.1 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Queue Storage | | | lie) | | 0.00 | + | | 27 | 2 | _ | 0.00 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | u 1), S/ | | | | JZ. I | | - | 12 | | | 9.1 | 13.U 2 E | 13.U 2.E | 1.0 | 4.7 | 4 .7 |
| ncremental Delay (d 2), s/veh | | | | | 0.1 | | | 12. | 0 | _ | 0.4 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Initial Queue Delay (d ₃), s/veh Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | | 32.4 | + | | 40 | 2 | | 0.0 | 15.5 | 15.6 | 7.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | JZ.1 | - | - | 49. | ~ | | 9.4 Δ | R | 13.0 R | Δ | Δ | Δ |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 32.1 | | C | 10 | 2 | | D | 15 / | | B | 57 | | |
| Intersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | 52.1 | | 1 | 4.4 | - | | 5 | 13.4 | | | B. 3.7 | | |
| Intersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | | | 1 | <i></i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Multimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | edestrian LOS Score / LOS | | | | | В | 2.3 | 0 | | В | 1.71 | | В | 1.71 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC |)S | | 0.54 | | А | 0.8 | 9 | | A | 1.56 | ; | В | 1.47 | , | Α |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS™ Streets Version 7.8.5

| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | | Interse | ction In | format | ion | × | | × L |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------|--------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|------|----------|----------|--------|---------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Î | Duration | ո, h | 0.25 | 0 | | 4+4 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Dat | e Aug | 14, | 2020 | | Area Ty | ре | Othe | er | 4 | | 4 * |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Futur Proje | e w ct - | vith - AM | | PHF | | 0.96 | i | 4 4 4 | w∔e 8 | ↓ + + * |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | is Yea | r 2026 | | | | Analysis | Period | 1> 7 | :45 | | | <u>_</u> |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/La Villa N | <i>l</i> arina | File Na | ame | 12AN | /1 - F | Future | with | Project. | kus | | | | <u>]</u>]] | * (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 - | | |
| | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | | W | В | | NE | 3 | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 18 | 1 | 11 | | 68 | 0 | 166 | 5 24 | 116 | 57 57 | 65 | 1057 | 29 |
| | | | | | F 111 | F 11 2 | | | | | _ | _ | | - | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | 215 | _ <u>2</u> 45 | | | | | | | | | | _ |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | ľ | 1 51 | 2 | Ë. | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | ╋ ₄ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 10.1 | 50.6 | | 14.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | <u> </u> |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | \square | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | $\mathbf{\nabla}$ | | Y |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.3 | 0.7 | | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| T . D . K | | | | EDI | Ĩ | EDT | | | | MOT | | | NDT | 0.01 | | ODT |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBI | ⊢ | VVBL | - | WBI | NB | | NBI | SBI | | SBI |
| Assigned Phase | 9 | | | | | 4 | ┢ | | _ | 8 | <u> </u> | _ | 6 | 5 | | 2 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 8.0 | ╇ | | | 8.0 | <u> </u> | | 6.3 | 1.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | 20.0 | ⊢ | | _ | 20.0 | | | 55.0 | 15.0 |) | 70.0 | |
| Change Period, | Period, (Y+R c), s | | | | | 5.3 | + | | | 5.3 | | | 4.4 | 4.9 | | 4.4 |
| Max Allow Head | dway(<i>I</i> | MAH), s | | | | 3.4 | ⊢ | | | 3.4 | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | 3.4 | ⊢ | | | 15.8 | | | | 3.1 | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | 0.5 | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | | 1.00 | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | | 1.00 | | | | 0.00 |) | |
| Manager 4 Ora | | | | | | | - | | | ` | | | | | 0.0 | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | Suits | | | EB | | ⊢ | | | | <u> </u> | | | | SB | D |
| Approach Move | ement | | | | 1 | R | ┢ | | 1 | R | | | R | L E | 1 | R |
| Assigned wove | ment | > 1.0 | | 1 | 4 | 14 | ┢ | 3 | 8 | 18 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow F | |), ven/n | | | 31 | | ┢ | | 244 | | 25 | 642 | 633 | 68 | 568 | 563 |
| Adjusted Satura | | bw Rate (s), ven/n/i | n | | 1122 | | ⊢ | | 1572 | 2 | 505 | 1900 | 1868 | 1810 | 1900 | 1882 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | Js), S - Time () | | | 0.0 | | ┢ | | 11.5 | | 2.0 | 20.1 | 20.2 | 1.1 | 10.4 | 10.4 |
| | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | | 1.4 | | ┢ | | 13.8 | 3 | 2.1 | 20.1 | 20.2 | 1.1 | 10.4 | 10.4 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | 0.16 | | ┢ | | 0.16 | | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.70 | 0.73 | 0.73 |
| Capacity (c), v | eh/h | ·· · /) /) | | | 247 | | ┢ | | 308 | 0 | 364 | 1068 | 1050 | 432 | 1385 | 1372 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | | | | 0.126 | | ┢ | | 0.79 | 0 | 0.069 | 0.60 | 0.602 | 0.157 | 0.410 | 0.410 |
| Back of Queue | (Q),π/ | in (95 th percentile) |) | | 26.4 | | ⊢ | | 260 | | 11.2 | 333. | 1 330.2 | 15.1 | 158.4 | 157.1 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), Ve | $\frac{1}{2}$ | ie) | | 1.1 | - | ⊢ | | 10.4 | + | 0.4 | 13.4 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Queue Storage | | KQ) (95 in percent | lie) | | 0.00 | | ⊢ | | 27.0 | , | 0.00 | 12.00 | 12.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| $(u_1), s_1$ | | | | 32.1 | - | ┢ | | 37.2 | <u> </u> | 9.1 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 7.5 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| Incremental De | cremental Delay (d 2), s/veh | | | | 0.1 | | ⊢ | | 12.0 | , | 0.4 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Control Dates (| hitial Queue Delay (d ȝ), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | | ╞ | | 0.0 | , | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | 32.1 | | ┡ | | 49.2 | - | 9.4 | 15.5 | 15.6 | 7.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Level of Service | evel of Service (LOS) | | | | C | | ╞ | 40.0 | U | | A | B | L B | A = - | A | A |
| Approach Delay | Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | C | | 49.2 | | D | 15. | 4 | В | 5.7 | | A |
| Intersection De | ersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | 1 | 4.4 | - | | | | | | В | | |
| Multimodal Po | I Results | | | | ER | | | | | 3 | | NP | | | SR | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | | 2 20 | | R | ┢ | 2 30 | | R | 17 | | R | 1 74 | | B | |
| Biovola LOS So | | | LOS | | | | ┢ | 2.00 0.90 | | ^ | 1.7 | 6 | B | 1.7 | 2 | |
| Dicycle LOG 30 | | | | 0.54 | | ~ | | 0.09 | | ~ | 1.5 | | J | 1.40 | , | Л |

| | | | Ŭ | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|--------|----------|---------------|-----------------------|----------|---------------|----------|----------|---------|-------------|-------------------|--------|----------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intersec | tion Inf | ormatio | on | | 4441 | þa ly |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | eers | | | | Duration | , h | 0.250 | | 1 | 4 + 5 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | • | Analys | sis Dat | e Aug 1 | 4, 2020 | | Area Typ | e | Other | | 4 | | <u>∼</u> |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existi | ng - PM | | PHF | | 0.99 | | | W = E | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | sis Yea | ır 2020 | | | Analysis | Period | 1> 16 | :45 | 4 | | + * |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/La Villa N | larina | File Na | ame | 12PM | - Existi | ng.xu | s | | | | | ኻተቱ | ¥ |
| Project Descript | tion | Paseo Marina | | л | | | | • | | | | | 1 | 414441 | א א |
| · · · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | Β | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 20 | 1 | 36 | 50 | 2 | 2 72 | 27 | 957 | 64 | 129 | 1088 | 13 |
| | | | | | | - 112 | | | | | _ | | | 1 | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | 215 | _ <mark>s2↓</mark> 3a | - 3 S | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | ľ | <u>ੈ 51</u> | ŗ₿_" | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | ← ₄ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 10.1 | 50.6 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | <u> </u> |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | > | $\mathbf{\nabla}$ | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.3 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | | EBT | WB | | WBT | NBI | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 4 | | _ | 8 | | _ | 6 | 5 | | 2 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 8.0 | | _ | 8.0 | | | 6.3 | 1.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | \rightarrow | 20.0 | | _ | 20.0 | | | 55.0 | 15.0 |) | 70.0 |
| Change Period, | nge Period, (Y+R c), s Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 5.3 | | \rightarrow | 5.3 | | | 4.4 | 4.9 | | 4.4 |
| Max Allow Head | x Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 3.4 | | _ | 3.4 | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), S | | | \rightarrow | 4.6 | | \rightarrow | 8.4 | | | | 4.1 | _ | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | \rightarrow | 0.3 | | _ | 0.2 | | | 0.0 | 0.1 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prob | bability | | | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 1.00 | | \rightarrow | 1.00 | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | 0.06 | | | | 0.04 | • | |
| Movement Gro | up Res | sults | | | FB | | | WF | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | | Т | R | 1 | Т | R | 1 | Т | R | 1 | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | _ | | 58 | | | 125 | 5 | 27 | 521 | 510 | 130 | 557 | 555 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | | 1586 | | | 155 | 8 | 515 | 1900 | 1858 | 1810 | 1900 | 1892 |
| Queue Service | Time (d | as). S | | | 0.0 | | | 3.5 | | 2.2 | 14.9 | 14.9 | 2.1 | 10.1 | 10.1 |
| Cycle Queue Cl | learance | e Time (| | | 2.6 | | | 6.4 | | 2.2 | 14.9 | 14.9 | 2.1 | 10.1 | 10.1 |
| Green Ratio (a | /C) | - ····· (3 ·), - | | | 0.16 | - | | 0.16 | 3 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.70 | 0.73 | 0.73 |
| Capacity (c), y | / reh/h | | | | 313 | | | 311 | | 369 | 1068 | 1044 | 503 | 1385 | 1379 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acitv Ra | tio(X) | | | 0.184 | | | 0.40 | 3 | 0.074 | 0.488 | 0.488 | 0.259 | 0.402 | 0.402 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | (In (95 th percentile) | | | 49.3 | | | 112. | 5 | 12.3 | 258.9 | 254.6 | 30.1 | 153.7 | 153.1 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | 2.0 | | | 4.5 | | 0.5 | 10.4 | 10.2 | 1.2 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 |) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d 1), s | /veh | , | | 32.6 | | | 34.1 | 1 | 9.1 | 11.9 | 11.9 | 6.5 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| Incremental Del | Jniform Delay (d 1), s/veh | | | | 0.1 | | | 0.3 | | 0.4 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| nitial Queue Delay (<i>d</i> 3), s/veh | | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | | 32.7 | | | 34.4 | 1 | 9.5 | 13.5 | 13.5 | 6.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | С | | | С | | A | В | В | Α | Α | A |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 32.7 | 7 | С | 34.4 | 1 | С | 13.4 | 1 | В | 5.7 | | A |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | - 1 | 1.0 | | - | | | | B | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Iultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | destrian LOS Score / LOS | | | |) | В | 2.30 |) | В | 1.71 | 1 | В | 1.71 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 0.58 | 3 | А | 0.69 |) | А | 1.36 | 3 | А | 1.51 | | В |

| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inter | rsect | tion Infe | ormatio | on | <u>,</u> | 4444 | × l <u>x</u> |
|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------|-----------------|----------|---------|--------------|--------------------|---------------|--------|--------|-----------|---------|-------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Dura | ation, | h | 0.250 | | | 4+4 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Date | e Aug 1 | 4, 2020 | | Area | а Тур | е | Other | | 4 | | 4 |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existi | ng with ct - PM | | PHF | | | 0.99 | | * * * | w∔e | ** ** |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | is Yea | 2020 | | | Anal | lysis | Period | 1> 16 | :45 | | K A A . | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/La Villa N | <i>l</i> larina | File Na | ame | 12PM | l - Existii | ng wi | th Pro | oject. | xus | | | - - | | * /* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | N | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Г | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 20 | 1 | 36 | 50 | | 2 | 72 | 27 | 960 | 64 | 129 | 1088 | 13 |
| Cignal Informa | tion | | | | 6 111 | 6 11: | | | _ | _ | | | 1 | | | |
| Signal informa | | Poforonao Dhaga | 2 | | 245 | ¥¥ | B. 2 S | 1 | | | | | | | | ~ |
| Offect s | 90.0 | Reference Priase | Z End | | | - 5 1 | | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult Cap E/W | On | Green | 10.1 | 50.6 | 14.7 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ l | | | | Ð- |
| Earco Modo | Fixed | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Pod | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | 5 | $\mathbf{\Psi}$ | 7 | ¥. |
| Porce Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | OII | Reu | 1.5 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 3 | | 1 | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | WB | BT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | е | | | | | 4 | | | 8 | | | | 6 | 5 | | 2 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 8.0 | | | 8.0 |) | | | 6.3 | 1.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | , s | | | | | 20.0 | | | 20.0 | 0 | | | 55.0 | 15.0 |) . | 70.0 |
| Change Period, | ange Period, ($Y+Rc$), s | | | | | 5.3 | | | 5.3 | 3 | | | 4.4 | 4.9 | | 4.4 |
| Max Allow Head | ange Period,(Y+ <i>R c</i>), s x Allow Headway(<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 3.4 | | | 3.4 | 1 | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | 4.6 | | \rightarrow | 8.4 | 1 | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 0.3 | | | 0.2 | 2 | | | 0.0 | 0.1 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 | 0 | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Probal | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | 0.0 | 6 | | | | 0.04 | L . | |
| | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | W | 3 | _ | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | T | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | <u> </u> | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | - 1 | 18 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow H | Rate (v |), veh/h | | | 58 | <u> </u> | | 12 | 5 | _ | 27 | 523 | 511 | 130 | 557 | 555 |
| Adjusted Satura | | w Rate (s), ven/n/l | n | | 1586 | | | 155 | - 8 | _ | 515 | 1900 | 1858 | 1810 | 1900 | 1892 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | J s , S | | | 0.0 | | | 3.0 |) | _ | 2.2 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 2.1 | 10.1 | 10.1 |
| Croop Patia (a | | e fille (<i>g c</i>), s | | | 2.0 | | | 0.4 | + | - | 2.2 | 0.56 | 15.0 | 2.1 | 0.72 | 0.72 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | 212 | | | 21/ | 1 | _ | 260 | 1069 | 1044 | 502 | 1205 | 1270 |
| Volume to Can | en/n | tio (X) | | | 0 1 9/ | | | 0.40 | 1 | - | 309 | 1000 | 0.400 | 0.250 | 1305 | 1379 |
| Back of Oueue | | llio (| | | 10.104 | | | 112 | 5 | _ | 12.3 | 260 | 255.7 | 30.1 | 0.40Z | 153.1 |
| Back of Queue | $(\mathbf{Q}), \mathbf{u}$ | h/ln (95 th percentie) | (ما | | 49.3 | | | 112 | | _ | 0.5 | 10.4 | 10.2 | 1.2 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | 0.00 | | | 0.0 | 0 | | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d_1) s | /veh | | | 32.6 | | | 34 | 1 | | 9.1 | 11.9 | 11.9 | 6.6 | 4 7 | 4 7 |
| Incremental De | av (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | _ | | 0.1 | | | 0.3 | 3 | | 0.4 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Initial Queue De | | | 0.0 | 1 | | 0.0 |) | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | | 32.7 | | | 34 | 4 | | 9.5 | 13.5 | 13.5 | 6.7 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | C | | | C | - | | A | B | B | A | A | A |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 32.7 | | С | 34.4 | | C | | 13.4 | | В | 5.7 | | A |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | - 1' | 1.0 | | | | | | _ | B | | |
| Intersection Delay, s/ven/ LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Iultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.30 | | В | 2.30 |) | В | | 1.71 | | В | 1.71 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 0.58 | | А | 0.69 |) | A | | 1.36 | 6 | А | 1.51 | | В |

| | | | Ū | | | | | | | | , | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|------------------------------|---------|----------|--------------|-------------------|----------|---------------|----------|----------|---------|-------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|--|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intersec | tion Inf | ormatio | on | | 4441 | þa ly | |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Duration | , h | 0.250 | | | 417 | | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Dat | e Aug 1 | 4, 2020 | | Area Typ | e | Other | | - <u>-</u> | | ۲. ا | |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e - PM | | PHF | | 0.99 | | * | W↓E | | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | is Yea | r 2026 | | | Analysis | Period | 1> 16 | :45 | 4 | | + * | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/La Villa N | /larina | File Na | ame | 12PM | - Future | e.xus | | | | | | ኻተቱ | ¥ | |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | л | | | | | | | | | 5 | । । । ব ↑ ф \ 1 | *] * | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | W | | ′B | | NB | | | SB | | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | r R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | |
| Demand (<i>v</i>), v | eh/h | | | 21 | 1 | 38 | 53 | 2 | 2 76 | 29 | 1082 | 2 68 | 137 | 1227 | 14 | |
| | | | | 1 | b 111 | b 115 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | - | | 215 | _ ∠ ↓s | | 1 | | | | | \mathbf{k} | | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | ľ | - ¹ 51 | B. | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | ♣ 4 | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 10.1 | 50.6 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | <u> </u> | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | > | $\mathbf{\nabla}$ | | Y | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.3 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBI | WB | | WBI | NBI | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBI | |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | <u> </u> | | 4 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 8 | <u> </u> | | 6 | 5 | _ | 2 | |
| Case Number | | | | <u> </u> | _ | 8.0 | <u> </u> | | 8.0 | <u> </u> | _ | 6.3 | 1.0 | | 4.0 | |
| Phase Duration | ase Duration, s ange Period $(Y+R_c)$ s | | | | | 20.0 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 20.0 | <u> </u> | | 55.0 | 15.0 | , | 70.0 | |
| Change Period | | | | 5.3 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 5.3 | <u> </u> | | 4.4 | 4.9 | | 4.4 | | | |
| Max Allow Head | | | | | | -+ | 3.4 | | 0.0 | | 3.2 | | 0.0 | | | |
| Queue Clearan | | | | 4.8 | | | 8.8 | | | 0.0 | 4.3 | _ | 0.0 | | | |
| Green Extensio | h n nme | (<i>g</i> e), s | | <u> </u> | | 0.3 | <u> </u> | | | <u> </u> | 0.0 | | 1.00 | | 0.0 | |
| Max Out Broke | | | | | | 0.00 | <u> </u> | | 0.10 | <u> </u> | | | 1.00 | | | |
| Max Out Proba | onity | | | | | 0.00 | | | 0.10 | | | | 0.05 |) | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | NB | | | SB | | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 | |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |), veh/h | | | 61 | | | 132 | 2 | 29 | 587 | 575 | 138 | 628 | 626 | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | | 1589 | 1 | | 155 | 6 | 450 | 1900 | 1860 | 1810 | 1900 | 1892 | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | y s), S | | | 0.0 | | | 3.9 |) | 2.7 | 17.6 | 17.6 | 2.3 | 12.0 | 12.1 | |
| Cycle Queue C | learance | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | | 2.8 | 1 | | 6.8 | ; | 2.7 | 17.6 | 17.6 | 2.3 | 12.0 | 12.1 | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | i | | | 0.16 | 1 | | 0.10 | 3 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.70 | 0.73 | 0.73 | |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | | 313 | | | 310 |) | 333 | 1068 | 1046 | 463 | 1385 | 1379 | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | itio(X) | | | 0.193 | | | 0.42 | 6 | 0.088 | 0.549 | 0.550 | 0.299 | 0.453 | 0.454 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | | 52 | | | 119. | 6 | 13.6 | 297.6 | 293.1 | 32.1 | 183.4 | 182.8 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | 2.1 | | | 4.8 | ; | 0.5 | 11.9 | 11.7 | 1.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | 0.00 | | | 0.0 | C | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s/ | /veh | | | 32.7 | | | 34.2 | 2 | 9.2 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 7.5 | 4.9 | 4.9 | |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | | 0.1 | | | 0.3 | ; | 0.5 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | |
| Initial Queue De | tial Queue Delay ($d z$), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Control Delay (| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | 32.8 | | | 34.6 | 6 | 9.7 | 14.5 | 14.6 | 7.6 | 6.0 | 6.0 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | С | | | С | | Α | В | В | Α | A | A | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | 32.8 | 5 | С | 34.6 | 3 | С | 14.4 | l I | В | 6.2 | | А | | |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | h / LOS | | | | 1 | 1.6 | | | | | | В | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | WE | | 3 | | NB | | | SB | | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.30 | | В | 2.30 | | В | 1.71 | | В | 1.71 | | В | |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 0.59 | | А | 0.71 | | А | 1.47 | 7 | А | 1.64 | - | В | |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS[™] Streets Version 7.8.5

| Interaction to motion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------|----------|---------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|--|--------------|
| Agency Linescot, Law & Greenepan. Engineers Duration, h 0.250 Diration, h | General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Interse | ction Inf | ormatio | on | 2 | 4 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 | ι Ļ |
| Analysis JAS Analysis Date Analysis Date Analysis Date Other Other Other Jurisdiction Olity of Los Angelos Project 200 Analysis Previde 1>16.3 0.39< | Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Duratio | ո, h | 0.250 | 1 | | 4+4 | |
| Jurisdiction City of Los Angeles Time Period Future with project - PM PHF 0.39 0.30 0.41< | Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Date | Aug 1 | 4, 2020 | | Area Ty | ре | Other | | 4 | | 4 * |
| Urban Street Mindanao Way Analysis Year 2026 Analysis Period 1> 16:45 Intersection Paseo Marina TERM 12PM - Future with Project.xus Image Construction Image Cons | Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e with ct - PM | | PHF | | 0.99 | | *** | w ‡ e | ÷ |
| Intersection Mindanaolla Ville Marina File Name 12PM - Future with Project.xus Image: Construct on the second of the sec | Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | is Year | 2026 | | _ | Analysis | Period | 1> 16 | :45 | | 5 4 4 | <u> </u> |
| Project Description Paseo Marina Demand Information EB WB NB SB Approach Movement L T R | Intersection | | Mindanao/La Villa N | /larina | File Na | ame | 12PM | - Future | e with | Project. | xus | | | 1 | 111 141471 | * [* |
| Demand Information L T R L C T | Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Demand Information L T R | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Movement L T R | Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | Β | | NB | | | SB | |
| Demand (v), veh/h 21 1 38 53 2 76 29 1085 68 137 1227 14 Signal information Cycle, s 90.0 Reference Phase 2 1 38 53 2 76 29 1085 68 137 1227 14 Signal information Force Mode No Reference Phase 2 1 60.6 137 0.0 | Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | ר | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Signal Information Cycle, s 90.0 Reference Phase 2 Offset, s 0 Reference Phase 2 Offset, s 0 Reference Phase 2 Orfset, s 0 Reference Phase 2 Force Mode Fixed Simult. Gap EW 0 6 37.36 0.0 </td <td>Demand (v), v</td> <td>eh/h</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>21</td> <td>1</td> <td>38</td> <td>53</td> <td>2</td> <td>2 76</td> <td>29</td> <td>1085</td> <td>5 68</td> <td>137</td> <td>1227</td> <td>14</td> | Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 21 | 1 | 38 | 53 | 2 | 2 76 | 29 | 1085 | 5 68 | 137 | 1227 | 14 |
| Signal information Cycle, s 00.0 Reference Phase Creen 10.1 50.6 14.7 0.0 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cycle, s 00.0 Reference Print Control Control <thcontrol< th=""> Control Contro<td>Signal Informa</td><td>tion</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>215</td><td>- Alta</td><td>3 4</td><td>4</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>_</td></thcontrol<> | Signal Informa | tion | | | | 215 | - Alta | 3 4 | 4 | | | | | | | _ |
| Offset O Reference Point End Willow 3.6 Sold H.7 O | Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | • | 51 | ×R ° | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | $\mathbf{+}$ |
| $ \begin{array}{ $ | Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 10.1 | 50.6 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | <u> </u> |
| Force Mode Fixed Simult. Gap N/S On Red 1.3 0.7 1.7 0.0 0.0 I< | Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | N | | 7 |
| Immer Results EBL EBL EBT WBL WBT NBL NBT SBL SBT Assigned Phase 4 8.0 6 5 2 Case Number 8.0 8.0 6.0 5.0 10.0 4.0 Phase Duration, s 5.3 5.3 4.4 4.9 4.4 Max Allow Headway (MAH), s 3.4 3.4 3.4 0.0 3.2 0.0 Queue Clearance Time (g ., s 4.8 8.8 4.3 - 4.3 - 1.00 0.0 <t< td=""><td>Force Mode</td><td>Fixed</td><td>Simult. Gap N/S</td><td>On</td><td>Red</td><td>1.3</td><td>0.7</td><td>1.7</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td></td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td></t<> | Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.3 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Time Results EBL EBL EBT WBL WBT NBL NBT SBL SBT Assigned Phase 4 8 6 5 2 Case Number 8.0 8.0 8.0 6 5 7.0 Change Period, (YHR c), S 5.3 20.0 55.0 15.0 70.0 Change Period, (YHR c), S 3.4 3.4 0.0 3.2 0.0 Queue Clearance Time (g s), S 4.8 8.8 4.4 9.0 1.00 Phase Call Probability 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 Max Out Probability 0.00 0.00 0.10 0.0 0.01 0.0 Max Out Probability 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.01 0.0 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 | | | | | | | | | _ | | | _ | | | | |
| Assigned Phase 4 8 6 5 2 Case Number 8.0 8.0 8.0 6.3 1.0 4.0 Phase Duration, s 20.0 20.0 5.3 6.3 1.0 4.0 Phase Duration, s 3.4 3.4 3.4 0.0 3.2 0.0 Change Period, (Y+R c), s 3.4 3.4 0.0 0.2 4.4 4.9 4.4 Max Allow Headway (MAH), s 3.4 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Queue Clearance Time (g e), s 0.3 0.2 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.0 Max Out Probability 1.00 | Timer Results | | | | EBL | | EBT | WBI | L | WBT | NB | - | NBT | SBL | · - | SBT |
| Case Number 8.0 8.0 6.3 1.0 4.0 Phase Duration, s 20.0 20.0 55.0 15.0 70.0 Change Period, (Y+R c), s 5.3 5.3 5.3 4.4 4.9 4.4 Max Allow Headway (MAH), s 3.4 3.4 0.0 3.2 0.0 Queue Clearance Time (g c), s 4.8 8.8 4.8 4.3 4.3 4.4 Max Out Probability 1.00 1.00 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 Max Out Probability 0.00 0.00 0.10 0.0 0.0 1.00 | Assigned Phase | Э | | | | | 4 | | | 8 | | | 6 | 5 | | 2 |
| Phase Duration, s 20.0 20.0 55.0 15.0 70.0 Change Period, (Y+R c), s 5.3 < | Case Number | | | | | | 8.0 | | | 8.0 | | | 6.3 | 1.0 | | 4.0 |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | Phase Duration | , S | | | | 20.0 | | | 20.0 | | | 55.0 | 15.0 | | 70.0 | |
| Max Allow Headway (MAH), s 3.4 3.4 0.0 3.2 0.0 Queue Clearance Time (g s), s 4.8 8.8 4.3 4.3 4.3 4.3 4.3 | Change Period, | | | | 5.3 | | | 5.3 | | | 4.4 | 4.9 | | 4.4 | | |
| Queue Clearance Time ($g \circ$), s 4.8 8.8 Image: Clearance Time ($g \circ$), s 4.8 8.8 Image: Clearance Time ($g \circ$), s 1.00 1.00 0.2 0.0 0.1 0.0 Phase Call Probability 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 0.0 | Max Allow Head | dway(A | <i>MAH</i>), s | | | | 3.4 | | | 3.4 | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Green Extension Time (ge), s0.30.20.20.00.10.0Phase Call Probability1.00 <td>Queue Clearan</td> <td>ce Time</td> <td>e (g s), s</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>4.8</td> <td colspan="2"></td> <td>8.8</td> <td></td> <td colspan="2"></td> <td>4.3</td> <td></td> <td></td> | Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | 4.8 | | | 8.8 | | | | 4.3 | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | Green Extensio | n Time | (g _e), s | | | | 0.3 | | | 0.2 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Max Out Probability 0.00 0.10 Image: transmitted integral and transmi | Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 | | | | | | |
| Movement Group Results Image: Im | Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | 0.10 | | | | 0.05 | | |
| Approach MovementLTR </td <td>Movement Gra</td> <td>un Boo</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>ED</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>\\//</td> <td>></td> <td></td> <td>ND</td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td><u>e</u>p</td> <td></td> | Movement Gra | un Boo | | | | ED | | | \\// | > | | ND | _ | | <u>e</u> p | |
| Approach WovementTTT </td <td>Approach Move</td> <td>oup Res</td> <td>Suits</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>ED T</td> <td>D</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>» </td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>D</td> <td></td> <td><u>эр</u></td> <td>B</td> | Approach Move | oup Res | Suits | | | ED T | D | | | » | | | D | | <u>эр</u> | B |
| Assigned wovenent1414361616667212Adjusted Flow Rate (v), veh/h616113829588576138628626Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate (s), veh/h/ln1589155645019001800181019001892Queue Service Time ($g \cdot s$), s0.015893.92.717.717.72.312.012.1Cycle Queue Clearance Time ($g \cdot s$), s2.82.86.82.717.717.72.312.012.1Green Ratio (g/C)0.160.160.160.560.560.560.700.730.73Capacity (c), veh/h3130.1930.4260.0880.5510.5510.2990.4530.454Back of Queue (Q), ft/ln (95 th percentile)52119.6119.613.629.829.332.1183.4182.8Back of Queue (Q), veh/ln (95 th percentile)5219.0119.613.629.829.432.118.4182.8Back of Queue (Q), veh/ln (95 th percentile)2.10.000.000.000.000.000.000.000.000.00Uniform Delay ($d \cdot$), s/veh3.2/432.7134.29.212.512.57.54.94.9Incremental Delay ($d \cdot$), s/veh0.00.00.00.000.000.000.000.000.000.000.0 | Approach Move | mont | | | | 1 | K | | 0 | 10 | | I C | Г. 16 | E | 1 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate (V), verification Flow Rate (s), verification Flow | Adjusted Flow | |) | | - / | 4 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Saturation Prov Rate (S), vertified136913691360 | Adjusted Flow F | |), ven/n | n | | 1590 | | | 152 | <u> </u> | 29 | 200 | 370 | 1010 | 020 | 020 |
| Curve Service Time (g s), sImage: g s) sImage: g s), s </td <td>Aujusteu Satura</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1309</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>2.0</td> <td>0</td> <td>430</td> <td>177</td> <td>17.7</td> <td>2.2</td> <td>12.0</td> <td>1092</td> | Aujusteu Satura | | | | | 1309 | | | 2.0 | 0 | 430 | 177 | 17.7 | 2.2 | 12.0 | 1092 |
| Cycle dudie clearatice time (g *), s2.82.82.80.82.81.71.72.31.2.01.2.1Green Ratio (g/C)0.160.160.160.560.560.560.700.730.73Capacity (c), veh/h31331303103331068104646213851379Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (X)0.19300.4260.0880.5510.5510.2990.4530.454Back of Queue (Q), th/n (95 th percentile)520119.613.6298.8294.332.1183.4182.8Back of Queue (Q), veh/ln (95 th percentile)2.104.80.512.011.81.37.37.3Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile)2.10.00.000.000.000.000.000.000.000.000.00Uniform Delay (d 1), s/veh32.74.34.24.34.29.212.512.57.54.94.9Incremental Delay (d 2), s/veh0.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.0Control Delay (d), s/veh32.8C34.64.89.714.514.67.66.06.0Level of Service (LOS)C32.8C34.6C14.4B6.2AApproach Delay, s/veh / LOS32.8C34.6C14.4B6.2AIntersection Delay, s/veh / LOS32.8 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>g(s), S</td><td></td><td></td><td>2.0</td><td></td><td></td><td>5.9</td><td></td><td>2.1</td><td>17.7</td><td>17.7</td><td>2.3</td><td>12.0</td><td>12.1</td></td<> | | | g(s), S | | | 2.0 | | | 5.9 | | 2.1 | 17.7 | 17.7 | 2.3 | 12.0 | 12.1 |
| Capacity (c), veh/h 313 0.16 0.36 0.36 0.36 0.73 0.73 0.73 Capacity (c), veh/h 0.193 0 313 10 333 1068 1068 462 1385 1379 Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (X) 0.193 0 0.426 0.088 0.551 0.591 0.299 0.453 0.454 Back of Queue (Q), ft/ln (95 th percentile) 52 0 119.6 13.6 298.8 294.3 32.1 183.4 182.8 Back of Queue (Q), veh/ln (95 th percentile) 2.1 I 4.8 0.5 12.0 11.8 1.3 7.3 7.3 Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile) 0.00 <td< td=""><td>Croop Datia (a</td><td></td><td>e fille (<i>g</i> c), s</td><td></td><td></td><td>2.0</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.0</td><td>2</td><td>2.1</td><td>0.56</td><td>0.56</td><td>2.3</td><td>12.0</td><td>12.1</td></td<> | Croop Datia (a | | e fille (<i>g</i> c), s | | | 2.0 | | | 0.0 | 2 | 2.1 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 2.3 | 12.0 | 12.1 |
| Capacity (c), verifyIndex313Index313Index104646213531379Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (X) $0 \cdot 193$ $0 \cdot 193$ $0 \cdot 193$ $0 \cdot 25$ $0 \cdot 088$ $0 \cdot 55$ $0 \cdot 551$ $0 \cdot 299$ $0 \cdot 453$ $0 \cdot 454$ Back of Queue (Q), th/ln (95 th percentile) $2 \cdot 1$ $2 \cdot 1$ $119 \cdot 6$ 13.6 $29 \cdot 8$ 294.3 32.1 $18 \cdot 34$ 182.8 Back of Queue (Q), veh/ln (95 th percentile) $2 \cdot 1$ 100 $4 \cdot 8$ $0 \cdot 5$ $0 \cdot 50$ $12 \cdot 5$ 118.3 1.33 7.3 7.3 Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile) $0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0$ $0 \cdot 0$ | Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | 0.10 | | | 240 |)) | 0.50 | 1069 | 1046 | 462 | 1205 | 1270 |
| Notice to Capacity Ratio (X) 0 <t< td=""><td>Volume to Con</td><td>en/n</td><td>tio (X)</td><td></td><td></td><td>0 102</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.42</td><td>6</td><td>0.000</td><td>0.551</td><td>0.551</td><td>402</td><td>1303</td><td>0.454</td></t<> | Volume to Con | en/n | tio (X) | | | 0 102 | | | 0.42 | 6 | 0.000 | 0.551 | 0.551 | 402 | 1303 | 0.454 |
| Back of Queue (Q), wh/ln (95 th percentile) $2 \cdot 1$ $3 \cdot 2 \cdot 1$ $19 \cdot 3$ $29 \cdot 3$ $29 \cdot 3$ $32 \cdot 1$ $18 \cdot 4$ $162 \cdot 3$ Back of Queue (Q), wh/ln (95 th percentile) $2 \cdot 1$ $4 \cdot 8$ $4 \cdot 8$ $0 \cdot 5$ $12 \cdot 0$ $11 \cdot 8$ 1.3 7.3 7.3 Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile) $0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0$ $0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0$ $0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0$ $0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0$ $0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0$ $0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0$ $0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0$ $0 \cdot 0 \cdot$ | Rock of Oucuo | | $(0 (\Lambda))$ | | | 52 | | | 110 | 6 | 12.6 | 200 0 | 204.2 | 0.299 | 102 4 | 102.0 |
| Back of Queue (Q), verial (95 th percentile) $I = 0$ < | Back of Queue | $(Q), \Pi$ | h (95 th percentile) | | | 20 | | | 119. | 0 | 13.0 | 290.0 | 294.3 | 32.1 | 103.4 | 102.0 |
| Incremental Delay (d 1), s/vehImage: delta del | Ducuo Storago | (Q), Ve | PO(05 th percent) | ile) | | 2.1 | | | 4.0 | | 0.5 | 12.0 | 0.00 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 7.3 |
| Incremental Delay (d 1), sivenImage: d 2 d 2) 32.7 Image: d 2 d 2) 32.7 12.3 12.3 17.3 14.9 14.9 Incremental Delay (d 2), siven0.10.10.10.20.30.5 2.0 2.1 0.1 1.1 1.1 Initial Queue Delay (d 3), siven0.0 | Uniform Doloy (| | | lie) | | 22.7 | | | 24.0 | 2 | 0.00 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Incremental Delay (d 2), sivenImage: d 2), sivenIm | Incremental De | (u +), s | | | | 0.1 | | | 03 | <u>~</u> | 9.2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.1 | 4.9 | 4.9 |
| Initial Galace Delay (0.3), sivenIII< | Initial Queue De | ay (U2 | | | | 0.1 | | | 0.3 | | 0.5 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| Level of Service (LOS)CCS4.0F4 | Initial Queue Delay (d ₃), s/veh | | | | | 32.9 | | | 2/ 4 | 3 | 0.0 | 14.5 | 14.6 | 7.6 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS 32.8 C 34.6 C 14.4 B 6.2 A Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS 11.7 B B B C | Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | JZ.0 | | | 04.0 C | , | 9.1 | 14.0 D | 14.0 D | 7.0 A | 0.0 A | 0.0 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS 52.0 C 54.0 C 14.4 B 6.2 A Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS 11.7 B B C | Approach Delay, s/yeb / LOS | | | | 20.0 | | <u> </u> | 24.0 | | | A 44 | | | A | A | A |
| Intersection Delay, S/Vell / LOS II./ B | Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 32.8 | | 44 | 34.0 | , | U | 14.4 | + | D | 0.2 P | | A |
| | Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 1 | .1 | | | 1 | | В | | | |
| Multimodal Results EB WB NB SB | Multimodal Re | Multimodal Results | | | | FB | | \\/R | | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS 2.30 B 2.30 B 1.71 B 1.71 B | Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.30 | | B | |) | В | 1.7 | | B | | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS 0.59 A 0.71 A 1.47 A 1.64 B | Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 0.59 | | А | 0.71 | | А | 1.4 | 7 | А | 1.64 | | В |

APPENDIX K

HCM AND LEVELS OF SERVICE EXPLANATION HCM DATA WORKSHEETS – WEEKDAY AM AND PM PEAK HOURS OPTION B

LEVEL OF SERVICE FOR SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

In the *Highway Capacity Manual (HCM)*, published by the Transportation Research Board, 2010, level of service for signalized intersections is defined in terms of delay, which is a measure of driver discomfort, frustration, fuel consumption, and increased travel time. The delay experienced by a motorist is made up of a number of factors that relate to control, geometrics, traffic, and incidents. Total delay is the difference between the travel time actually experienced and the reference travel time that would result during base conditions: in the absence of traffic control, in the absence of geometric delay, in the absence of incidents, and when there are no other vehicles on the road. Only the portion of total delay attributed to the control facility is quantified. This delay is called *control delay*. Control delay includes initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay.

Level of Service criteria for traffic signals are stated in terms of the average control delay per vehicle. Delay is a complex measure and is dependent on a number of variables, including the quality of progression, the cycle length, the green ratio, and the v/c ratio for the lane group in question.

| Level of Service Criteri | a for Signalized Intersections |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Level of Service | Control Delay (Sec/Veh) |
| А | ≤ 10 |
| В | > 10 and ≤ 20 |
| С | > 20 and ≤ 35 |
| D | $> 35 \text{ and} \le 55$ |
| E | > 55 and ≤ 80 |
| F | > 80 |

Level of Service (LOS) values are used to describe intersection operations with service levels varying from LOS A (free flow) to LOS F (jammed condition). The following descriptions summarize *HCM* criteria for each level of service:

LOS A describes operations with very low control delay, up to 10 seconds per vehicle. This level of service occurs when progression is extremely favorable and most vehicles arrive during the green phase. Most vehicles do not stop at all. Short cycle lengths may also contribute to low delay values.

LOS B describes operations with control delay greater than 10 and up to 20 seconds per vehicle. This level generally occurs with good progression, short cycle lengths, or both. More vehicles stop than with LOS A, causing higher levels of delay.

LOS C describes operations with control delay greater than 20 and up to 35 seconds per vehicle. These higher delays may result from fair progression, longer cycle lengths, or both. Individual cycle failures may begin to appear at this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant at this level, though many still pass through the intersection without stopping.

LOS D describes operations with control delay greater than 35 and up to 55 seconds per vehicle. At LOS D, the influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Longer delays may result from some combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, or high v/c ratios. Many vehicles stop, and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines. Individual cycle failures are noticeable.

LOS E describes operations with control delay greater than 55 and up to 80 seconds per vehicle. This level is considered by many agencies to be the limit of acceptable delay. These high delay values generally indicate poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high v/c ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences.

LOS F describes operations with control delay in excess of 80 seconds per vehicle. This level, considered to be unacceptable to most drivers, often occurs with oversaturation, that is, when arrival flow rates exceed the capacity of the lane groups. It may also occur at high v/c ratios with many individual cycle failures. Poor progression and long cycle lengths may also be major contributing factors to such delay levels.

LEVEL OF SERVICE FOR UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

In the *Highway Capacity Manual (HCM)*, published by the Transportation Research Board, 2010, level of service for unsignalized intersections is defined in terms of delay, which is a measure of driver discomfort, frustration, fuel consumption, and lost travel time. The delay experienced by a motorist is made up of a number of factors that relate to control, geometrics, traffic, and incidents. Total delay is the difference between the travel time actually experienced and the reference travel time that would result during base conditions, in the absence of incidents, control, traffic, or geometric delay. Only the portion of total delay attributed to the traffic control measures, either traffic signals or stop signs, is quantified. This delay is called *control delay*. Control delay includes initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay.

Level of Service criteria for unsignalized intersections are stated in terms of the average control delay per vehicle. The level of service is determined by the computed or measured control delay and is defined for each minor movement. Average control delay for any particular minor movement is a function of the service time for the approach and the degree of utilization. (Level of service is not defined for the intersection as a whole for two-way stop controlled intersections.)

| Level of Service Criteria f | or TWSC/AWSC Intersections |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Level of Service | Average Control Delay (Sec/Veh) |
| А | ≤ 10 |
| В | $> 10 \text{ and } \le 15$ |
| С | > 15 and ≤ 25 |
| D | > 25 and ≤ 35 |
| Е | $>$ 35 and \leq 50 |
| F | > 50 |

Level of Service (LOS) values are used to describe intersection operations with service levels varying from LOS A (free flow) to LOS F (jammed condition). The following descriptions summarize *HCM* criteria for each level of service:

LOS A describes operations with very low control delay, up to 10 seconds per vehicle.

LOS B describes operations with control delay greater than 10 and up to 15 seconds per vehicle.

LOS C describes operations with control delay greater than 15 and up to 25 seconds per vehicle.

LOS D describes operations with control delay greater than 25 and up to 35 seconds per vehicle.

LOS E describes operations with control delay greater than 35 and up to 50 seconds per vehicle.

LOS F describes operations with control delay in excess of 50 seconds per vehicle. For two-way stop controlled intersections, LOS F exists when there are insufficient gaps of suitable size to allow side-street demand to safely cross through a major-street traffic stream. This level of service is generally evident from extremely long control delays experienced by side-street traffic and by queuing on the minor-street approaches.

HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report General Information Site Information Analyst JAS Intersection Walgrove / Washington

| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Walgrove / Washington |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Culver City |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Washington Boulevard |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Walgrove Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastbound | | | | Wosth | ound | - | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | |
|---|------|-----------|--------|-------------|----|--------|------|-----|---|-------|-------|----|------------|-------|------|------|
| Approach | | Lastu | т | D | | vvesti | т | D | | NOITH | T | D | | Journ | T | D |
| Movement | U | L | 1 | К | U | L | 1 | К | U | L | 1 | ĸ | U | L | 1 | К |
| Priority | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 40 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 290 | 1180 | | | | 1107 | 164 | | | | | | 13 | | 254 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Left Only 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 315 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 290 | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 487 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 323 | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.65 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.90 | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 4.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 8.6 | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 25.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 64.4 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | С | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 4 | .9 | | | | | | | | 64 | .4 | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | I | - | |

| | | e control hepoirt | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Walgrove / Washington |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Culver City |
| Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Washington Boulevard |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Walgrove Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | | |
|---|------|---------|-------------|---|----|------|-------|-----|---|-------|-------|---|------|-------|-------|------|--|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 290 | 1204 | | | | 1131 | 164 | | | | | | 13 | | 254 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | Left Only 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 315 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 290 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 476 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 314 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.66 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.92 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 4.8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 9.1 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 26.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 70.7 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | D | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 5 | .1 | | | | | | | | | | 70.7 | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | I | | | |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

Generated: 12/1/2020 2:13:19 PM

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Walgrove / Washington |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Culver City |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Washington Boulevard |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Walgrove Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | Westk | ound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-------|--------|---|----|-------|------|-----|---|-------|-------|---|------------|------|-------|------|--|--|--|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | | | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 308 | 1290 | | | | 1191 | 174 | | | | | | 14 | | 270 | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | Left Only | | | | | | | | | 5 | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 335 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 309 | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 444 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 271 | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.14 | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 6.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13.4 | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 33.9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 138.1 | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | D | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | 6.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | 138.1 | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Walgrove / Washington |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Culver City |
| Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Washington Boulevard |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Walgrove Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | Westb | bound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | |
|---|------|-----------|--------|---|----|-------|-------|-------|---|-------|-------|---|------------|------|-------|------|--|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 308 | 1314 | | | | 1215 | 174 | | | | | | 14 | | 270 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | Left Only | | | | | | | | | | ļ | 5 | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 335 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 309 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 434 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 260 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.77 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.19 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 6.6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 14.2 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 36.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 156.3 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | E | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | 6.9 | | | | | | | 156.3 | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | - | | |

| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Walgrove / Washington | | | | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Culver City | | | | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Washington Boulevard | | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Walgrove Avenue | | | | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastbound Westbound | | | | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|---------------------|--------|------|------|---|------|-------|-------|---|------------|---|-------|------|-------|------|--|--|--|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | | | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 256 | 1153 | | | | 1156 | 82 | | | | | | 51 | | 329 | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Left | Only | | | | | | | ! | 5 | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 264 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 392 | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 534 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 323 | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.49 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.21 | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 2.7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 17.2 | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 18.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 155.5 | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | С | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 3 | .3 | | | | | | | | | | 155.5 | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | I | | | | | |

| nesi iwo way stop control teport | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | | | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Walgrove / Washington | | | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Culver City | | | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Washington Boulevard | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Walgrove Avenue | | | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound Westbound | | | | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---------|--------|------|------|---|-------|-------|-------|------------|---|---|---|------|-------|------|--|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 256 | 1158 | | | | 1163 | 82 | | | | | | 51 | | 329 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Left | Only | | | | | | | ł | 5 | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 264 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 392 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 531 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 321 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.22 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 2.7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 17.3 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 18.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 158.9 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | С | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 3 | .3 | | | | | | 158.9 | | | | | 8.9 | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | I | = | | |

| HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | | | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Walgrove / Washington | | | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Culver City | | | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Washington Boulevard | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Walgrove Avenue | | | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Future - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound Westbound | | | | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|-------|--------|------|------|---|-------|-------|---|------------|---|---|-------|------|-------|------|--|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 272 | 1258 | | | | 1281 | 87 | | | | | | 54 | | 349 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Left | Only | | | | | | | ! | 5 | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 280 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 415 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 474 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 271 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.59 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.53 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 3.8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 24.4 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 23.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 291.2 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | С | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 4 | .1 | | | | | | | | | | 291.2 | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | | | |
| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Walgrove / Washington |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Culver City |
| Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Washington Boulevard |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Walgrove Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| , | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|-------|--------|------|------|-------|-------|----|---|-------|-------|---|---|-------|-------|------|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | Westk | bound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 272 | 1263 | | | | 1288 | 87 | | | | | | 54 | | 349 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (|) | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Left | Only | | | | | | | ļ | 5 | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 280 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 415 | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 471 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 269 | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.59 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.54 | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 3.8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 24.6 | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 23.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 296.8 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | С | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 4 | .1 | | | | | | | | | | | 29 | 6.8 | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | - | |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

HCS TM TWSC Version 7.8.5 01PM - Future with Project - Option B.xtw Generated: 12/1/2020 2:24:30 PM

| | | 1103 | 7 Sig | nanze | a mt | 51360 | | 163 | unto c | Jun | Innary | y | | | | |
|-------------------|--|-------------------------------|--------|----------|----------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------|----------|------------|--------------|------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inter | secti | ion Info | ormatio | on | K | *** | ι I _a |
| Agency | lation | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | Fnain | eers | | | | Durat | tion. | h | 0.250 | | | ╡↓↓↓└ | <u>ل</u> |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | | 7 2020 | | Area | Type | د | Other | | | | ۲. ۲. |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | | Fxistir | $n_{\rm r} = \Delta M$ | | PHF | Type | , | 0 98 | | → _* -> | w∔e | *_ <u>}</u> ≁_∲ |
| Urban Street | | Lincoln Boulevard | | Analys | sis Year | 2020 | ig - 7 (W | | Analy | vsis F | Period | 1> 8.0 | 00 | ¥ 7 | | |
| Intersection | | Lincoln / Maxella | | File N | ame | 02AM | - Existi | na vi | is is | y 010 1 | onou | 11 0.0 | | | | <u>_</u> _ |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | 02/10 | | ig.nu | | | | | | | 1) 1 1 4 1 4 1 1 1 | ſ * ſ* |
| T TOJECT Descrip | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | T | R | L | | Т | R | L | T | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 76 | 80 | 196 | 183 | 3 | 39 1 | 122 | 117 | 2072 | 277 | 122 | 1827 | 59 |
| | | | | 1 | | b 116 | _ | | | | | _ | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | 245 | < <mark>∎4</mark> ¥∎ | | | E | _7 | | ļ | | rta | | |
| Cycle, s | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | ľ | 517 | * | 2 | 2 F | ₹ | | | 1 | | | ♣ 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 18.9 | 19.6 | 19.1 | 18 | 3.9 2 | 23.9 | 0.0 | | | | | 5 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.9 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 3. | 6 3 | 3.6 | 0.0 | ' | <u>ר</u> ן א | | | Y |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 2. | 5 2 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timer Peculta | | | | EDI | _ | EDT | \//D | | \//D ⁻ | т | NDI | | NDT | CDI | | ерт |
| Assigned Phase | 0 | | | EDI | | | VVD | | VVD | <u> </u> | 5 | | 2 | 301 | | 6 |
| Assigned Phase | U | | | <u> </u> | | 4 | | \rightarrow | 0 | | 10 | | 2 | 10 | <u> </u> | 0 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 9.0 | | - | 9.0 | | 25.0 | | 3.0 | 1.2 | | 4.0 |
| Charge Duration | | | | <u> </u> | | SU.U | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 25.0 | , | 25.0 | <u> </u> | 50.0 | 25.0 | | 50.0 |
| Change Period | , (Y+R | Y+R c), s vay (MAH), s | | | | 6.1 | | - | 6.1 | - | 5.9 | | 5.9 | 6.1 | _ | 5.4 |
| Max Allow Head | eadway (<i>MAH</i>), s rance Time (<i>g</i> s), s | | | <u> </u> | | 4.4 | | - | 4.3 | | 3.1 | _ | 0.0 | 3.1 | _ | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | Headway (MAH), s earance Time (g s), s | | | <u> </u> | | 14.3 | <u> </u> | _ | 10.3 | 3 | 2.0 | | | 5.3 | \rightarrow | |
| Green Extensio | rance Time ($g s$), s sion Time ($g e$), s | | | <u> </u> | | 1.0 | | _ | 0.9 | | 7.8 | | 0.0 | 0.2 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | <u> </u> | _ | 1.00 |) | 1.00 |) | | 1.00 | <u></u> | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.09 | | | 0.13 | 3 | 0.26 | 5 | | 0.00 | , | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | W | В | | _ | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | F | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | 78 | 82 | 200 | 125 | 10 | 1 12 | 24 | 119 | 2114 | 283 | 124 | 1451 | 473 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1610 | 1810 | 184 | 15 16 | 610 | 1757 | 1725 | 1610 | 1757 | 1900 | 1857 |
| Queue Service | Time (| g s), s | | 4.8 | 4.8 | 12.3 | 8.3 | 6. | 57. | .7 | 0.0 | 44.1 | 14.3 | 3.3 | 29.2 | 29.2 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 4.8 | 4.8 | 12.3 | 8.3 | 6. | 57. | .7 | 0.0 | 44.1 | 14.3 | 3.3 | 29.2 | 29.2 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.33 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 5 0.2 | 29 | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | 4:- (X) | | 333 | 349 | 533 | 263 | 26 | 8 46 | 68 | 6/6 | 1/56 | 780 | 622 | 1956 | 637 |
| Volume-to-Capa | | $\frac{100(X)}{100(X)}$ | | 0.233 | 104.4 | 0.376 | 0.476 | 120 | 10 0.2 | 200 | 72.0 | 1.204 | 0.362 | 0.200 | 0.742 | 0.742 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), IU | in (95 in percentile) | | 99.5 | 104.4 | 140.9 | 1/5 | 138 | 1.Z 14 | 41 | 13.9 | 1225. 2 | 234.3 | 02.7 | 495.7 | 511.9 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 4.0 | 4.2 | 5.6 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 6 5. | .6 | 3.0 | 49.0 | 9.4 | 2.5 | 19.7 | 20.5 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0.0 | 00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d 1), s | /veh | | 45.2 | 45.2 | 6.7 | 51.0 | 50. | .2 35 | 5.4 | 44.6 | 43.0 | 20.9 | 33.7 | 37.6 | 37.6 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 | e), s/veh | | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 90. | .3 | 0.0 | 97.6 | 1.3 | 0.1 | 2.6 | 7.6 |
| Initial Queue De | elay(d | з), 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 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| d), s/ve | eh | | 45.6 | 45.6 | 7.1 | 52.3 | 51. | .1 35 | 5.7 | 44.6 | 140.5 | 22.2 | 33.8 | 40.2 | 45.3 |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | D | D | A | D | D | | D | D | F | С | С | D | D |
| Approach Delay | y, s/veh | / LOS | | 24.2 | 2 | С | 46.1 | 1 | D | | 122. | 7 | F | 41.0 |) | D |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | eh / LOS | | | | 79 | 9.2 | | | | | | | E | | |
| Multiment | a | | | | | | | 144 | D | | | | | | 0.0 | |
| Nuttimodal Re | SUITS | 11.00 | | 0.07 | - EB | 0 | 0.07 | 7 | | | 0.00 | NB | | 0.00 | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LUS | | 2.97 | | | 2.87 | | C | | 2.32 | | В | 2.32 | | в |
| BICYCIE LOS SC | ore / LC | 72 | | 1.08 | 5 | А | 1.07 | | А | | 1.87 | | В | 1.33 |) | А |

| | | - | - 5 | | | | | | | - | | , | | | | |
|---------------------|---|-------------------------|--------|---------|-----------|----------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------|---|--------------|---------|-------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inters | ecti | ion Info | ormatio | on | 2 | 474+1 | ⊾ Ļ_ |
| Agency | | Linscott. Law & Gre | enspan | . Enain | eers | | | | Durati | ion. I | h | 0.250 | | | 4 † † † † ¢ | 4 |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | Dec 1 | 2020 | | Area 1 | Tvne | <i>د</i> | Other | | | | ₹ |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Fxisti | , <u></u> na - AM | | PHF | .,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | | 0.98 | | → _^ | w‡e | *_ } • |
| Urban Street | | Lincoln Boulevard | | Analy | sis Year | 2020 | 19 7 111 | | Analys | sis F | Period | 1> 8.0 | 0 | * ~ | | |
| Intersection | | Lincoln / Maxella | | File N | ame | 02AM | - Existi | na wi | ith Proje | ect - | Ontion | | | ┤҇─┓ | | <u>∽</u> |
| Project Description | tion | Paseo Marina - On | ion B | 1 10 14 | | 02/ 11/ | Exioti | ig w | | 501 | option | D.Xuo | | - | 4 1 4 Y 1 | ן ד ר ^{יי} |
| Trojoot Booonp | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | VB | | | NB | | Γ | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | T · | ТІ | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 76 | 80 | 196 | 192 | 3 | 39 1 | 31 | 117 | 2072 | 2 303 | 131 | 1827 | 59 |
| - | | | | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | <u>.</u> | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | 215 | | | | | 7 | | | Ĺ | _ | | _ |
| Cycle, s | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | B | 1 S.1 | - 51 | 2 | 1 | ŝ | | | | Y | ×⊢+- | ÷ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 18.9 | 19.6 | 19.1 | 18 | 3.9 2 | 3.9 | 0.0 | _ | | | | <u> </u> |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.9 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 3. | 6 3 | .6 | 0.0 | ^ | くる | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 2. | 5 2 | .5 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | - | EBT | WB | L | WBT | - | NBL | - | NBT | SBI | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 4 | | \rightarrow | 8 | _ | 5 | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 9.0 | | | 9.0 | 4 | 1.3 | | 3.0 | 1.2 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 30.0 | | $ \rightarrow $ | 25.0 | _ | 25.0 | | 50.0 | 25.0 |) : | 50.0 |
| Change Period, | ge Period, (Y+ <i>R</i> c), s Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 6.1 | | | 6.1 | | 5.9 | | 5.9 | 6.1 | | 5.4 |
| Max Allow Head | Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s ue Clearance Time (<i>q</i> s), s | | | | | 4.4 | | | 4.3 | | 3.1 | | 0.0 | 3.1 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | c Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s eue Clearance Time (<i>g</i> s), s | | | | | 14.3 | | | 10.7 | | 2.0 | | | 5.5 | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 1.0 | | | 0.9 | | 7.9 | | 0.0 | 0.2 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 | | 1.00 |) | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | e Clearance Time (<i>g</i> _s), s n Extension Time (<i>g</i> _e), s e Call Probability Dut Probability | | | | | 0.09 | | | 0.17 | | 0.27 | , | | 0.00 |) | |
| Movement Gro | un Res | sults | | | FB | | | W | R | 1 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | 1 | Т | R | 1 | Т | R | | 1 | Т | R | 1 | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |) veh/h | | 78 | . 82 | 200 | 131 | 10 | 4 134 | 4 | 119 | 2114 | 309 | 134 | 1451 | 473 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo |), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1610 | 1810 | 184 | 4 161 | 10 | 1757 | 1725 | 1610 | 1757 | 1900 | 1857 |
| Queue Service | Time (| α_s) s | | 4.8 | 4.8 | 12.3 | 87 | 6 | 7 83 | 3 | 0.0 | 44 1 | 15.9 | 3.5 | 29.2 | 29.2 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (a c), s | | 4.8 | 4.8 | 12.3 | 8.7 | 6.7 | 7 8.3 | 3 | 0.0 | 44.1 | 15.9 | 3.5 | 29.2 | 29.2 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | cc (g c), c | _ | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.33 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 5 0.2 | 29 | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 333 | 349 | 533 | 263 | 26 | 8 46 | 8 | 676 | 1756 | 780 | 622 | 1956 | 637 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | atio (X) | | 0.233 | 0.234 | 0.376 | 0.499 | 0.39 | 90 0.28 | 86 | 0.177 | 1.204 | 0.396 | 0.215 | 0.742 | 0.742 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft | /In (95 th percentile) |) | 99.3 | 104.4 | 140.9 | 184.5 | 143 | .7 152 | 2.3 | 73.9 | 1225. | 256 | 67.5 | 493.7 | 511.9 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), v | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 4.0 | 4.2 | 5.6 | 7.4 | 5.7 | 7 6.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 49.0 | 10.2 | 2.7 | 19.7 | 20.5 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | tile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | | 45.2 | 45.2 | 6.7 | 51.2 | 50. | 3 35. | .7 | 44.6 | 43.0 | 21.4 | 33.8 | 37.6 | 37.6 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 | e), s/veh | | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 9 0.3 | 3 | 0.0 | 97.6 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 2.6 | 7.6 |
| Initial Queue De | elay(d | з), 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 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| d), s/v | eh | | 45.6 | 45.6 | 7.1 | 52.6 | 51. | 2 36. | .0 | 44.6 | 140.5 | 22.9 | 33.9 | 40.2 | 45.3 |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | D | D | A | D | D | D | | D | F | С | С | D | D |
| Approach Delay | y, s/veh | /LOS | | 24.2 | 2 | С | 46.2 | 2 | D | | 121. | 7 | F | 41.0 |) | D |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | eh / LOS | | | | 78 | 3.7 | | | | | | | E | | |
| Multimedal D | oulte | | | | FD | | | 10.0 | D | | | NID | | | 00 | |
| Nuttimodal Re | SUITS | /1.02 | | 0.07 | - EB | <u> </u> | 0.07 | 7 | | - | 0.00 | NB | P | 0.00 | SB | |
| Pieuestrian LOS | | | | 2.9 | | ^ | 2.01 | \rightarrow | | \rightarrow | 2.32 | - | D | 2.32 | - | |
| Dicycle LUS SC | UIE / LC | | | 1.08 | , c | А | 1.10 | , | A | | 1.89 | | D | 1.34 | | А |

| | | 1100 | i olg | nanze | a mi | 61366 | | 103 | unts c | Jun | Innary | y | | | | |
|-------------------|--|-------------------------------|--------|---------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|----------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| General Inforn | nation | | | | | | | | Inters | secti | ion Info | ormatio | on | K | 4741 | ι I _a |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | Engine | ers | | | | Durat | tion. | h | 0.250 | | | ╡↓↓↓└ | <u>ل</u> |
| Analyst | | JAS | onopun | Analys | sis Date | | 7 2020 | | Area | Type | د | Other | | - - 1 - 4 | | <u>گ</u> |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | - AM | | PHF | 1990 | , | 0.98 | | → _* * → | w∔e | *_ <u>}</u> ≁_∲ |
| Urban Street | | Lincoln Boulevard | | Analys | sis Year | 2026 | 5 7 11 | | Analy | vsis F | Period | 1> 8.0 | 0 | * ~ | | |
| Intersection | | Lincoln / Maxella | | File Na | ame | 02AM | - Future | | , and y | ,010 1 | onou | 11 0.0 | | ┤҇─┓ | | <u>~</u> ⊂ |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | 02/ (1/1 | - i uture | J.Auc | , | | | | | - | 1 | ۲ ۲ ۲ |
| r reject Becchip | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | ۷ | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | /eh/h | | | 81 | 85 | 208 | 262 | 4 | 11 1 | 135 | 124 | 2213 | 304 | 132 | 1964 | 63 |
| | | | | | b 111 | | | | | | _ | _ | | | | 1 |
| Signal Informa | ation | | | | 215 | s etter | | | Ę | 7 | | Į | L | -+- | | _ |
| Cycle, s | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | ľ | 1 <u>51</u> | * 1 2 SA | 7 | - ^e F | ₹ | | | 1 | | * 📑 - | € ₄ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 18.9 | 19.6 | 19.1 | 18 | 8.9 2 | 23.9 | 0.0 | | | | - | <u> </u> |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.9 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 3. | .6 3 | 3.6 | 0.0 | ' | く 4 | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 2. | .5 2 | 2.5 | 0.0 | ↓ | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timer Desults | | | | | | EDT | | | | T I | | | NDT | 0.01 | | ODT |
| Assigned Dhas | | | | EBI | | EBI | VVB | | VVB | - | NBL | - | NBI | SBL | - | 5B1 |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 4 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 0 | - | 2 | | 2 | 10 | | 0 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 9.0 | | - | 9.0 | | 25.0 | | 3.0 | 1.2 | | 4.0 |
| Change Duration | | (<i>HAH</i>) s | | | | SU.U | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 25.0 | , I | 25.0 | | 50.0 | 25.0 | , ; | 50.0 |
| Change Period | , (Y+R | Y+R c), s vay (MAH), s | | | | 0.1 | | - | 0.1 | - | 5.9 | | 5.9 | 0.1 | | 5.4 |
| Max Allow Heat | dway (<i>1</i> | | | | 4.4 | | - | 4.3 | _ | 3.1 | | 0.0 | 3.1 | | 0.0 | |
| Queue Clearan | Headway (MAH), s earance Time (g_s), s ension Time (g_s), s | | | | | 15.2 | | | 14.2 | <u> </u> | 2.0 | | 0.0 | 5.6 | | 0.0 |
| Green Extensio | ance Time (<i>g</i> _s), s sion Time (<i>g</i> _e), s | | | | + | 1.0 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 0.8 | | 8.6 | | 0.0 | 0.2 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | | | | | 1.00 | <u> </u> | | 1.00 | - | 1.00 | | | 1.00 | , | | |
| Max Out Proba | DIIITY | | | | | 0.15 | | | 0.85 |) | 0.32 | | | 0.00 |) | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | W | В | Т | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | F | र | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v | ′), veh/h | | 83 | 87 | 212 | 179 | 13 | 0 13 | 38 | 127 | 2258 | 310 | 135 | 1560 | 508 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1610 | 1810 | 183 | 39 16 | 10 | 1757 | 1725 | 1610 | 1757 | 1900 | 1858 |
| Queue Service | Time (| g s), s | | 5.1 | 5.1 | 13.2 | 12.2 | 8. | 5 8. | .6 | 0.0 | 44.1 | 16.0 | 3.6 | 32.2 | 32.2 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 5.1 | 5.1 | 13.2 | 12.2 | 8. | 58. | .6 | 0.0 | 44.1 | 16.0 | 3.6 | 32.2 | 32.2 |
| Green Ratio (g | ı/C) | | | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.33 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 5 0.2 | 29 | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 333 | 349 | 533 | 263 | 26 | 7 46 | 68 | 660 | 1756 | 780 | 622 | 1956 | 637 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | atio (X) | | 0.248 | 0.248 | 0.399 | 0.681 | 0.4 | 87 0.2 | 294 | 0.192 | 1.286 | 0.398 | 0.217 | 0.798 | 0.798 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft | /In (95 th percentile) | | 106.2 | 111.3 | 150.2 | 254.3 | 182 | 2.3 157 | 7.5 | 78.4 | 1459. 9 | 257 | 68 | 540.5 | 564.8 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), v | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 4.2 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 10.2 | 7.3 | 3 6. | .3 | 3.1 | 58.4 | 10.3 | 2.7 | 21.6 | 22.6 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay | (d 1), s | /veh | | 45.4 | 45.4 | 6.8 | 52.7 | 51. | .1 35 | 5.8 | 46.0 | 43.0 | 21.4 | 33.8 | 38.6 | 38.6 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 | e), s/veh | | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 7.0 | 1.4 | 4 0. | .3 | 0.1 | 133.2 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 3.5 | 10.0 |
| Initial Queue De | elay(d | з), 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 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| d), s/v | eh | | 45.8 | 45.7 | 7.2 | 59.6 | 52. | .5 36 | 6.1 | 46.0 | 176.2 | 22.9 | 33.9 | 42.1 | 48.7 |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | D | D | A | Е | D | | 2 | D | F | С | С | D | D |
| Approach Delay | y, s/veh | /LOS | | 24.3 | 3 | С | 50.3 | 3 | D | | 152.4 | 4 | F | 43.1 | | D |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | eh / LOS | | | | 93 | 3.9 | | | | | | | F | | |
| Multimodal De | eulte | | | | ED | | | \^/ | B | | | NP | | | SD | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /1.05 | | 2.07 | 7 | C | 2.87 | 7 | | - | 2 3 3 | | B | 2 20 | | B |
| Ricycle I OS Sc | | | | 2.97 | , | Δ | 1.07 | 2 | ^ | \rightarrow | 1.07 | | B | 1 10 | - | Δ |
| Dicycle LOS SC | | | | 1.12 | - | Л | 1.20 | , | A | | 1.97 | | U | 1.40 | , | Λ |

| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Interse | ction | Info | ormatic | on | k | ** | د ل <u>د</u> |
|----------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------|----------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|--------|--------------|---------|---------|---------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|---|
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | eers | | | | Duratio | n, h | | 0.250 | | 1 | 4 + + + / | <u>د</u> |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | Dec 1 | , 2020 | | Area T | /pe | | Other | | 4 | | 4 |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e with ct - AM | | PHF | | | 0.98 | | 4 \ \ \ \ \ | w ∲ E | 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 |
| Urban Street | | Lincoln Boulevard | | Analys | sis Year | 2026 | | | Analys | is Peri | od | 1> 8:0 | 00 | | | ~ |
| Intersection | | Lincoln / Maxella | | File Na | ame | 02AM | - Future | e with | Project | - Opti | on E | 3.xus | | | * | ۲ ۲ (۲ |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Г Б | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 81 | 85 | 208 | 271 | 4 | 1 14 | 4 1 | 24 | 2213 | 330 | 141 | 1964 | 63 |
| | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | • | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | 215 | d ulli a i | | | | | | l | Ĺ | | | _ |
| Cycle, s | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | ľ | l Str | - 51 | 2 | - Æ | | | | | Y | Ľr;- | - € ₄ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 18.9 | 19.6 | 19.1 | 18 | 3.9 23 | .9 (| 0.0 | | | - | • | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.9 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 6 3. | 6 (| 0.0 | | $\langle \mathbf{A} \rangle$ | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 2. | 5 2. | 5 (| 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | WBT | | NBL | | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | Э | | | | | 4 | | | 8 | | 5 | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 9.0 | | | 9.0 | | 1.3 | | 3.0 | 1.2 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 30.0 | | | 25.0 | 2 | 25.0 | | 50.0 | 25.0 |) ! | 50.0 |
| Change Period, | ange Period, (Y+R c), s | | | | | 6.1 | | | 6.1 | | 5.9 | | 5.9 | 6.1 | | 5.4 |
| Max Allow Head | x Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 4.4 | | | 4.3 | | 3.1 | | 0.0 | 3.1 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | x Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s leue Clearance Time (<i>g s</i>), s | | | | | 15.2 | | | 14.7 | | 2.0 | | | 5.8 | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 1.0 | | | 0.8 | | 8.6 | | 0.0 | 0.2 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 | · | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.15 | | | 1.00 | (| 0.33 | | | 0.00 |) | |
| Movement Gro | un Ros | ulte | | | EB | | | \//F | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | | Т | R | | T | , R | | | Т | R | | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 1 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | | | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow | Poto (v |) voh/h | | 1 | 97 | 212 | 195 | 123 | 1/7 | 10 | ,)7 | 2 | 12 | 144 | 1560 | 508 |
| Adjusted Satura | tion Ele |), ven/n w Rate (s) veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1000 | 1610 | 1810 | 183 | 8 161 | 17 | 57 | 1725 | 1610 | 1757 | 1000 | 1858 |
| | | | 1 | 5 1 | 5 1 | 12.2 | 1010 | 9 7 | 7 03 | | 0 | 1125 | 17.7 | 2.9 | 32.2 | 22.2 |
| | | g s , s | | 5.1 | 5.1 | 13.2 | 12.7 | 8.7 | 9.3 7 Q 3 | 0. | 0 | 44.1 | 17.7 | 3.0 | 32.2 | 32.2 |
| Green Ratio (a | | c mile (g ;), 3 | | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.33 | 0.15 | 0.7 | 5 0.20 | | 28 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Capacity (c) w | /0) /eh/h | | | 333 | 349 | 533 | 263 | 267 | 7 468 | 66 | 50 | 1756 | 780 | 622 | 1956 | 637 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | tio (X) | | 0.248 | 0.248 | 0.399 | 0 704 | 0.49 | 0.31 | 4 0 1 | 92 | 1 286 | 0.432 | 0.231 | 0 798 | 0 798 |
| Back of Queue | (Ω) ft/ | (In (95 th percentile) | | 106.2 | 111.3 | 150.2 | 264.5 | 187 | 7 169 | 78 | 4 | 1459 | 279.5 | 72.9 | 540.5 | 564.8 |
| Duck of Queue | (| | | 100.2 | 111.0 | 100.2 | 204.0 | | | 10 | | 9 | 210.0 | 12.0 | 040.0 | 004.0 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 4.2 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 10.6 | 7.5 | 5 6.8 | 3. | 1 | 58.4 | 11.2 | 2.9 | 21.6 | 22.6 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0.00 | 0.0 | 00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d 1), si | /veh | | 45.4 | 45.4 | 6.8 | 52.9 | 51. | 2 36.0 | 46 | .0 | 43.0 | 21.8 | 33.9 | 38.6 | 38.6 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 8.2 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 0. | 1 | 133.2 | 1.7 | 0.1 | 3.5 | 10.0 |
| Initial Queue De | elay (<i>d</i> | з), 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/ve | eh | | 45.8 | 45.7 | 7.2 | 61.1 | 52. | 6 36.4 | 46 | .0 | 176.2 | 23.6 | 34.0 | 42.1 | 48.7 |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | D | D | Α | Е | D | D | C |) | F | С | С | D | D |
| Approach Delay | /, s/veh | /LOS | | 24.3 | 3 | С | 50.9 |) | D | 1 | 51.2 | 2 | F | 43.1 | | D |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | h / LOS | | | | 93 | 3.4 | | | | | | | F | | |
| Multi | | | | | 50 | | | | _ | | | NID | | | 05 | |
| Nultimodal Re | SUITS | 11.00 | | 0.07 | EB | 0 | 0.07 | | 5 | | 2.00 | NB | P | 0.07 | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LUS | | 2.97 | | | 2.87 | | C A | | 2.32 | | В | 2.32 | <u> </u> | В |
| BICYCIE LOS SC | ore / LC | 15 | | 1.12 | <u> </u> | A | 1.26 |) | A | | 1.98 | | В | 1.40 | | A |

 $\label{eq:copyright} Copyright @ 2020 \ University \ of \ Florida, \ All \ Rights \ Reserved.$

| | | 1103 | / Sig | nanze | u mu | 61360 | | 163 | untə | Juli | mai | y | | | | |
|---------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|----------|----------|---------|----------|-------|----------|---------|---|---------|-------|-----------|----------------------|---------------|
| O an a sel la fa se | 4! | | | | | | | | Inte | 4 | | | | T D | | T. |
| General Inforn | hation | | | <u> </u> | | | | | Inte | ersect | | ormatio | on | - 1 | ╡↓↓↓└ | Ļ |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Dur | ration, | n | 0.250 | | | | R |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | Aug 2 | 7, 2020 | | Are | ea Type | e | Other | • | ×× | | ~ _ |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existin | ng - PM | | PHI | F | | 0.98 | | | w+e 8 | |
| Urban Street | | Lincoln Boulevard | | Analys | sis Year | 2020 | | | Ana | alysis | Period | 1> 17 | :00 | ار الح | | 1 |
| Intersection | | Lincoln / Maxella | | File Na | ame | 02PM | - Existi | ng.xı | ls | | | | | | <u>11111</u> | 7 |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | শ 1 প শ 1 | <u>" "</u> |
| Domand Inform | nation | | | | ED | | | V | | | <u>, </u> | ND | | | CD. | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | | Т | R | | V | т | R | 1 | | R | 1 1 | Т | R |
| Demand (v) v | oh/h | | | 86 | 65 | 103 | 321 | | 1 | 102 | 10/ | 1705 | 346 | 104 | 2060 | 118 |
| Demand (V), V | en/n | | | 00 | 05 | 105 | 521 | | 0 | 192 | 134 | 1790 | 540 | 104 | 2000 | 110 |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | UL. | | | | 3 | | | | 1 | | | |
| Cvcle, s | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | 1 | 12 V 3 | | | _ | F | B. | | | | V | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | | 40.0 | | | | 7 | | | _ | 1 | 2 | 3 | Y 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult, Gap E/W | On | Green | 18.9 | 19.6 | 19.1 | 18 | 3.9 6 | 23.9 | 0.0 | _ | | | | \rightarrow |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult, Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 2 | 5 | 2.5 | 0.0 | -7 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | - | | 1 | | | Щ | | 1 - | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | W | /BT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phas | e | | | | | 4 | | | 8 | 8 | 5 | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 9.0 | | | 9. | .0 | 1.3 | | 3.0 | 1.2 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | . S | | | | | 30.0 | | | 25 | 5.0 | 25.0 | | 50.0 | 25.0 |) : | 50.0 |
| Change Period | . (Y+R) | c). S | , s \H), s | | | 6.1 | | | 6. | .1 | 5.9 | | 5.9 | 6.1 | | 5.4 |
| Max Allow Hea | dwav (/ | иАН), s | , s AH), s a s) s | | | 4.3 | | | 4. | .3 | 3.1 | | 0.0 | 3.1 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (q s), S | | | 8.1 | | - | 17 | 7.3 | 3.6 | | | 4.8 | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | 0.8 | | | 0. | .5 | 6.7 | | 0.0 | 0.2 | | 0.0 | |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.0 | 00 | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | 1.0 | 00 | 0.25 | | | 0.00 | , | |
| | , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | - | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate(<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | 88 | 66 | 105 | 219 | 20 | 8 | 196 | 198 | 1832 | 353 | 106 | 1683 | 540 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1610 | 1810 | 185 | 53 1 | 1610 | 1757 | 1725 | 1610 | 1757 | 1900 | 1827 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), s | | 5.4 | 3.8 | 6.1 | 15.3 | 14. | .1 1 | 12.8 | 1.6 | 44.1 | 18.8 | 2.8 | 35.8 | 35.8 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 5.4 | 3.8 | 6.1 | 15.3 | 14. | .1 1 | 12.8 | 1.6 | 44.1 | 18.8 | 2.8 | 35.8 | 35.8 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.33 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 5 (| 0.29 | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 333 | 349 | 533 | 263 | 26 | 9 4 | 468 | 645 | 1756 | 780 | 622 | 1956 | 627 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | tio(X) | | 0.264 | 0.190 | 0.197 | 0.834 | 0.7 | 72 0 |).418 | 0.307 | 1.043 | 0.452 | 0.171 | 0.861 | 0.861 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | 113.1 | 84 | 71.9 | 332.5 | 302 | .4 2 | 223.3 | 122.9 | 814 | 293.7 | 53.2 | 598.6 | 627.2 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 4.5 | 3.4 | 2.9 | 13.3 | 12. | .1 | 8.9 | 4.9 | 32.6 | 11.7 | 2.1 | 23.9 | 25.1 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay | (d 1), s | /veh | | 45.5 | 44.9 | 6.3 | 54.0 | 53. | .5 3 | 37.2 | 47.1 | 43.0 | 22.1 | 33.6 | 39.8 | 39.8 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 20.1 | 12. | .9 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 33.7 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 14.5 |
| Initial Queue D | elay (<i>d</i> | з), 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 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| d), s/ve | eh | | 45.9 | 45.1 | 6.5 | 74.1 | 66. | .4 3 | 37.8 | 47.2 | 76.7 | 24.0 | 33.6 | 45.0 | 54.3 |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | D | D | A | E | E | | D | D | F | С | С | D | D |
| Approach Dela | y, s/veh | /LOS | | 29.7 | 7 | С | 60.1 | | E | E | 66.4 | | E | 46.7 | | D |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | h / LOS | | | | 55 | 5.8 | | | | | | | E | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | // 00 | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | _ | | SB | _ |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LOS | | 2.97 | | C | 2.87 | | C | ; | 2.32 | | В | 2.32 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS So | ore / LC |)S | | 0.92 | 2 | A | 1.52 | 2 | E | В | 1.80 | | В | 1.45 | | A |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS[™] Streets Version 7.8.5

| | | | | | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|--------|------------|----------|---------------------|----------|---------------|--------------|------------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inters | sect | ion Info | ormatio | on | 2 | * 7 4 1 | بد لي |
| Agency | | Linscott. Law & Gre | enspan | . Engine | ers | | | | Durat | tion. | h | 0.250 | | | 4 + + + / | Ļ. |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | Dec 1 | 2020 | | Area | Type | <i>.</i> . | Other | | | | <i>د</i> لا |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existin | ng with | | PHF | .) P - | - | 0.98 | | <u>ן</u> ↓ ל | w∔s | ע קיין קיין קיין קיין |
| Urban Street | | Lincoln Boulevard | | Analys | sis Year | 2020 | | | Analy | ysis F | Period | 1> 17 | :00 | | 5 5 6 6 6 | ¥ م |
| Intersection | | Lincoln / Maxella | | File Na | ame | 02PM | - Existi | ng wi | th Proj | ject - | Option | B.xus | | ň | ব ↑ ব্দম্প 1 | × ا ^م |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L L | | г | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 86 | 65 | 103 | 322 | 9 | 8 1 | 193 | 194 | 1795 | 354 | 107 | 2060 | 118 |
| | | | | | E III | F 112 | _ | | | | _ | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | - | | 215 | < <mark>∠↓</mark> a | | | | 7 | | ļ | L | -+- | | _ |
| Cycle, s | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | ľ | 51 | * | 2 | ۶F | ₹ | | | 1 | | Ĕ ┌─ ⋛─ | ♣ 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 18.9 | 19.6 | 19.1 | 18 | 3.9 2 | 23.9 | 0.0 | | | | - | <u> </u> |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.9 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 3. | 63 | 3.6 | 0.0 | ^ | く IA | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 2. | 5 2 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timer Results | | | | FBI | | FBT | WB | | WB1 | т | NBI | | NBT | SBI | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | <u>0</u> | | | | - | 4 | | - | 8 | <u> </u> | 5 | - | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | <u> </u> | | | <u> </u> | | 9.0 | | \rightarrow | 9.0 | - | 13 | | 20 | 12 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | | | | | | 30.0 | - | - | 25.0 | | 25.0 | | 50.0 | 25.0 | | 50.0 |
| Change Period | (V+P) | | | <u> </u> | | 6 1 | | - | 6.1 | , I | 5.0 | | 5.0 | 6.1 | | 5 1 |
| Max Allow Hear | , (7 .7. (A | μ(), 3 ΜΔΗ) s | | | - | 0.1 1 3 | - | - | / 3 | - | 3.1 | - | 0.0 | 3.1 | | 0.0 |
| | co Timo | (α_{r}) s | | | | 4.J Q 1 | | - | 17 / | 1 | 3.1 | | 0.0 | 1.0 | | 0.0 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | $(g_s), s$ | | | | 0.8 | | | 0.5 | - | 6.7 | | 0.0 | 4.3 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | (3,),- | | | | 1.00 | | - | 1.00 |) | 1.00 | | | 1.00 | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | 1.00 |) | 0.25 | | | 0.00 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | F | २ | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | | 88 | 66 | 105 | 220 | 208 | 3 19 | 97 | 198 | 1832 | 361 | 109 | 1683 | 540 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1610 | 1810 | 185 | 3 16 | 510 N 0 | 1757 | 1725 | 1610 | 1757 | 1900 | 1827 |
| | lime (g | js), S e Time (a.c.) s | | 5.4 5.4 | 3.8 | 0.1 6.1 | 15.4 | 14. | 1 12 1 12 | 2.8 | 1.0 | 44.1 | 19.4 10.4 | 2.9 | 35.8 | 35.8 |
| Green Ratio (a | | e fille (<i>g c</i>), s | | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.1 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 5 0 3 | 20 | 0.28 | 0.3/ | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Capacity (c) y | /O) /eh/h | | | 333 | 349 | 533 | 263 | 269 | a 46 | 38 | 645 | 1756 | 780 | 622 | 1956 | 627 |
| Volume-to-Can | acity Ra | tio (X) | _ | 0.264 | 0 1 9 0 | 0 197 | 0.837 | 0.77 | 74 0 4 | 121 | 0 307 | 1 043 | 0.463 | 0.176 | 0.861 | 0.861 |
| Back of Queue | (Ω) ft/ | (In (95 th percentile) | | 113 1 | 84 | 71 9 | 334 | 303 | 1 224 | 44 | 122.9 | 814 | 301.1 | 54.7 | 598.6 | 627.2 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), 10 | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 4.5 | 3.4 | 2.9 | 13.4 | 12. | 1 9. | .0 | 4.9 | 32.6 | 12.0 | 2.2 | 23.9 | 25.1 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0.0 | 00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d 1), si | /veh | | 45.5 | 44.9 | 6.3 | 54.0 | 53. | 5 37 | 7.3 | 47.1 | 43.0 | 22.3 | 33.6 | 39.8 | 39.8 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 20.4 | 13. | 1 0. | .6 | 0.1 | 33.7 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 14.5 |
| Initial Queue De | elay (<i>d</i> | з), 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 (| <i>d</i>), s/ve | eh | | 45.9 | 45.1 | 6.5 | 74.5 | 66. | 6 37 | 7.9 | 47.2 | 76.7 | 24.2 | 33.6 | 45.0 | 54.3 |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | D | D | A | E | E | | 2 | D | F | С | С | D | D |
| Approach Delay | , s/veh | /LOS | | 29.7 | / | С | 60.3 | 3 | Е | | 66.3 | | Е | 46.6 | | D |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | eh / LOS | | | | 55 | 5.8 | | | | | | | E | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | W | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian I OS | S Score | / LOS | | 2.97 | , | С | 2.87 | 7 | С | | 2.32 | | В | 2.32 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 0.92 | 2 | А | 1.52 | 2 | В | | 1.80 | | В | 1.45 | | А |

| | nee | r org | nanzo | a iii | .01300 | | 100 | unt | Jour | innai j | , | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--------|---------|---------|--------|--------------------|-------|-----------------|----------------|----------|--------|-------|-------|------------|---------------|
| General Information | | | | | | | | In | torsoct | tion Inf | ormati | 20 | | 4 | × l <u>.</u> |
| | Lincott Low & Gro | onenan | Engin | ore | | | | | uration | b | 0.250 | | | 4 ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ | L. |
| Agency | | enspan | | | Aug 2 | 7 2020 | | | | <u></u> | Othou | , | 1 | | ۲_ ۲_ |
| Analyst | JAS City of Los Annalas | | Times | | | 7,2020 | | | еатур | e | | | | wî e | ₹ }_ |
| Jurisaiction | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | erioa | Future | 9 - PIVI | | Pr | | Daniad | 0.98 | | | | × * * |
| Urban Street | | | Analys | sis rea | r 2026 | E. A. | | Ar | naiysis | Period | > / | :00 | | | к. К. |
| | Lincoln / Maxella | | File Na | ame | 02PM | - Future | e.xus | S | | | | | _ | <u> </u> | ſ |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 1 44 1 1 | * |
| Demand Information | 1 | | | EB | | | V | NB | | T | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Movement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), veh/h | | | 91 | 69 | 109 | 382 | 1 | 04 | 209 | 206 | 200 | 1 411 | 116 | 2241 | 125 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| Signal Information | | | | 215 | | | Τ | 2 | | | | Ĺ | | | |
| Cycle, s 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | P | - R. | . N S 10 | 2 | Ù | . ¥ | | | | Ψ | | ÷ |
| Offset, s 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 18.0 | 19.6 | 10 1 | 1 | <u>/</u> 8 0 | ² 3 | 0.0 | _ | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| Uncoordinated No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.9 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 3 | .6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | | < 🛛 | | | \rightarrow |
| Force Mode Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 2 | .5 | 2.5 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | ۷ | VBT | NBL | - | NBT | SBI | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | | | | | 4 | | | | 8 | 5 | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | 9.0 | | | ę | 9.0 | 1.3 | | 3.0 | 1.2 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | | | | | 30.0 | | | 2 | 25.0 | 25.0 | | 50.0 | 25.0 |) ; | 50.0 |
| Change Period, (Y+ | ₹ c), s | | | 6.1 | | | (| 6.1 | 5.9 | | 5.9 | 6.1 | | 5.4 | |
| Max Allow Headway | ү+к с), s ay (<i>MAH</i>), s Time (g s), s | | | | 4.3 | | | 4 | 4.3 | 3.1 | | 0.0 | 3.1 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearance Tin | ay (<i>MAH</i>), s Time (<i>g</i> s), s | | | | 8.5 | | | 2 | 20.7 | 4.5 | | | 5.1 | | |
| Green Extension Time | Time (g s), s Fime (g e), s | | | | 0.9 | | | (| 0.0 | 7.5 | | 0.0 | 0.2 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability | Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s arance Time (<i>g</i> _s), s ension Time (<i>g</i> _e), s Probability | | | | 1.00 | | | 1 | .00 | 1.00 | , | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Probability | | | | | 0.00 | | | 1 | .00 | 0.37 | · | | 0.00 |) | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Group Re | esults | | | EB | | | W | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Movement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | - | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Movement | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate (| <i>v</i>), veh/h | | 93 | 70 | 111 | 261 | 23 | 35 | 213 | 210 | 2042 | 419 | 118 | 1827 | 587 |
| Adjusted Saturation F | low Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1610 | 1810 | 18 | 50 | 1610 | 1757 | 1725 | 1610 | 1757 | 1900 | 1829 |
| Queue Service Time | (gs), s | | 5.7 | 4.1 | 6.5 | 18.7 | 16 | .1 | 14.1 | 2.5 | 44.1 | 23.6 | 3.1 | 40.3 | 40.4 |
| Cycle Queue Clearan | ice Time (<i>g ₀</i>), s | | 5.7 | 4.1 | 6.5 | 18.7 | 16 | .1 | 14.1 | 2.5 | 44.1 | 23.6 | 3.1 | 40.3 | 40.4 |
| Green Ratio (g/C) | | | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.33 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 15 | 0.29 | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Capacity (c), veh/h | | | 333 | 349 | 533 | 263 | 26 | 69 | 468 | 632 | 1756 | 780 | 622 | 1956 | 627 |
| Volume-to-Capacity F | Ratio (X) | | 0.279 | 0.202 | 0.209 | 0.993 | 0.8 | 73 | 0.456 | 0.333 | 1.163 | 0.537 | 0.190 | 0.934 | 0.936 |
| Back of Queue (Q), | ft/ln (95 th percentile) |) | 120 | 89.5 | 76.2 | 457.8 | 363 | 3.3 | 241.4 | 130.4 | 1111.2 | 355.3 | 59.5 | 684.3 | 732.8 |
| Back of Queue (Q), | veh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 4.8 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 18.3 | 14 | .5 | 9.7 | 5.2 | 44.4 | 14.2 | 2.4 | 27.4 | 29.3 |
| Queue Storage Ratio | (RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d 1), | s/ven | | 45.6 | 45.0 | 6.3 | 55.5 | 54 | .4 | 31.1 | 47.7 | 43.0 | 23.3 | 33.7 | 41.3 | 41.3 |
| Incremental Delay (a | 2), s/ven | | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 53.4 | 25 | .4 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 80.0 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 9.8 | 23.3 |
| | u 3), s/ven | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0. | U | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/ | ven | | 46.1 | 45.2 | 6.5 | 108.8 | /9 | .8 | 38.4 | 47.8 | 123.0 | 26.0 | 33.7 | 51.1 | 64.6 |
| Level of Service (LOS | 5) / 00 | | D | | A | F | Ē | : | 0 | D | F | | C | U | E |
| Approach Delay, s/ve | n/LOS | | 29.8 | 5 | C | 78.0 | ו | | E | 101.8 | 5 | F | 53.4 | | D |
| Intersection Delay, s/ | /en / LOS | | | | 76 | 5.1 | | | | | | | E | | |
| Multimodal Results | | | | FR | | | \٨/ | /B | | | NR | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS Scor | e/10S | | 2 07 | , | C | 2.87 | 7 | | С | 2 32 | | В | 2 32 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Score / I | _OS | | 0.94 | | A | 1.66 | 3 | | B | 1.96 | | B | 1.53 | 3 | B |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS[™] Streets Version 7.8.5

| | | | Ū | | | | | | | | - | , | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|--------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------|------------------|----------|------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Int | tersect | ion Infe | ormatio | on | 2 | *** | ⊾ Ļ_ |
| Agency | | Linscott. Law & Gre | enspan | . Engine | eers | | | | Du | uration. | h | 0.250 | | | 41117 | 4 |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | Dec 1 | 2020 | | Ar | ea Typ | е | Other | | | | بر 4 |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | with | | PH | HF | | 0.98 | | <u>↓</u> ↓ ↓ ↓ | W ^N E 8 | *_ <u>↓</u> *_ ↓ |
| Urban Streat | | Lincoln Boulovard | | Apolyc | | Projec | t - PM | | ۸n | | Poriod | 1 > 17 | .00 | | | ۲. ۲ |
| Interportion | | | | File N | | | Eutur | o varitk | | aiysis voigot | Ontion I | | .00 | - 1 | <u> </u> | 7 |
| Braiget Desering | tion | LINCOIT / Maxella | ion P | File ING | ame | | - Future | | IFI | ojeci - | Option | J.XuS | | - | 4 1 4 Y I | <u>• (*</u> |
| Project Descrip | uon | Paseo Marina - Opt | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | ٧B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | T | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 91 | 69 | 109 | 383 | 1 | 04 | 210 | 206 | 2001 | 419 | 119 | 2241 | 125 |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | . <u> </u> | 5 111 | F 113 | - | | | | - | | ↑ | 1 | 1 | |
| | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 242 | | 8 | в | Ě | 12 | | ļ | ୢ⊢ | sta | | ~ |
| Offect o | 130.0 | Reference Philase | End | | | - 5 1 | ~ ^ 1 | 7 | 2 | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult Con E/W | On | Green | 18.9 | 19.6 | 19.1 | 18 | 3.9 | 23.9 | 0.0 | _ | | | | A |
| Earco Modo | Eivod | Simult. Gap L/W | On | Pod | 3.9 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 3. | 6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | — — |) ₌ ►₁ | | 7 | ¥ . |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Rea | Z.Z | 1.0 | 2.3 | Ζ. | 5 | 2.5 | 0.0 | • | 5 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| Timer Results | _ | | | EBI | - | EBT | WB | L | V | VBT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 4 | | | | 8 | 5 | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 9.0 | | | ç | 9.0 | 1.3 | | 3.0 | 1.2 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 30.0 | | | 2 | 5.0 | 25.0 | , | 50.0 | 25.0 |) : | 50.0 |
| Change Period. | (Y+R) | c). S | | | | 6.1 | | \rightarrow | 6 | 6.1 | 5.9 | | 5.9 | 6.1 | | 5.4 |
| Max Allow Head | dwav (/ | MAH). s | | | | 4.3 | | | 4 | 4.3 | 3.1 | | 0.0 | 3.1 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | (q_s) , s | | | | 8.5 | | - | 2 | 0.8 | 4.5 | | | 5.2 | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 0.9 | | | C | 0.0 | 7.5 | | 0.0 | 0.2 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1 | .00 | 1.00 |) | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Probal | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | 1 | .00 | 0.38 | ; | | 0.00 |) | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | 93 | 70 | 111 | 262 | 23 | 5 | 214 | 210 | 2042 | 428 | 121 | 1827 | 587 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1610 | 1810 | 185 | 50 | 1610 | 1757 | 1725 | 1610 | 1757 | 1900 | 1829 |
| Queue Service | Time(g | g s), s | | 5.7 | 4.1 | 6.5 | 18.8 | 16. | 2 | 14.2 | 2.5 | 44.1 | 24.2 | 3.2 | 40.3 | 40.4 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 5.7 | 4.1 | 6.5 | 18.8 | 16. | 2 | 14.2 | 2.5 | 44.1 | 24.2 | 3.2 | 40.3 | 40.4 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.33 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 5 | 0.29 | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Capacity (c), v | eh/h | | | 333 | 349 | 533 | 263 | 26 | 9 | 468 | 632 | 1/56 | 780 | 622 | 1956 | 627 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | | | 0.279 | 0.202 | 0.209 | 0.995 | 0.8 | (4 | 0.458 | 0.333 | 1.163 | 0.548 | 0.195 | 0.934 | 0.936 |
| Back of Queue | (Q),π/ | /in (95 th percentile) | | 120 | 89.5 | 76.2 | 460.2 | 364 | | 242.3 | 130.4 | 1111.Z | | 61.1 | 684.3 | 732.8 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RO) (95 th percent | ile) | 4.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 14. | 0 | 9.7 | 0.00 | 44.4 | 14.5 | 2.4 | 27.4 | 29.3 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d 1), s | /veh | | 45.6 | 45.0 | 6.3 | 55.5 | 54. | 4 | 37.7 | 47.7 | 43.0 | 23.5 | 33.7 | 41.3 | 41.3 |
| Incremental De | lay (d 2 |), s/veh | | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 54.1 | 25. | 6 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 80.0 | 2.8 | 0.1 | 9.8 | 23.3 |
| Initial Queue De | elay (d | з), s/veh | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| d), s/ve | eh | | 46.1 | 45.2 | 6.5 | 109.6 | 80. | 0 | 38.4 | 47.8 | 123.0 | 26.3 | 33.8 | 51.1 | 64.6 |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | D | D | Α | F | F | | D | D | F | С | С | D | Е |
| Approach Dela | , s/veh | / LOS | | 29.8 | 3 | С | 78.4 | 1 | | E | 101. | 7 | F | 53.4 | | D |
| Intersection Del | lay, s/ve | eh / LOS | | | | 76 | 5.1 | | | | | | | E | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LOS | | 2.97 | 7 | С | 2.87 | 7 | | С | 2.32 | 2 | В | 2.32 | 2 | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 0.94 | 1 | А | 1.66 | 5 | | В | 1.96 | ; | В | 1.53 | 3 | В |

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop | o-Control Report | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Del Rey / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Del Rey Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|-------|--------|------|------|-------|------|----|---|-------|-------|---|---|-------|-------|------|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | Westb | ound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 146 | 361 | | | | 277 | 82 | | | | | | 35 | | 76 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (|) | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Left | Only | | | | | | | 2 | 2 | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 152 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 116 | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 1174 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 645 | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.18 | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q_{95} (veh) | | 0.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.6 | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 8.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 11.8 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | А | | | | | | | | | | | | | В | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 2. | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | 11 | .8 | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | E | 3 | |

| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Del Rey / Maxella | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Del Rey Avenue | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | |
|---|------|-------------|--------|---|----|------|-------|----|---|-------|-------|------|------------|------|------|------|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 146 | 396 | | | | 295 | 82 | | | | | | 35 | | 76 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (|) | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | Left Only 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 152 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 116 | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 1155 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 632 | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.18 | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.7 | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 8.6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 12.0 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | А | | | | | | | | | | | | | В | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 2 | .3 | | | | | | | | | 12.0 | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | E | 3 | |

| HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| General Information Site Information | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Del Rey / Maxella | | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Del Rey Avenue | | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Future - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | | |

Project Description



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

Paseo Marina

| | Eastb | ound | | | Westk | ound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | | |
|-------|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | | |
| 0 | 155 | 395 | | | | 319 | 86 | | | | | | 55 | | 129 | |
| 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Left | Only | | | | | | | ž | 2 | | | | |
| adway | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | |
| | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | |
| | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | |
| | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | |
| Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 161 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 192 | | |
| | 1127 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 620 | | |
| | 0.14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.31 | | |
| | 0.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.3 | | |
| | 8.7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13.4 | | |
| | А | | | | | | | | | | | | | В | | |
| | 2. | 5 | | | | | | | | | 13.4 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | E | 3 | | |
| | U 1U 0 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 | Eastb U I 1U 1 1U 1 0 1 1U 1 1 0 1 1 0 155 3 3 3 4 155 3 4 155 3 2 2 3 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | EastburdULT1U1201201201301553953333333310155395331015539533101553953310155104.161102.231102.231101611112711100.142100.51108.7110A110A1 | Eastburger U I R 1U 1 2 3 1U 1 2 3 0 1 2 0 1 1 2 3 0 1 2 0 1 1 1 1 0 15 395 1 0 155 395 1 0 155 395 1 1 3 1 1 0 155 395 1 1 150 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | FastburdULTRU1U1234U1U1234U012001200101200133113311 | Fastbund West U L R U L 1U 1 2 3 4U 4 0 1 2 0 0 0 1U 1 2 0 0 0 1U 1 2 0 0 0 1U 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 0 15 395 4 0 1 0 155 395 5 5 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 <td>Image: static strain s</td> <td>Vertication of the section of the sect</td> <td>EastburdIRULTRU11234U45611U1234U4561012000201120002011112011711112000201112011111333111111331111111331111111133111111111111111111411</td> <td>VerturnNorthiULTRUL1U1234U456701200020001U1200020001U1200020001U1200020001U120002000112000121010011539511111111015539511<td>Note the set of the set of</td><td>VertexNorthermation (Colspan="4">Northermation (Colspan="4")ULTRULTRULTR1U1234U456G78901200020G0001U12000201078901120002010000117R1010101010101010117R10101010101010101033310101010101010101010103310101010101010101010101033101010101010101010101010331010101010101010101010101111111111111111111111111111111111</td><td>UUUUUTRULTRULTRU11234U456107891011234U456107891011200020101010101011200017R1010101011200017R1010101011200011110101010101010333111<</td><td>Lestburger Image: Normal and the sector of the sector</td><td>U L T R U L T R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R I R I R I R I <thi< th=""> <thi< th=""> <thi< th=""></thi<></thi<></thi<></td></td> | Image: static strain s | Vertication of the section of the sect | EastburdIRULTRU11234U45611U1234U4561012000201120002011112011711112000201112011111333111111331111111331111111133111111111111111111411 | VerturnNorthiULTRUL1U1234U456701200020001U1200020001U1200020001U1200020001U120002000112000121010011539511111111015539511 <td>Note the set of the set of</td> <td>VertexNorthermation (Colspan="4">Northermation (Colspan="4")ULTRULTRULTR1U1234U456G78901200020G0001U12000201078901120002010000117R1010101010101010117R10101010101010101033310101010101010101010103310101010101010101010101033101010101010101010101010331010101010101010101010101111111111111111111111111111111111</td> <td>UUUUUTRULTRULTRU11234U456107891011234U456107891011200020101010101011200017R1010101011200017R1010101011200011110101010101010333111<</td> <td>Lestburger Image: Normal and the sector of the sector</td> <td>U L T R U L T R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R I R I R I R I <thi< th=""> <thi< th=""> <thi< th=""></thi<></thi<></thi<></td> | Note the set of | VertexNorthermation (Colspan="4">Northermation (Colspan="4")ULTRULTRULTR1U1234U456G78901200020G0001U12000201078901120002010000117R1010101010101010117R10101010101010101033310101010101010101010103310101010101010101010101033101010101010101010101010331010101010101010101010101111111111111111111111111111111111 | UUUUUTRULTRULTRU11234U456107891011234U456107891011200020101010101011200017R1010101011200017R1010101011200011110101010101010333111< | Lestburger Image: Normal and the sector of the sector | U L T R U L T R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R U I R I R I R I R I <thi< th=""> <thi< th=""> <thi< th=""></thi<></thi<></thi<> | |

| HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----|------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Del Rey / Maxella | | | | | |

| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Del Rey / Maxella |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Del Rey Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | |
|---|-----------|---------|--------|---|----|------|-------|----|---|-------|-------|---|------------|------|------|------|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 155 | 430 | | | | 337 | 86 | | | | | | 55 | | 129 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (|) | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | Left Only | | | | | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adway | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 161 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 192 | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 1109 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 608 | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.32 | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.3 | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 8.8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13.6 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | А | | | | | | | | | | | | | В | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 2 | .3 | | | | | | | | 13.6 | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | E | 3 | |

| HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| General Information Site Information | | | | | | | | | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Del Rey / Maxella | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Del Rey Avenue | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | |

Project Description



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

Paseo Marina

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | ound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
|---|-----------|-------|--------|---|----|------|------|----|---|-------|-------|---|---|-------|-------|------|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 81 | 477 | | | | 428 | 81 | | | | | | 89 | | 189 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (|) | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | Left Only | | | | | | ź | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 87 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 299 | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 1011 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 596 | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.09 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.50 | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2.8 | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 8.9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 17.0 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | А | | | | | | | | | | | | | С | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 1. | .3 | | | | | | | | | | | 17 | .0 | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (| 2 | |

| nest two way stop control hepoin | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Del Rey / Maxella | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Del Rey Avenue | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | Southbound | | | |
|---|------|---------|--------|------|------|------|-------|----|---|-------|-------|------|------------|------|------|------|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 81 | 488 | | | | 432 | 81 | | | | | | 89 | | 189 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (|) | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Left | Only | | | | | | | : | 2 | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 87 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 299 | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 1008 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 593 | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.09 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.50 | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2.8 | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 8.9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 17.1 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | А | | | | | | | | | | | | | С | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 1 | .3 | | | | | | | | | 17.1 | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (| 2 | |

| HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Del Rey / Maxella | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Del Rey Avenue | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Future - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound Westbound | | | | | | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | | |
|---|---------------------|---------|--------|---|----|---|-----|-----|-------|-------|---|---|-----------|-------|------|------|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 98 | 545 | | | | 490 | 104 | | | | | | 97 | | 210 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (|) | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | Left Only | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 2 | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 3.33 | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 105 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 330 | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 934 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 543 | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.61 | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4.0 | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 9.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 21.4 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | А | | | | | | | | | | | | | С | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | 1.4 | | | | | | | | 21.4 | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | (| 2 | | |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

_

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop | o-Control Report | |
|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Del Rey / Maxella |

| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Del Rey / Maxella |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Del Rey Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastbound Westbound | | | | | | | | North | oound | | | South | oound | |
|---|--------|---------------------|--------|---|----|---|-----|-----|---|-------|-------|---|---|-------|-------|------|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration | | L | Т | | | | Т | TR | | | | | | | LR | |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 98 | 556 | | | | 494 | 104 | | | | | | 97 | | 210 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (|) | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | Left Only | | | | | | | | | | ź | 2 | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 105 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 330 | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 931 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 540 | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.61 | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4.1 | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 9.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 21.6 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | А | | | | | | | | | | | | С | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 1.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | 21 | .6 | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | с | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Ocean Way / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Ocean Way |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | Westb | bound | | | North | oound | | | South | bound | | |
|---|--------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|---|---|-------|-------|------|---|-------|-------|----|--|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | L | Т | | | L | | R | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 305 | 43 | 0 | 33 | 278 | | | 50 | | 62 | | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | 3 | 3 | | | | 3 | | 3 | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | N | 0 | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.1 | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.16 | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.2 | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.23 | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | 35 | | | | 53 | | 66 | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | 1178 | | | | 439 | | 822 | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | 0.03 | | | | 0.12 | | 0.08 | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | 0.1 | | | | 0.4 | | 0.3 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 8.2 | | | | 14.3 | | 9.8 | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | А | | | | В | | А | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 0 | .9 | | | 11 | .8 | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | E | 3 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | J | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--------|----------|---------|---------------|----------|--------|-------------|-------|----------|--------|--------|------------|----------------|--------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inters | secti | ion Info | rmatio | on | 2 | 444 | . Ja l <u>a</u> |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | Engine | ers | | | | Durat | ion. | h | 0.250 |) | | | |
| Analyst | | JAS | onopun | Analys | is Date | Dec 1 | 2020 | | Area | Tvne | | Othe | - - | | | <u>بر</u> ج |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existin | na with | | PHF | Type | , | 0.94 | | | w – E | ← ↓ ↓ |
| | | | | | | Projec | t - AM | | | | | | | | | |
| Urban Street | | Maxella Avenue | | Analys | is Year | 2020 | | | Analy | sis F | Period | 1> 8: | 00 | | ን ሰ | |
| Intersection | | Ocean Way/Maxella | a | File Na | ame | 04AM | - Existi | ng wit | th Proj | ect - | Option | B.xus | | 5 | *1 1 *** | * * * |
| Project Descript | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | FD | | | 10 | D | | | ND | | | CD. | |
| Approach Move | mation | | | | | | + | VV | - - | П | | | | <u> </u> | <u>эр</u> т | |
| | oh/h | | | <u> </u> | 200 | 75 | 20 | 27 | 70 | R | L 69 | | R 00 | <u> </u> | | |
| Demand (V), V | en/n | | | | 308 | 75 | 30 | 21 | 0 | | 00 | | 80 | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | - | " | T | T | Г | | | | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | 1 | L, 2 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Croon | | 24.0 | | | | | 0.0 | _ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 24.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | | | K 2 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 7 6 | 7 | Ϋ́. |
| | | | | ~ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | - | WBT | · | NBL | NBT | | SBL | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 6 | | | 2 | | | | 8 | | | |
| Case Number | | | | | | 8.0 | | | 6.0 | | | | 9.0 | | | |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 | _ | | | 30.0 | | | | |
| Change Period, | (Y+R | | | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 | 4 | | | 5.1 | | | | |
| Max Allow Head | dway(/ | ИАН), s | | | 0. | | | _ | 0.0 | 4 | | | 3.4 | | | |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | _ | | - | | 4.0 | | | _ | |
| Green Extensio | | (ge), s | | | | 0.0 | | _ | 0.0 | - | | | 0.3 | <u> </u> | _ | |
| Phase Call Prot | | | | | | | | - | | - | | | 1.00 | | - | |
| Max Out Proba | biiity | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | Т | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | 2 | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | Ť | 3 | | 18 | | | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | | 208 | 199 | 40 | 296 | 3 | | 72 | _ | 85 | | | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | | 1900 | 1772 | 993 | 180 | 9 | | 1810 | | 1610 | | | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | | | 4.3 | 4.5 | 1.7 | 3.1 | | | 1.5 | | 2.0 | | | |
| Cycle Queue Cl | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | | 4.3 | 4.5 | 6.1 | 3.1 | | | 1.5 | | 2.0 | | | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.4 | 1 | _ | 0.42 | | 0.42 | | | |
| Capacity (<i>c</i>), v | reh/h | | | | 785 | 732 | 457 | 149 | 5 | _ | 751 | - | 668 | | _ | |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | itio (X) | | | 0.265 | 0.272 | 0.088 | 0.19 | 8 | 4 | 0.096 | | 0.127 | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) |) | | 82.9 | 80 | 18 | 54.2 | 2 | - | 26.5 | | 32 | | _ | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), Ve | en/in (95 th percenti | le) | | 3.3 | 3.2 | 0.7 | 2.2 | | - | 1.1 | | 1.3 | | | |
| Queue Storage | | KQ) (95 in percent | lie) | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |)) | + | 10.7 | | 0.00 | | | |
| Incremental Del | $(u_1), s_1$ | | | | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 03 | <u><</u> | + | 0.3 | | 0.4 | | | |
| | ay (u 2 | 3) s/veh | | | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.3 | | - | 0.0 | | 0.4 | | | |
| Control Delay (| al Queue Delay (d ₃), s/veh trol Delay (d) s/veh | | | | 12.4 | 12 5 | 14.0 | 11 | 5 | | 10.9 | | 11.2 | | | |
| l evel of Service | control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | R | - <u>2</u> .5 | R | R | | | B | | B | | | |
| Approach Delay | evel of Service (LOS) | | | | | B | 11.8 | | B | | 11 1 | | B | 0.0 | | |
| Intersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | | | - 12 | 2.0 | | | | | | - | B | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 1.92 | | В | 0.72 | 2 | А | | 2.28 | | В | 2.11 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 0.82 | | А | 0.76 | ; | A | | | | F | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Ocean Way / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/12/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Ocean Way |
| Time Analyzed | Future - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | oound | | | South | bound | | |
|---|--------|---------|--------|------|-------|------|-------|---|---|-------|-------|------|---|-------|-------|----|--|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | L | Т | | | L | | R | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 351 | 49 | 0 | 38 | 307 | | | 65 | | 77 | | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | 3 | 3 | | | | 3 | | 3 | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | N | 0 | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.1 | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.16 | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.2 | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.23 | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | 40 | | | | 69 | | 82 | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | 1123 | | | | 389 | | 789 | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | 0.04 | | | | 0.18 | | 0.10 | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | 0.1 | | | | 0.6 | | 0.3 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 8.3 | | | | 16.2 | | 10.1 | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | А | | | | С | | В | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 0 | .9 | | | 12 | .9 | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | В | | | | | | | | |

| | | | - 5 | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------|-----------|------------|--------|----------|------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intersed | tion Info | ormati | on | 2 | 4 가 야 † | the lat |
| Agency | | Linscott Law & Gre | ensnan | Engine | ers | | | | Duration | h | 0.25 | 0 | | | |
| Analyst | | | enopun | | is Data | Dec 1 | 2020 | | | n, m ne | Othe | or | | | <u>ئ</u> ے ک |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time E | | Euture | , 2020 | | | 50 | 0 04 | •1 | - → + | w‡e | ← ↓ ↓ |
| Junsaletion | | | | | enou | Projec | t - AM | | | | 0.94 | | | | |
| Urban Street | | Maxella Avenue | | Analvs | is Year | 2026 | | | Analysis | Period | 1> 8 | :00 | | | <u>د</u> |
| Intersection | | Ocean Wav/Maxella | 3 | File Na | ime | 04AM | - Future | e with | Project - | Option E | 3.xus | | | <u>ী</u> (অক্ষেম্প | 17 1 |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | 1 | | 1 | | | j | | | | 1 " | | |
| r reject becomp | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | В | | NB | ; | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | | 354 | 81 | 43 | 30 | 7 | 83 | - | 95 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | " | | | | | | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Croon | | | • | | | 0.0 | _ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 24.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -10 | | | | K 2 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 7 6 | 7 | Ύ. |
| / | | · · · | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | | EBT | WB | L | WBT | NBL | NBT | | SBL | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | Э | | | | | 6 | | | 2 | | | 8 | | | |
| Case Number | | | | | | 8.0 | | + | 6.0 | | + | 9.0 | | | |
| Phase Duration | S | | | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 | | | |
| Change Period | (Y+R) | c) S | | | 52 | | + | 52 | | + | 5.1 | | | | |
| Max Allow Head | dway (/ | MAH)s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 3.4 | | | |
| | ce Time | (a_s) s | | | 0.0 | | | + | 0.0 | | + | 4.4 | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (q_{s}) , s | | | | 0.0 | | - | 0.0 | <u> </u> | - | 0.4 | | | |
| Phase Call Prot | hability | (90), 3 | | | | 0.0 | | - | 0.0 | <u> </u> | + | 1.00 | | | |
| Max Out Probal | bility | | | - | | | | - | | - | - | 0.00 | | | |
| | Shity | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | WE | ; | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | 3 | | 18 | | | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | | | 237 | 226 | 46 | 327 | | 88 | | 101 | | | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | | 1900 | 1778 | 944 | 1809 | 9 | 1810 | | 1610 | | | |
| Queue Service | Time (d | q s), S | | | 5.0 | 5.1 | 2.1 | 3.5 | | 1.8 | | 2.4 | | | |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>q</i> c), s | | | 5.0 | 5.1 | 7.2 | 3.5 | | 1.8 | | 2.4 | | _ | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | | 0.42 | | 0.42 | | | |
| Capacity (c), y | /eh/h | | | | 785 | 735 | 430 | 149 | 5 | 751 | | 668 | | | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | atio (X) | | | 0.302 | 0.307 | 0.106 | 0.21 | 8 | 0.118 | | 0.151 | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q) ft/ | (In (95 th percentile) | | | 96.2 | 92.6 | 21.1 | 60.5 | 5 | 29.9 | | 34.8 | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q) ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | 3.8 | 37 | 0.8 | 24 | - | 12 | | 14 | | | |
| | Ratio (| BO (95 th percent | tile) | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | 0.00 | | 0.00 | | | |
| Liniform Delay (| $d_1)$ | | | | 11.8 | 11.8 | 14.2 | 11 / | , | 10.8 | | 11 0 | | | |
| Incremental De | $\left[\frac{u}{d} \right]$ | | | | 1.0 | 11.0 | 0.5 | 0.3 | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | |
| Initial Quoup Do | ay (u 2 | | | | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 | | 0.0 | _ | 0.0 | | _ | |
| Control Dolay (| al Queue Delay (<i>d</i> ₃), s/veh | | | | 12.0 | 12.0 | 14.7 | 11 7 | , | 10.0 | | 11.0 | | | |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | | 12.0 P | 12.9 P | 14.1 P | D | | P 10.0 | | П.0 В | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | 40.0 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 12.8 | | D | 12.1 | | В | 10.9 | | D | 0.0 P | | |
| ntersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 12 | <u></u> | | В | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Po | limodal Desulte | | | | FR | | | | 2 | | NR | | | SR | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /1.05 | | 1 0 2 | | B | 0.70 | | Δ | 2 20 | | R | 2 11 | 00 | B |
| Ricycle I OS So | | | | 1.92 | | Δ | 0.72 | - + | <u>_</u> | 2.20 | | F | 2.11 | | 5 |
| DICYCIE LOS SC | | | | 0.07 | | | 0.78 | , | А | | | L, L | | | |

| | 11037 1100 1103 5101 | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Ocean Way / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Ocean Way |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| - - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------|--------|------|-------|------|-----|---|---|-------|-------|------|---|-------|-------|----|--|
| Approach | Eastbound Westbound U L T R U L T R 111 1 2 3 411 4 5 6 | | | | | | | | | North | oound | | | South | oound | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | L | Т | | | L | | R | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 441 | 90 | 0 | 49 | 392 | | | 64 | | 49 | | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | 3 | 3 | | | | 3 | | 3 | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | N | 0 | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.1 | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.16 | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.2 | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.23 | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | 51 | | | | 67 | | 51 | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | 1006 | | | | 299 | | 718 | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | 0.05 | | | | 0.22 | | 0.07 | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | 0.2 | | | | 0.8 | | 0.2 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 8.8 | | | | 20.5 | | 10.4 | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | А | | | | С | | В | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 1 | .0 | | | 16 | 5.1 | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | с | | | | | | | | |

| General Inform | | | | | | | Inters | octi | on Info | rmati | on | 2 | 역 Y 약 † | Ja l <u>a</u> | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------|---------|-------------|--------|----------|--------|---------|----------------|--------|-------|----------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| | ation | Linscott Law & Gre | onenan | Engine | ore | | | | Durati | on k | | 0 250 | | | | |
| Apolyot | | | enspan | | | Dec 1 | 2020 | | Arool | 011, 1 5/00 | I | Othou | , | <u>*</u> | | ۲. ۲. |
| Analyst | | JAO City of Los Angolos | | Time | | | , 2020 | | | lype | | | | - <u>→</u> -→ | w1r | ← <mark>}-</mark> |
| Junsaiction | | City of Los Angeles | | I Ime F | renou | Proied | t - PM | | РПГ | | | 0.90 | | | | ¥ - |
| Urban Street | | Maxella Avenue | | Analys | is Year | 2020 | | | Analys | sis P | eriod | 1> 17 | 2:00 | | K X | Ē |
| Intersection | | Ocean Way/Maxella | a | File Na | ame | 04PM | - Existi | ng wit | h Proje | ect - | Option | B.xus | | - 1 | 1 1 4 4 | 14 |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | | 442 | 100 | 51 | 39 | 2 | | 68 | | 53 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | _ | 1 |
| Signal Informa | tion | | 0 | | 5 | _ | | | | | | | | — | | |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | = _* | l Si | 7 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 24.8 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) 0 | .0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) () | .0 | 0.0 | | | → | | \sim |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 0 | .0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | _ | 501 | | EDT | | | MOT | | | | NET | 0.01 | | 0.0.7 |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | | EBI | WBI | | WBI | + | NBL | | NBI | SBL | _ | SBI |
| Assigned Phase | 9 | | | | | 6 | | | 2 | _ | | | 8 | | | |
| Case Number | | | | | | 8.0 | | | 6.0 | | | | 9.0 | | | |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 | _ | | | 30.0 | | | |
| Change Period, | Change Period, (Y+R c), s | | | | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 | | | | 5.1 | | | |
| Max Allow Head | Max Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 3.4 | | | | |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | | | | | | 3.4 | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | | 0.2 | | | |
| Phase Call Pro | oability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | |
| Max Out Probal | oility | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 | | | |
| | _ | • | | | | | | | | _ | | | _ | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | WB | 3 | + | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | | R | L | | R | _ | | | R | L | | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | + | 3 | | 18 | | | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | | | 290 | 275 | 53 | 408 | | _ | 71 | | 55 | | | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | | 1900 | 1779 | 859 | 1809 | 9 | _ | 1810 | | 1610 | | | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | | | 6.3 | 6.4 | 2.7 | 4.5 | _ | _ | 1.4 | | 1.2 | | | |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e lime (<i>g</i> c), s | | | 6.3 | 6.4 | 9.2 | 4.5 | | _ | 1.4 | | 1.2 | | | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | | | 0.42 | | 0.42 | | _ | |
| Capacity (<i>c</i>), v | eh/h | | | | 785 | 735 | 383 | 1495 | 5 | _ | 751 | - | 668 | | | |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | itio(X) | | | 0.369 | 0.373 | 0.139 | 0.27 | 3 | (| 0.094 | | 0.083 | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | | 122.6 | 117 | 26.3 | 77.7 | 7 | _ | 25.9 | | 20.3 | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | 4.9 | 4.7 | 1.1 | 3.1 | | _ | 1.0 | | 0.8 | | | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |) | | 0.00 | | 0.00 | | | |
| Uniform Delay (| d 1), s | /veh | | | 12.2 | 12.2 | 15.4 | 11.6 | ; | | 10.7 | | 10.6 | | | |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | | 1.3 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 0.5 | | | 0.2 | | 0.2 | | | |
| Initial Queue De | elay(d | з), s/veh | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | | 13.5 | 13.7 | 16.1 | 12.1 | | | 10.9 | | 10.9 | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | В | В | В | В | | | В | | В | | | |
| Approach Delay | /, s/veh | / LOS | | 13.6 | ; | В | 12.6 | 6 | В | | 10.9 | | В | 0.0 | | |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 12 | 2.9 | | | | | | | В | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | imodal Results | | | | EB | | | WB | 8 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 1.92 | 2 | В | 0.72 | 2 | Α | | 2.28 | | В | 2.11 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 0.95 | ; | А | 0.87 | ' | А | | | | F | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Ocean Way / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Ocean Way |
| Time Analyzed | Future - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| | | | | | | | | | Northbaurd Coutbbaurd | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------|--------|------|-------|------|-------|---|-----------------------|-------|-------|------|---|-------|-------|----|--|
| Approach | Eastbound Westbound U L T R U L T 1U 1 2 3 4U 4 5 | | | | | | bound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | L | Т | | | L | | R | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 496 | 110 | 0 | 64 | 463 | | | 75 | | 59 | | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | 3 | 3 | | | | 3 | | 3 | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | N | 0 | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | eadways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.1 | | | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.16 | | | | 6.86 | | 6.96 | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.2 | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.23 | | | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | 67 | | | | 78 | | 61 | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | 940 | | | | 239 | | 677 | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | 0.07 | | | | 0.33 | | 0.09 | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | 0.2 | | | | 1.4 | | 0.3 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 9.1 | | | | 27.2 | | 10.8 | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | А | | | | D | | В | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 1 | .1 | | 20.0 | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | с | | | | | | | | |

| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inters | ectio | on Info | rmati | on | 2 | * | , be l <u>e</u> |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|----------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|---------------|--------|--------|-----------|-------|-------------|------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | . Engine | ers | | | | Durati | on. h |) 1 | 0.250 |) | | | |
| Analyst | | JAS | onopun | Analys | is Date | Dec 1 | 2020 | | Area T | Tvne | | Othe | - - | | | <u>بر</u> ج |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | with | | PHE | JPO | | 0.96 | | → ∻ → | w ^N ∓e | ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ |
| Julisalolion | | | | | chou | Projec | t - PM | | | | | 0.00 | | T T | | v v |
| Urban Street | | Maxella Avenue | | Analys | is Year | 2026 | | | Analys | sis P | eriod | 1> 17 | ':00 | | | <u> </u> |
| Intersection | | Ocean Way/Maxella | a | File Na | ame | 04PM | - Future | e with | Projec | :t - O | ption E | 3.xus | | - | ব ↑ কՒ | 1 to (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| , , , | | - 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | ٦ | - F | र | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | | 497 | 120 | 66 | 46 | 63 | | 79 | | 63 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | | Т | | | | | | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase | 2 |] | le ² | | | | | | | | | Y | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 24.8 | 24.9 | • • • • • | 0.0 | | 0 | 0.0 | _ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) 0 | .0 | 0.0 | - | | | | к 2 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) 0. | .0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 7 6 | 7 | Y [∗] |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | WBT | Т | NBL | | NBT | SBL | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 6 | | | 2 | | | | 8 | | | |
| Case Number | | | | | | 8.0 | | | 6.0 | | | | 9.0 | | | |
| Phase Duration | . S | | | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 | | | | 30.0 | | | |
| Change Period. | hange Period, ($Y+R_c$), s | | | | | 5.2 | | \rightarrow | 5.2 | | | | 5.1 | | | |
| Max Allow Head | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | | 3.4 | | | | | |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | (q_s) | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | 3.7 | | + | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | | 0.3 | | | |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | (9 °), ° | | | | 0.0 | | - | 0.0 | | | | 1.00 | | + | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 | | | |
| | onney | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | 0.00 | | a de la com | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | | 3 | | 18 | | | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | | | 331 | 311 | 69 | 482 | 2 | | 82 | | 66 | | | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | | 1900 | 1772 | 799 | 180 | 9 | Ī | 1810 | | 1610 | | | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | q s), S | | | 7.4 | 7.5 | 4.0 | 5.4 | | | 1.7 | | 1.5 | | | |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>q</i> c), s | | | 7.4 | 7.5 | 11.5 | 5.4 | | | 1.7 | | 1.5 | | | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.4 | 1 | | 0.42 | | 0.42 | | | |
| Capacity (c), y | , eh/h | | | | 785 | 732 | 350 | 149 | 5 | | 751 | - | 668 | | | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acitv Ra | atio (X) | | | 0.422 | 0.425 | 0.196 | 0.32 | 3 | | 0.110 | | 0.098 | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q) ft | /In (95 th percentile) | | | 144.7 | 137.2 | 36.7 | 94.3 | 3 | | 30.3 | | 24.3 | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), R | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | 5.8 | 5.5 | 1.5 | 3.8 | - | | 12 | | 10 | | | |
| | Ratio (| RO) (95 th percent | tile) | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 |) | | 0.00 | | 0.00 | | | + |
| Liniform Delay (| (d_1) e | | | | 12.5 | 12.5 | 16.6 | 11 0 | 2 | | 10.8 | | 10.7 | | | + |
| Incremental De | (u r), s | | | | 12.5 | 12.5 | 10.0 | 0.6 | , | | 0.3 | | 0.3 | | | + |
| | ay (u 2 | | | | 1.7 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | | + | 0.0 | | 0.3 | | | + |
| | ial Queue Delay (d 3), s/veh | | | | 14.2 | 14.2 | 17.0 | 12 | | + | 11 1 | | 11.0 | | | + |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | | 14.Z | 14.3 D | П.9 П | | , | - | п. і р | | П.U В | | | + |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | 44.0 | В | | B 40.0 | | | + | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 14.2 | | В | 13.2 | | В | | 11.0 | | В | 0.0 | | |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 13 | 0.4 | | В | | | | | | | |
| Multimodel Be | Multimodel Peculte | | | | ED | | | ١٨/٢ | 2 | | | ND | | | e D | |
| Podostrian I OC | Soore | /1.05 | 1.00 | | P | 0.70 | | , ^ | - | 2.20 | DI | B | 0 44 | | P | |
| Riovela LOS C- | | | | 1.92 | - | Δ | 0.72 | 1 | A | + | 2.20 | | D E | 2.11 | \rightarrow | U |
| DICYCIE LOS SC | UIE / L | | | 1.02 | - | A | 0.94 | t | А | | | | - | | | |

| HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Maxella Dwy / Maxella | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Maxella Avenue Driveway | | | | | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound Westbound U L T R U L T R | | | | | | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|-------|--------|------|-------|---|-----|---|-------|-------|---|------|-------|-------|----|----|--|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | | Т | | | | | R | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 342 | 1 | | | 283 | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | N | 0 | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.9 | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.96 | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.3 | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.33 | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 821 | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q_{95} (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 9.4 | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | A | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | 9.4 | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | A | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Maxella Dwy / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Maxella Avenue Driveway |
| Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound Westbound U L T R U L T F | | | | | | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | | | | |
|---|---|---------|--------|------|-------|---|-----|---|-------|-------|---|------|-------|-------|----|----|--|--|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | | Т | | | | | R | | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 360 | 4 | | | 288 | | | | | 7 | | | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | N | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.9 | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.96 | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.3 | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.33 | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | l Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 8 | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 807 | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.01 | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 9.5 | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | А | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | 9.5 | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | A | | | | | | | | | |

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop | o-Control Report | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Maxella Dwy / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Maxella Avenue Driveway |
| Time Analyzed | Future - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Assessed Earth and Martha and Neither ad Calible ad | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------|--------|------|-------|---|-----|---|-------|-------|----|------|-------|-------|----|----|--|--|
| Approach | Eastbound Westbound U L T R U L T F | | | | | | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | | Т | | | | | R | | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 401 | 1 | | | 315 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | N | lo | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.9 | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.96 | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.3 | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.33 | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 783 | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 9.6 | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | А | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | 9.6 | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | A | | | | | | | | | |

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Maxella Dwy / Maxella | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Maxella Avenue Driveway | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Future + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | | | | | | | | | | | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound Westbound U L T R U L T R | | | | | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------|--------|----|----|---|-----|-------|-------|---|---|-------|-------|----|----|----|--|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | | Т | | | | | R | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 419 | 4 | | | 320 | | | | | 7 | | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | N | 0 | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | Undivided | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.9 | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.96 | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.3 | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.33 | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 8 | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 769 | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.01 | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q_{95} (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 9.7 | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | А | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | 9.7 | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | ļ | 4 | | | | | | |

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop | o-Control Report | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Maxella Dwy / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Maxella Avenue Driveway |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach Eastbound Westbound Northbound Southbound | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|----------|-------|-------|------|---|-------|-------|----|--|--|--|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | Westb | bound | | | North | oound | | | South | bound | | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | | | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | | Т | | | | | R | | | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 464 | 3 | | | 394 | | | | | 6 | | | | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | No | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undiv | vided | | | | <u> </u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.9 | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.96 | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.3 | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.33 | | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 7 | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 743 | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.01 | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 9.9 | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | A | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | 9 | 9 | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | A | 4 | | | | | | | | |

| | 11C37 100 Way 3to | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Maxella Dwy / Maxella |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Maxella Avenue Driveway |
| Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach Eastbound Westbound Northbound Southbound | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|---------|--------|------|-------|------|-------|---|---|-------|-------|------|---|-------|-------|----|--|--|--|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | oound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | | | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | | Т | | | | | R | | | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 468 | 4 | | | 396 | | | | | 7 | | | | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | No | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.9 | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.96 | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.3 | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.33 | | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 8 | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 740 | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.01 | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 9.9 | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | A | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | 9 | .9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | ļ | 4 | | | | | | | | |

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Maxella Dwy / Maxella | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Maxella Avenue Driveway | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Future - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lawaa | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach Eastbound Westbound Northbound Southbound | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|---------------------|--------|-------|-------|---|-----|---|---|-------|-------|------|---|-------|-------|----|--|--|
| Approach | | Eastbound Westbound | | | | | | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | | Т | | | | | R | | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 528 | 3 | | | 477 | | | | | 6 | | | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | No | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undiv | vided | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.9 | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.96 | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.3 | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.33 | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 7 | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 705 | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.01 | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 10.2 | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | В | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | 10 |).2 | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | I | 3 | | | | | | | |

| | HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Maxella Dwy / Maxella | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Maxella Avenue | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Maxella Avenue Driveway | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Future + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | | | | | | | | | | | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach Eastbound Westbound Northbound Southbound | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------|--------|------|-------|---|-----|----------|----|-------|-------|------|---|-------|-------|----|--|--|
| Approach | Eastbound Westbound U L T R U L T R | | | | | | | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | | |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Configuration | | | Т | TR | | | Т | | | | | R | | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 532 | 4 | | | 479 | | | | | 7 | | | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | No | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | <u>'</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adway | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.9 | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.96 | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.3 | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.33 | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 8 | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | 702 | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.01 | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | 10.2 | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | В | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | 10 | .2 | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | E | 3 | | | | | | | |

| | J · | | | | | | | | | , | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|------|---------|----------|------------------|-----|---------|-----------|---------|-------|------------|---|--------------------|
| General Inform | Seneral Information Jgency Linscott, Law & Green | | | | | | | | In | tersect | tion Infe | ormatio | on | 2 | * | بد لي |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Greensr | an, End | inee | rs | | | | Di | uration | h | 0.250 | | | 444 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | Ana | lvsis | Date | Aug 1 | 3 2020 | | Ar | rea Tvp | e. | Other | | | | ار ک |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | Tim | e Pe | riod | Fxistir | na - AM | | P | HF | • | 0.96 | | → _* -> | w∔e | ≮_ ↓ |
| Urban Street | | Glencoe Avenue | Ana | lvsis | Year | 2020 | 19 7 111 | | Ar | nalvsis | Period | 1> 8.7 | 15 | 4 1 A | | |
| Intersection | | Glencoe/Maxella | File | Nam | | 06AM | - Existi | וא חר | 19 | laryolo | | 1. 0. | | | * * * | <u> </u> |
| Project Descript | tion | Paseo Marina | | Inall | | | | ig.nu | 13 | | | | | - 5 | <u>]</u>][[]]]][]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]] | × (* |
| T Toject Descrip | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | · |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | ٧ | VB | | T | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | | Т | R | L | Т | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | 10 | 8 | 100 | 135 | 65 | 8 | 33 | 83 | 116 | 569 | 56 | 73 | 533 | 84 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | · | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | 215 | | | | | | | | <u>A</u> | | |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase 2 | | | € ¥ | 1 SA2 | 7 | | | | | | 4 | ¥ _ | 2 | († x |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point En | d Gre | en 2 | 24 8 | 24.9 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W Or | 1 Yell | ow 3 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | <u>a</u> | | 512 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S Or | Red | 1 1 | .6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | Y 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | S On Red 1.6 1.5 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | E | BL | | EBT | WB | | V | NBT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | Э | | | | | 6 | | | | 2 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | | 6.0 | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | ; | 30.0 | | | 3 | 30.0 | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period, | (Y+R c), s | | | | | 5.2 | | | į | 5.2 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Head | ow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | _ | 0.0 | | | (| 0.0 | | | 3.4 | | | 3.4 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | (gs),s | | | | | | | | | | | 17.9 | | | 23.0 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | \vdash | | 2.6 | | | 1.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probal | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.54 | | | 1.00 |
| Movement Gro | un Res | ults | | | FB | | | W | 'B | | | NB | | | SB | _ |
| Approach Move | ment | | | | т | R | | Т | . T | R | | Т | R | | т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | 1 | + | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | 11 | 3 | 104 | 141 | 68 | - 86 | 3 | 86 | 121 | 593 | 58 | 76 | 328 | 314 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s), veh/h/ln | 123 | 1 1 | 900 | 1610 | 1310 | 190 | 00 | 1610 | 799 | 1900 | 1610 | 837 | 1900 | 1809 |
| Queue Service | Time (o | 7 s). S | 3. | 7 | 2.0 | 3.4 | 2.0 | 1. | 7 | 2.0 | 7.6 | 15.9 | 1.3 | 5.1 | 7.3 | 7.4 |
| Cvcle Queue C | learance | e Time (<code>a c</code>), s | 5. | , | 2.0 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 1. | 7 | 2.0 | 14.9 | 15.9 | 1.3 | 21.0 | 7.3 | 7.4 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | - · · · · · (3 -), - | 0.4 | 1 (|).41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.4 | 1 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| Capacity (c), y | /eh/h | | 58 | 3 . | 785 | 666 | 617 | 78 | 5 | 666 | 353 | 789 | 668 | 245 | 789 | 751 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | tio(X) | 0.1 | 91 0 | .133 | 0.211 | 0.110 | 0.1 [·] | 10 | 0.130 | 0.342 | 0.752 | 0.087 | 0.310 | 0.416 | 0.419 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | 47. | 9 3 | 38.6 | 55.2 | 27.5 | 31. | .7 | 32.5 | 59.4 | 280.9 | 19.5 | 44.2 | 128.1 | 122.7 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percentile) | 1.9 |) | 1.5 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 3 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 11.2 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 5.1 | 4.9 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percentile) | 0.0 | 0 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | 12. | 7 ′ | 0.9 | 11.3 | 12.2 | 10. | .8 | 10.9 | 17.7 | 14.9 | 10.7 | 23.9 | 12.4 | 12.4 |
| Incremental De | lay (d 2 |), s/veh | 0.1 | 7 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Initial Queue De | elay (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 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| bl Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | 13. | 4 [·] | 11.3 | 12.0 | 12.5 | 11. | .1 | 11.3 | 17.9 | 18.6 | 10.7 | 24.1 | 12.5 | 12.6 |
| Level of Service | evel of Service (LOS) | | В | | В | В | В | В | | В | В | В | В | С | В | В |
| Approach Delay | Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | 2.2 | T | В | 11.6 | ; | 1 | В | 17.9 | | В | 13.8 | | В |
| Intersection Del | lay, s/ve | h / LOS | | | | 14 | 1.8 | | | | | | | B | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | W | B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | 2 | .28 | | В | 2.11 | | | В | 2.11 | | В | 2.28 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | 1 | .08 | | А | 0.69 |) | | А | 1.76 | ; | В | 1.08 | ; | А |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS™ Streets Version 7.8.5

| | | | - | | | | | | | | - | - | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------|-------------|----------------------|---------|----------|-------|----------|----------|----------|---------|------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | ersect | ion Inf | ormatio | on | | | × l <u>x</u> |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Dur | ration, | h | 0.250 |) | 1 | 444 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | e Dec 1 | , 2020 | | Are | a Type | e | Other | - | | | <u>م</u> |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existin | ng with | | PHI | F | | 0.96 | | 4 1 4 ↓ | W ↓ E | ₹ ↓ ↑ |
| Urban Street | | Glencoe Avenue | | Analys | sis Yea | r 2020 | | | Ana | alysis | Period | 1> 8: | 15 | | 542 | e e e |
| Intersection | | Glencoe/Maxella | | File Na | ame | 06AM | - Existi | ng wi | ith Pr | roject · | - Optior | n B.xus | | | 1 1 1 4 1 4 1 1 1 | × (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | , | | | | - | | - | | | | 1 7 | | |
| | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | - | | V | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (<i>v</i>), v | eh/h | | | 122 | 105 | 141 | 65 | 8 | 88 | 83 | 116 | 591 | 56 | 73 | 568 | 84 |
| | 4! | | | . <u> </u> | | - | | | | T | | | | _ | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | Deference Dhees | 0 | 1 | | 203 | | | | | | | | \rightarrow | | ተ |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase | Z | | E . | 151 | 7 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Unset, s | U | Reference Point | Ena | Green | 24.8 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | • |
| | INO | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | | 4 | _ | Ψ. |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Rea | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | Y 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | BL EBT WBL WBT NBL I | | | | | NBT | SBL | - | SBT | | | |
| Assigned Phase | Э | | | | | 6 | | | 2 | 2 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6. | .0 | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 30.0 | | | 30 | 0.0 | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period, | (Y+R | c), S | | | 5.2 | | | 5. | .2 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 | |
| Max Allow Head | dway (<i>I</i> | MAH), s | | | 0.0 | | | 0. | .0 | | | 3.4 | | | 3.4 | |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | | | | | | 18.8 | | | 24.1 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | | 2.5 | | | 0.4 | |
| Phase Call Prob | bability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probal | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.65 | | | 1.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | NB | | | | | _ |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | <u> </u> | W | B | _ | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | | R | | | _ | R | L | | R | L | | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | <u> </u> | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow F | |), veh/h | | 127 | 109 | 147 | 68 | 92 | 2 | 86 | 121 | 616 | 58 | 76 | 347 | 332 |
| Adjusted Satura | | bw Rate (s), ven/n/l | n | 1225 | 1900 | 1610 | 1304 | 190 | 1 00 | 1610 | 113 | 1900 | 1610 | 820 | 1900 | 1814 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | gs), s a Tima (g) a | | 4.3 | 2.2 | 3.5 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 5 | 2.0 | 8.0 | 16.8 | 1.3 | 5.3 | 7.8 | 7.9 |
| Cycle Queue C | | e filme (<i>g</i> c), s | | 0.3 | 2.2 | 3.5 | 4.2 | 1.0 |) 1 (| 2.0 | 15.0 | 10.0 | 1.3 | 22.1 | 7.0 | 7.9 |
| Green Ratio (g | /0) | | | 0.41 596 | 795 | 666 | 612 | 70.4 | | 666 | 220 | 790 | 0.42 | 220 | 790 | 0.42 |
| Volume to Can | en/n | tio (X) | | 0.217 | 100 | 0.00 | 012 | 0 11 | | 000 | 0.356 | 0 781 | 000 | 230 | 0.440 | 0.442 |
| Back of Oueue | (0) ft | (In (95 th percentile) | | 55 | 40.7 | 57.9 | 27.6 | 33 | 7 4 | 32.5 | 60.7 | 200 1 | 19.5 | 15.3 | 137 1 | 131.5 |
| Back of Queue | $(\mathbf{Q}), \mathbf{u}$ | hin (35 th percenti | اھ) | 22 | 1.6 | 23 | 1 1 | 1 3 | / `` | 13 | 24 | 12.0 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 55 | 53 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d 1), s | /veh | | 12.9 | 11.0 | 11.4 | 12.3 | 10. | 8 - | 10.9 | 18.2 | 15.2 | 10.7 | 24.8 | 12.6 | 12.6 |
| Incremental De | lav (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Initial Queue De | elav (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 Delav (| d), s/ve | eh | | 13.7 | 11.3 | 12.1 | 12.6 | 11. | 2 | 11.3 | 18.5 | 19.8 | 10.7 | 25.1 | 12.7 | 12.7 |
| Level of Service | (LOS) | | | В | В | В | B | В | + | В | В | В | В | С | В | В |
| Approach Delay | (, s/veh | /LOS | | 12.4 | | B | - 11.6 | 3 | F | B | 18.9 |) | B | 14.0 |) | B |
| Intersection Del | lay, s/ve | eh / LOS | | | | 15 | 5.2 | | | | | | | B | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.28 | 3 | В | 2.11 | | E | В | 2.11 | | В | 2.28 | 3 | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 1.12 | 2 | A | 0.69 |) | Α | Ą | 1.80 |) | В | 1.11 | | A |

| | - 3 | | | | | | | | | , | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|--|------|-----------|------------|---------|----------|---------------|----------|----------|--------|---------------|-------|------------|--|--------------------|
| General Inform | | | | | | | Int | tersect | ion Infe | ormatio | on | 2 | * | بد لي | | |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Green | span | Engine | ers | | | | Du | uration. | h | 0.250 | | | 444 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Dat | e Aug 1 | 3 2020 | | Are | ea Tvo | е | Other | | | | ار ک |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | - AM | | PH | 4F | | 0.96 | | → _* -> | w∔e | ≮_ ↓ |
| Urban Street | | Glencoe Avenue | | Analys | is Yea | r 2026 | , | | An | alvsis | Period | 1> 8 | 15 | 4 | | + * |
| Intersection | | Glencoe/Maxella | | File Na | ame | 06AM | - Future | | 3 | laryolo | | . 0. | | | K # 2 | <u>~</u> |
| Project Descript | tion | Paseo Marina | | 1 110 110 | | | - dtart | 5.766 | | | | | | | 1 (나라 1 (1 (1 (1 (1 (1 (1 (1 (1 (1 | × (* |
| j | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | T | ٧ | VB | | Γ | NB | | T | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | · · | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 126 | 116 | 160 | 69 | ę | 93 | 90 | 124 | 620 | 59 | 79 | 586 | 98 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | | | | | | | | | ð- | | \mathbf{L} |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | ₿ ! | 1 54 | 7 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point I | End | Green | 24.8 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | <u> </u> | | √ |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | · - | EBT | WB | - | W | VBT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | 9 | | | | _ | 6 | | \rightarrow | 2 | 2 | | \rightarrow | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | | | _ | 5.0 | | _ | 6 | 5.0 | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | _ | | _ | 30.0 | | _ | 30 | 0.0 | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period, | iod, (Y+R c), s eadway (MAH), s | | | | _ | 5.2 | | | 5 | o.2 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Head | x Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | <u> </u> | _ | 0.0 | | _ | 0.0 | | | | 3.5 | <u> </u> | | 3.5 |
| Queue Clearan | | (gs), s | | <u> </u> | _ | | | | 0.0 | | | | 20.1 | <u> </u> | | 26.2 |
| Green Extensio | n lime | (ge), s | _ | <u> </u> | _ | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | | 2.3 | <u> </u> | _ | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | _ | | | | | \rightarrow | | | | | 1.00 | <u> </u> | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probai | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.82 | | | 1.00 |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | _ | L | Т | R | L | Т | - - | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | _ | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | + | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | _ | 131 | 121 | 167 | 72 | 97 | 7 | 94 | 129 | 646 | 61 | 82 | 365 | 348 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s), veh/h/ln | | 1211 | 1900 | 1610 | 1291 | 190 | . 0C | 1610 | 749 | 1900 | 1610 | 797 | 1900 | 1805 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | | 4.5 | 2.4 | 4.1 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 9 | 2.2 | 9.1 | 18.1 | 1.4 | 6.1 | 8.3 | 8.4 |
| Cycle Queue C | learance | e Time (g c), s | | 6.7 | 2.4 | 4.1 | 4.6 | 1.9 | 9 | 2.2 | 17.4 | 18.1 | 1.4 | 24.2 | 8.3 | 8.4 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.4 | 1 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 577 | 785 | 666 | 602 | 78 | 5 | 666 | 326 | 789 | 668 | 211 | 789 | 749 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | tio(X) | | 0.228 | 0.154 | 0.250 | 0.119 | 0.12 | 23 (| 0.141 | 0.396 | 0.819 | 0.092 | 0.391 | 0.463 | 0.464 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | 57.6 | 45.3 | 66.9 | 29.6 | 35. | .7 | 35.4 | 67.2 | 327 | 20.6 | 51.1 | 145.6 | 139.3 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percentile) | | 2.3 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 4 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 13.1 | 0.8 | 2.0 | 5.8 | 5.6 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percentile |) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | | 13.1 | 11.0 | 11.5 | 12.5 | 10. | .9 | 11.0 | 19.0 | 15.6 | 10.7 | 26.3 | 12.7 | 12.7 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 6.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Initial Queue De | elay(d | <i>d</i> ₂), s/ven (<i>d</i> 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 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | 14.0 | 11.4 | 12.4 | 12.9 | 11. | .2 | 11.4 | 19.3 | 21.9 | 10.7 | 26.7 | 12.9 | 12.9 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | В | В | В | В | | В | В | С | В | С | В | В |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 12.6 | | В | 11.7 | ' | I | В | 20.7 | · | С | 14.3 | | В |
| Intersection Del | lay, s/ve | h / LOS | | | | 16 | 6.0 | | | | | | | В | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.28 | | В | 2.11 | | I | В | 2.11 | | В | 2.28 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC |)S | | 1.18 | | А | 0.70 |) | | A | 1.87 | | В | 1.14 | | А |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS™ Streets Version 7.8.5
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inters | sect | ion Inf | ormatio | on | | | þa l _a |
|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|----------|----------|---------|----------|---------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|-------|------------|---------|---|
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Durat | tion, | h | 0.250 | 1 | 1 | 417 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | e Dec 1 | . 2020 | | Area | Tvpe | e | Other | | | | <i>د</i> 4 |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e with | | PHF | | | 0.96 | | | w∱e | ter |
| | | | | | | Projec | ct - AM | | | | | | | | | ۲ ۲ ۲ |
| Urban Street | | Glencoe Avenue | | Analys | sis Yea | r 2026 | | | Analy | ysis I | Period | 1> 8: | 15 | | ካ ተ r | |
| Intersection | | Glencoe/Maxella | | File Na | ame | 06AM | - Future | e with | Proje | ect - (| Option | B.xus | | 5 | * 1 *** | אן א |
| Project Descript | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Domand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | 10 | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | | Т | R | 1 | 7 | | R | | T | R | | Т | R |
| Demand (v) v | eh/h | | | 140 | 120 | 166 | 69 | 9 | 8 0 | 90 | 124 | 642 | 59 | 79 | 621 | 98 |
| | 011/11 | | | 110 | 120 | 100 | 00 | 0 | | 00 | 121 | UTZ | 00 | 10 | 021 | 00 |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | | Т | | | | | | | <u>⊼_</u> | | |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | | - • | 7 | | | | | | | | 1 | Φ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 24.8 | 24 9 | 1 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) (| 0.0 | 0.0 | | | x | | 512 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | nult. Gap N/S On | | | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) (| 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | Y 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | | WBT | Т | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 6 | | \rightarrow | 2 | | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 | | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 |) | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period, | (Y+R | c), S | | | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 | | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Head | dway(<i>I</i> | <i>MAH</i>), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | | 3.5 | | | 3.5 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | | | | | | 21.1 | | | 26.9 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | | 2.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prot | oability | | | | | | | \rightarrow | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probal | oility | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.95 | | | 1.00 |
| Movement Gre | | aulte | | | EB | | | \ \ /F | 2 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | Juito | _ | | Т | R | | Т | , R | 2 | 1 | Т | R | | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |) veh/h | | 146 | 125 | 173 | 72 | 101 | 1 9 | 5 | 129 | 669 | 61 | 82 | 383 | 366 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | 1206 | 1900 | 1610 | 1286 | 190 | 0 16 | 13 | 724 | 1900 | 1610 | 780 | 1900 | 1809 |
| Queue Service | Time (d | 7 s) S | | 5.1 | 2.5 | 4.2 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 2 | 2 | 9.6 | 19.1 | 1.4 | 5.8 | 8.9 | 8.9 |
| Cvcle Queue Cl | learanc | e Time (| | 7.3 | 2.5 | 4.2 | 4.7 | 2.0 | 2. | .2 | 18.4 | 19.1 | 1.4 | 24.9 | 8.9 | 8.9 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | (3) | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.4 | 1 0.4 | 41 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| Capacity (c), v | , eh/h | | | 574 | 785 | 666 | 598 | 785 | 5 66 | 67 | 313 | 789 | 668 | 196 | 789 | 751 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | itio(X) | | 0.254 | 0.159 | 0.260 | 0.120 | 0.12 | 9 0.1 | 42 | 0.412 | 0.848 | 0.092 | 0.420 | 0.486 | 0.487 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) | | 65.2 | 47.1 | 69.7 | 29.8 | 37.4 | 4 35 | 5.9 | 68.8 | 352.3 | 20.6 | 52.5 | 155 | 148 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 2.6 | 1.9 | 2.8 | 1.2 | 1.5 | i 1. | .4 | 2.8 | 14.1 | 0.8 | 2.1 | 6.2 | 5.9 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | D.O.C | 00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| d 1), s | /veh | | 13.3 | 11.1 | 11.6 | 12.5 | 10.9 | 9 11 | .0 | 19.6 | 15.8 | 10.7 | 27.3 | 12.9 | 12.9 |
| Incremental Del | lay (d 2 |), s/veh | | 1.1 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0. | .4 | 0.3 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Initial Queue Delay (<i>d z</i>), 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 | | | | 14.3 | 11.5 | 12.5 | 12.9 | 11.2 | 2 11 | .4 | 20.0 | 24.0 | 10.7 | 27.8 | 13.0 | 13.1 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | В | В | В | В | E | 3 | В | С | В | С | В | В |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 12.8 | 3 | В | 11.8 | 3 | В | | 22.5 | 5 | С | 14.5 | 5 | В |
| Intersection Del | Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | 16 | 6.7 | | | | | | | B | | |
| | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LOS | | 2.28 | 3 | В | 2.11 | | В | | 2.11 | | В | 2.28 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 1.22 | 2 | А | 0.71 | 1 | Α | | 1.91 | | В | 1.17 | | A |

| | | | 9 | | | | | | und (| | | , | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|-------|--------|---------|----------|---------|-------|------------|-----------|----------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inf | torsact | tion Inf | ormati | n | | 4 7 4 1 1 | به لي |
| | lation | Linscott Law & Green | enan | Engine | oore | | | | | uration | b | 0 250 | | | 414 | |
| Apolyot | | | ispan | | | | 2 2020 | | Δr | | <u></u> | Othou | | 1 | | <u>گ</u> |
| Analyst | | | | Times | | E Aug I | 3, 2020 | | | чатур | e | | | →× | w1∈ | <u>↓</u> |
| Jurisdiction | | | | Analys | | | ig - Pivi | | | | Dariad | 1 10.94 | | | | ¥ |
| Urban Street | | Giencoe Avenue | | Analys | sis rea | IF 2020 | E. J. Al | | An | alysis | Period | 1> 10 | :45 | | | к. К. |
| | | Giencoe/Maxella | | File Na | ame | 06PM | - Existi | ng.xı | us | | | | | _ | ጎተሰ | - 4 |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 144 | 141 | 185 | 96 | 1 | 52 | 100 | 125 | 354 | 72 | 47 | 693 | 117 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | | | Τ | | | | | | <u> </u> | | |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | 1 | | - 54 | 2 | | | | | | | | | Φ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Croop | | 24.0 | 100 | | 0 | 0.0 | | _ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | X | | st2 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | F 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | | - | EBT | WB | L | V | VBT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | Assigned Phase | | | | | 6 | | | | 2 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | se Number | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6 | 6.0 | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | hase Duration, s | | | | | 30.0 | | | 3 | 0.0 | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period, ($Y+Rc$), s | | | | | | 5.2 | | | 5 | 5.2 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | | 0.0 | | | (| 0.0 | | | 3.5 | | | 3.5 |
| Queue Clearance Time (g s), s | | | | | | | | | | | | | 24.4 | | | 12.9 |
| Green Extension Time ($g e$), s | | | | | | 0.0 | | | (| 0.0 | | | 0.3 | | | 3.5 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.24 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | W | 'B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |), veh/h | | 153 | 150 | 197 | 102 | 13 | 9 | 129 | 133 | 377 | 77 | 50 | 442 | 420 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/ln | | 1129 | 1900 | 1610 | 1257 | 190 | 00 | 1655 | 652 | 1900 | 1610 | 1022 | 1900 | 1804 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | ys), S | | 6.0 | 3.0 | 4.9 | 3.4 | 2. | 8 | 3.0 | 11.7 | 8.7 | 1.8 | 2.3 | 10.6 | 10.6 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 9.0 | 3.0 | 4.9 | 6.4 | 2. | 8 | 3.0 | 22.4 | 8.7 | 1.8 | 10.9 | 10.6 | 10.6 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.4 | 11 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| Capacity (c), v | eh/h | | | 530 | 785 | 666 | 576 | 78 | 5 | 684 | 275 | 789 | 668 | 396 | 789 | 749 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | tio (X) | | 0.289 | 0.191 | 0.296 | 0.177 | 0.1 | 76 | 0.189 | 0.484 | 0.478 | 0.115 | 0.126 | 0.560 | 0.561 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | 72.3 | 57.2 | 81 | 44.7 | 52 | .6 | 50.1 | 77.2 | 151.8 | 25.9 | 22.7 | 189.4 | 180.2 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), Ve | eh/ln (95 th percentile) |) | 2.9 | 2.3 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 2. | 1 | 2.0 | 3.1 | 6.1 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 7.6 | 7.2 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percentile |) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (01), S | ven | _ | 14.1 | 11.2 | 11.8 | 13.2 | 11. | .1 | 11.2 | 21.9 | 12.8 | 10.8 | 16.8 | 13.4 | 13.4 |
| Incremental Delay (d 2), s/veh | | | | 1.4 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0. | 5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Initial Queue Delay (d_3), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0. | U C | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | 15.4 | 11.8 | 12.9 | 13.9 | 11. | .6 | 11.8 | 22.4 | 13.0 | 10.8 | 16.8 | 13.9 | 14.0 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | В | | B | L B | 5 | В | C | В | В | В | В | В |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 13.3 | 5 | В | 12.3 | 5 | | В | 14.8 | 5 | В | 14.1 | | В |
| Intersection De | ntersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | 1: | 3.8 | | | | | | | В | | |
| Multimodal Po | Aultimodal Results | | | | EP | | | 10/ | 'B | | | NR | | | SR | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /1.05 | | 2.25 | 20 | B | 2 11 | | 0 | B | 2 11 | | B | 2.29 | | B |
| Bicycle I OS Sc | ore / I C |)S | | 1.31 | | A | 0.70 | , | | A | 1 45 | ; | A | 1 24 | _ | A |
| | | - | | | | | 5.10 | - | | · · | | | | | | |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS™ Streets Version 7.8.5

| | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|---------------------------|--------|----------|----------|---------|------------|----------|------------|----------|----------|---------|-------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | ersect | ion Inf | ormatio | on | 2 | | ⊨ L <u>⊾</u> |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | eers | | | | Dura | ration, | h | 0.250 | | 1 | 444 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | e Dec 1 | . 2020 | | Area | a Type | e | Other | | 4 | | |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existi | ng with | | PHF | F | | 0.94 | | 4 1 4 1 | W ↓ E | 1 1 1 1 1 1 |
| Urban Street | | Glencoe Avenue | | Analys | sis Yea | 2020 | | | Ana | alvsis | Period | 1> 16 | :45 | | | <u> </u> |
| Intersection | | Glencoe/Maxella | | File Na | ame | 06PM | - Existi | ng wi | th Pr | roject · | - Optior | B.xus | | | <u>ो ौ िं</u> च 1 केल | ۳ ۲ |
| Project Descript | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | _ | | <u> </u> | | <u> </u> | | | | 1 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | N | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | L | Т | R | <u> </u> | | г | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 147 | 142 | 186 | 96 | 1: | 54 | 100 | 125 | 358 | 72 | 47 | 704 | 117 |
| | <u> </u> | | | | | | _ | | | Γ | | | | _ | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | Defense Dhara | 0 | | | 215 | | | | | | | ~ | \rightarrow | | ሐ |
| Cycle, s | 0.00 | Reference Phase | Z | | | 1 51 | 2 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Ulisel, s | | Simult Cap 5/M | Ena | Green | 24.8 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | • |
| | Tixed | Simult Cap N/S | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | | e | - | ۲ |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Rea | 1.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | X 6 | 1 | 8 |
| Timer Results | | | EBI | - | EBT | WB | L | WE | BT | NBI | - | NBT | SBI | - | SBT | |
| Assigned Phase | Э | | | | | 6 | | | 2 | 2 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6. | .0 | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 30.0 | | | 30 | 0.0 | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period, | (Y+R | c), S | | | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 | .2 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Head | dway(<i>I</i> | <i>MAH</i>), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0. | .0 | | | 3.5 | | | 3.5 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | | | | | | 24.8 | | | 13.1 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0. | .0 | | | 0.1 | | | 3.6 |
| Phase Call Prot | oability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probal | oility | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.25 |
| | _ | | _ | _ | | | | | _ | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | up Res | sults | | | EB | | | | В | _ | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | | R | L | | _ | R | L | I | R | | | R |
| Assigned Move | |) I. //- | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 1 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow F | tion L |), ven/n | n . | 150 | 151 | 198 | 102 | 140 | | 131 | 133 | 381 | 1610 | 50 | 448 | 420 |
| | | | n | 6.2 | 1900 | 1010 | 2.4 | 190 | | 2.0 | 11.0 | 1900 | 1010 | 1010 | 10.9 | 1005 |
| | learanc | g(s), S | | 0.2 | 3.0 | 4.9 | 5.4 6.4 | 2.0 | 2 | 3.0 | 22.8 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 2.3 11 1 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Green Ratio (a | | e fille (<i>g c</i>), s | | 0./1 | 0.41 | 4.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | , , 1 (| 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.0 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| | /o/) | | | 520 | 785 | 666 | 575 | 78 | 5 6 | 685 | 271 | 780 | 668 | 303 | 789 | 7/0 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | utio (X) | | 0.296 | 0 192 | 0.297 | 0 177 | 0.17 | 78 0 | 191 | 0 4 9 0 | 0.483 | 0.115 | 0 127 | 0.568 | 0.568 |
| Back of Queue | (Q) ft | (In (95 th percentile) | | 74.5 | 57.8 | 81.5 | 44.7 | 53. | 1 5 | 50.5 | 77.9 | 154 | 25.9 | 22.8 | 192.1 | 183.8 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/ln (95 th percenti | le) | 3.0 | 2.3 | 3.3 | 1.8 | 2.1 | 1 | 2.0 | 3.1 | 6.2 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 7.7 | 7.4 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| d 1), s | /veh | | 14.1 | 11.2 | 11.8 | 13.3 | 11. | 1 1 | 11.2 | 22.1 | 12.8 | 10.8 | 16.9 | 13.4 | 13.4 |
| Incremental Del | lay (d 2 |), s/veh | | 1.4 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Initial Queue Delay (<i>d</i> 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 (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | 15.5 | 11.8 | 12.9 | 13.9 | 11. | 6 1 | 11.8 | 22.7 | 13.0 | 10.8 | 16.9 | 14.0 | 14.1 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | В | В | В | В | | В | С | В | В | В | В | В |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 13.4 | - | В | 12.3 | 3 | В | 3 | 14.9 | | В | 14.2 | 2 | В |
| Intersection Del | ay, s/ve | h / LOS | | | | 1: | 3.9 | | | | | | | В | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.28 | 3 | В | 2.11 | | В | 3 | 2.11 | | В | 2.28 | 3 | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 1.32 | 2 | А | 0.79 |) | A | 4 | 1.46 | 5 | A | 1.25 | 5 | A |

| | | | <u>g</u> | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|----------|--------|---------------|-----------|-------|--------|-------|---------|---------|-------|----------------|----------|-----------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | Inters | sort | ion Inf | ormatio | n | | * | x l <u>x</u> |
| Agency | lation | Linscott Law & Greensp | an Engir | eers | | | | Durat | tion | h | 0 250 | | | 444 | |
| Apolyet | | | | | to Aug 1 | 3 2020 | | Area | Type | | Other | | _3 _3 | | <u>ئ</u> ے ا |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angolos | Timo | Doriod | | 5, 2020 | | | туре | 6 | 0.04 | | → <u></u> _* | w↓e | |
| Jurisaiction | | City of Los Angeles | Apoly | | r 2026 | 5 - F IVI | | Analy | | Poriod | 1 16 | | - ⁴ | | |
| Intersection | | Glencoe/Maxella | Filo N | | | Eutur | | Analy | 515 1 | renou | 1-10 | .45 | | | <u> </u> |
| Project Descrip | tion | | File IN | ame | | - Futur | e.xus | • | | | | | - 4 | | × (* |
| Project Descrip | lion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | EE | 3 | | V | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | 169 | 16 | 5 201 | 102 | 1 | 80 1 | 108 | 151 | 393 | 76 | 54 | 762 | 145 |
| | | | | | | <u> </u> | | | | | | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | N. | _ | | | | | | | Ð− | | \mathbf{k} |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase 2 | | HE - | * ¶ s⊕ | 2 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point End | I Greer | 1 24.8 | 3 24.9 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W On | Yellov | v 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | <u>a</u> | | N |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S On | Red | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | Y 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | EB | | EBT | WB | | WBT | r | NBL | - | NBT | SBI | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | signed Phase | | | | 6 | | _ | 2 | _ | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | se Number | | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 | | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | Phase Duration, s | | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 | | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period, (Y+R c), s | | | | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 | | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | | 3.6 | | | 3.6 |
| Queue Clearance Time (g_s), s | | | | | | | | | | | | 26.9 | | | 14.7 |
| Green Extension Time (g e), s | | | | | 0.0 | | _ | 0.0 | | | | 0.0 | | | 3.9 |
| Phase Call Probability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.42 |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | _ | FB | | | W | 'B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | 1.1 | Т | R | 1 | Т | · R | २ | 1 | Т | R | 1 | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |), veh/h | 180 | 176 | 214 | 109 | 15 | 9 14 | 18 | 161 | 418 | 81 | 57 | 496 | 469 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s), veh/h/ln | 1090 | 1900 | 0 1610 | 1228 | 190 | 00 16 | 67 | 592 | 1900 | 1610 | 984 | 1900 | 1794 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | 7 s), S | 7.6 | 3.6 | 5.4 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 2 3. | .4 | 12.5 | 9.9 | 1.9 | 2.8 | 12.4 | 12.4 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>q</i> c), s | 11.1 | 3.6 | 5.4 | 7.3 | 3.2 | 2 3. | .4 | 24.9 | 9.9 | 1.9 | 12.7 | 12.4 | 12.4 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.4 | 1 0.4 | 41 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| Capacity (c), v | / veh/h | | 508 | 785 | 666 | 554 | 78 | 5 68 | 39 | 243 | 789 | 668 | 366 | 789 | 744 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | tio (<i>X</i>) | 0.354 | 0.22 | 4 0.321 | 0.196 | 0.2 | 02 0.2 | 14 | 0.661 | 0.530 | 0.121 | 0.157 | 0.629 | 0.629 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | 90.4 | 68.3 | 8 89.5 | 48.9 | 61 | 1 57 | '.8 | 116.9 | 174.9 | 27.4 | 27.4 | 218 | 208.9 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percentile) | 3.6 | 2.7 | 3.6 | 2.0 | 2.4 | 4 2. | .3 | 4.7 | 7.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 8.7 | 8.4 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percentile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | 14.9 | 11.4 | 11.9 | 13.7 | 11. | .3 11 | .3 | 25.2 | 13.2 | 10.8 | 17.9 | 13.9 | 13.9 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | 1.9 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 6 0. | .7 | 5.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 |
| 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 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | 12.0 |) 13.2 | 14.5 | 11. | .8 12 | 2.0 | 30.5 | 13.5 | 10.8 | 18.0 | 15.1 | 15.2 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | В | В | В | E | 3 | С | В | В | В | В | В |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 0 | В | 12.6 | 3 | В | | 17.3 | | В | 15.3 | 3 | В |
| Intersection De | ntersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 15 | 5.1 | | | | | | | В | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Multimodal Results | | | | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | 2.2 | 8 | В | 2.11 | | В | | 2.11 | | В | 2.28 | 3 | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | 1.4 | 3 | А | 0.83 | 3 | А | | 1.58 | | В | 1.33 | 3 | A |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS[™] Streets Version 7.8.5

| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inters | ecti | ion Infe | ormatio | on | * | 4444 | ⊨ T _{at} |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|----------|-------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|----------------|----------|----------|---------|---------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engin | eers | | | | Duratio | on, I | h | 0.250 | | 1 | 4 + 5 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | Dec 1 | , 2020 | | Area T | уре | ; | Other | | 4 | | |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e with ct - PM | | PHF | | | 0.94 | | 4 1 4 1 1 ↓ ∫ | w ^N € | 1 + + + + + + + + + |
| Urban Street | | Glencoe Avenue | | Analys | sis Year | 2026 | | | Analys | sis F | Period | 1> 16 | :45 | | | |
| Intersection | | Glencoe/Maxella | | File Na | ame | 06PM | - Future | e with | Proiec | t - C | Dption I | B.xus | | - | <u>ो 1 (</u> जनसङ्ख्या | ۲. ۲ |
| Project Descript | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | | , | | <u> </u> | | | 1 - | | |
| , , | | - 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | L | Т | R | L | Τ- | Г F | २ | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 172 | 166 | 202 | 102 | 18 | 32 10 | 28 | 151 | 397 | 76 | 54 | 773 | 145 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | 215 | | | | | | | | Δ | | |
| Cycle, s | 60.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 1 11 - 1 1 | 1 sa | 2 | | | | | | 1 | ¥ _ | 2 | († X |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 24.8 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0. | 0 | 0.0 | | | 2 | 5 | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0. | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | | | <u> </u> | | 512 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0. | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | _ | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | - | EBT | WB | L | WBT | 4 | NBL | - | NBT | SBI | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 6 | | | 2 | 4 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 | | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 | | | | 30.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period, | | | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 | | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 | | |
| Max Allow Head | dway(<i>I</i> | <i>MAH</i>), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | | 3.6 | | | 3.6 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | | | | | | 26.9 | | | 14.8 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | | 0.0 | | | 4.0 |
| Phase Call Prot | oability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probal | oility | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.43 |
| | | | | _ | 50 | | _ | 10.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | |
| Movement Gro | up Kes | Sults | | <u> </u> | EB | | | | 3 | + | | NB | | <u> </u> | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | | R | L C | | R 40 | + | L | 1 | R 40 | | 1 | R |
| Assigned Move | meni Dete (i | · //- | | 1 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 2 | | | 3 | 8 | 18 | 1 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow F | tion Fla |), ven/n | - | 183 | 1// | 215 | 109 | 160 | 148 | , | 101 | 422 | 81 | 57 | 502 | 474 |
| Adjusted Satura | | bw Rate (s), ven/n/i | n | 1088 | 1900 | 1610 | 1227 | 190 | | 8 | 585 | 1900 | 1610 | 980 | 1900 | 1795 |
| Queue Service | Time ((| gs), s a Tima (g) a | | 1.0 | 3.0 | 5.4 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 3.4 | | 12.3 | 10.0 | 1.9 | 2.8 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Croop Patia (a | | e fille (<i>g</i> c), s | | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.4 | . 3.4 1 0.4 | | 24.9 | 0.42 | 1.9 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| Conocity (c) y | /C) | | | 507 | 785 | 666 | 553 | 79/ | 5 690 | <u>'</u> | 240 | 790 | 669 | 262 | 780 | 745 |
| Volume to Can | city Ra | atio (X) | | 0.361 | 0 225 | 000 | 0 106 | 0.20 | | 6 | 0.670 | 0.536 | 000 | 0 158 | 0.637 | 0.637 |
| Back of Ououo | (0) ft | (0, 7) | | 0.301 | 68.8 | 80.0 | 40 | 61 | 5 58 | 4 | 110 2 | 177.5 | 27.4 | 27.5 | 0.007 | 211.0 |
| Back of Queue | $(\mathbf{Q}), \mathbf{u}$ | ah/In (95 th percentie) | (ما | 32.4 | 2.8 | 3.6 | 49 20 | 2 5 | 2 2 3 | + | 110.5 | 7 1 | 1 1 | 1 1 | 8.8 | 85 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | | , 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| d 1). s | /veh | | 15.0 | 11.4 | 11.9 | 13.8 | 11.3 | 3 11.3 | 3 | 25.4 | 13.2 | 10.8 | 18.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Incremental Del | lay (d 2 |), s/veh | | 2.0 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 6 0.7 | , | 5.8 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 1.4 |
| Initial Queue Delay (<i>d</i> 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 (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | 17.0 | 12.0 | 13.2 | 14.6 | 11.9 | 9 12.1 | 1 | 31.2 | 13.6 | 10.8 | 18.1 | 15.3 | 15.4 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | В | В | В | В | В | | С | В | В | В | В | В |
| Approach Delay | | 14.0 |) | В | 12.6 | 3 | В | | 17.5 | 5 | В | 15.5 | 5 | В | | |
| Intersection Del | Intersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | | 15 | 5.2 | | | | | | | В | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | W | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LOS | | 2.28 | 3 | В | 2.11 | | В | | 2.11 | | В | 2.28 | 3 | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 1.44 | + | А | 0.83 | 3 | А | | 1.58 | 3 | В | 1.34 | - | А |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/N. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Northerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | Westk | ound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
|---|------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|------|---|----|-------|-------|---|----|-------|-------|---|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | | | | | | | | | Т | | | | Т | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | 741 | | | | 733 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | 11037 1100 1103 5101 | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/N. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Northerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Facth | ound | | | Mastk | aund | | | North | hound | | | Couth | agund | |
|---|------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|---|----|-------|-------|---|----|-------|-------|---|
| Approach | | Easto | ouna | | | west | bound | | | North | bound | | | South | Jouna | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | | | | | | | | | Т | | | | Т | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | 763 | | | | 774 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/N. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Northerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
|---|------|-------|--------|------|-------|------|-------|---|----|-------|-------|---|----|-------|-------|---|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | | | | | | | | | Т | | | | Т | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | 804 | | | | 815 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/N. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Northerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
|---|------|---------|--------|------|-----------|---|---|---|------------|---|-----|---|------------|---|-----|---|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | | | | | | | | | Т | | | | Т | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | 826 | | | | 856 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | ivided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/N. Glencoe Dwy | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Northerly Glencoe Dwy | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | Westbound | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | | |
|---|------|---------|--------|------|-----------|---|---|------------|----|---|-----|------------|----|---|-----|---|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | | | | | | | | | Т | | | | Т | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | 551 | | | | 974 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| General InformationSite InformationAnalystJASIntersectionGlencoe/N. Glencoe DwyAgency/Co.Linscott, Law & GreenspanJurisdictionCity of Los AngelesDate Performed12/1/2020East/West StreetNortherly Glencoe DwyAnalysis Year2020North/South StreetGlencoe AvenueTime AnalyzedExisting + Project - PMPeak Hour Factor0.92Intersection OrientationNorth-SouthAnalysis Time Period (hrs)0.25 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| AnalystJASIntersectionGlencoe/N. Glencoe DwyAgency/Co.Linscott, Law & GreenspanJurisdictionCity of Los AngelesDate Performed12/1/2020East/West StreetNortherly Glencoe DwyAnalysis Year2020North/South StreetGlencoe AvenueTime AnalyzedExisting + Project - PMPeak Hour Factor0.92Intersection OrientationNorth-SouthAnalysis Time Period (hrs)0.25 | General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co.Linscott, Law & GreenspanJurisdictionCity of Los AngelesDate Performed12/1/2020East/West StreetNortherly Glencoe DwyAnalysis Year2020North/South StreetGlencoe AvenueTime AnalyzedExisting + Project - PMPeak Hour Factor0.92Intersection OrientationNorth-SouthAnalysis Time Period (hrs)0.25 | Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/N. Glencoe Dwy | | | | | |
| Date Performed12/1/2020East/West StreetNortherly Glencoe DwyAnalysis Year2020North/South StreetGlencoe AvenueTime AnalyzedExisting + Project - PMPeak Hour Factor0.92Intersection OrientationNorth-SouthAnalysis Time Period (hrs)0.25 | Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | |
| Analysis Year 2020 North/South Street Glencoe Avenue Time Analyzed Existing + Project - PM Peak Hour Factor 0.92 Intersection Orientation North-South Analysis Time Period (hrs) 0.25 | Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Northerly Glencoe Dwy | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed Existing + Project - PM Peak Hour Factor 0.92 Intersection Orientation North-South Analysis Time Period (hrs) 0.25 | Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation North-South Analysis Time Period (hrs) 0.25 | Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | |
| | Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | |
| Project Description Paseo Marina - Option B | Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | | | | | | |

Lanes



| - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|---------|--------|------|-----------|---|---|---|------------|---|-----|---|------------|---|-----|---|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | | | | | | | | | Т | | | | Т | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | 555 | | | | 971 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/N. Glencoe Dwy | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Northerly Glencoe Dwy | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Future - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Lanes



| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
|---|------|---------|--------|------|-----------|---|---|---|------------|---|-----|---|------------|---|------|---|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | | | | | | | | | Т | | | | Т | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | 620 | | | | 1065 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/N. Glencoe Dwy | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Northerly Glencoe Dwy | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Future + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
|---|------|-------|--------|------|-----------|---|---|---|------------|---|-----|---|------------|---|------|---|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | | | | | | | | | Т | | | | Т | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | 624 | | | | 1062 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/S. Glencoe Dwy | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Southerly Glencoe Dwy | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | |

Lanes



| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|---------|-----------|------|-----------|------|------|------|------------|------|-----|----|------------|------|-----|----|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | LR | | | | LR | | | L | Т | TR | | L | Т | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) | | 13 | | 6 | | 10 | | 10 | 0 | 14 | 718 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 714 | 16 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | 0 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | Undivided | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 4.1 | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 4.16 | | | | 4.16 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 2.2 | | | | 2.2 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 2.23 | | | | 2.23 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | 21 | | | | 22 | | | 15 | | | | 3 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | 175 | | | | 219 | | | 817 | | | | 824 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | 0.12 | | | | 0.10 | | | 0.02 | | | | 0.00 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q_{95} (veh) | | | 0.4 | | | | 0.3 | | | 0.1 | | | | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | 28.3 | | | | 23.2 | | | 9.5 | | | | 9.4 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | D | | | | С | | | А | | | | А | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 28 | 28.3 23.2 | | | | 0.2 | | | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | D C | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/S. Glencoe Dwy | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Southerly Glencoe Dwy | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Lanes



| Approach | Eastbound Westbound U L T R U L T | | | | | | | | | North | oound | | | South | bound | |
|---|---|-------|--------|------|---|------|------|------|----|-------|-------|----|----|-------|-------|----|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | LR | | | | LR | | | L | Т | TR | | L | Т | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) | | 35 | | 64 | | 10 | | 10 | 0 | 56 | 715 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 713 | 60 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | (| C | | | (| C | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | Undivided | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 4.1 | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 4.16 | | | | 4.16 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 2.2 | | | | 2.2 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 2.23 | | | | 2.23 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | 108 | | | | 22 | | | 61 | | | | 3 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | 221 | | | | 169 | | | 784 | | | | 826 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | 0.49 | | | | 0.13 | | | 0.08 | | | | 0.00 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | 2.4 | | | | 0.4 | | | 0.3 | | | | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | 35.7 | | | | 29.5 | | | 10.0 | | | | 9.4 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | E | | | | D | | | А | | | | А | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 35 | 5.7 | | | 29 | 9.5 | | | 0 | 7 | | | 0 | .0 | |
| Approach LOS | E D | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/S. Glencoe Dwy | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Southerly Glencoe Dwy | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue | | | | | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Future - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Lanes



| Approach | Eastbound Westbound U L T R U L T | | | | | | | | | North | oound | | | South | bound | |
|---|---|---------|--------|------|---|------|------|------|----|-------|-------|----|----|-------|-------|----|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | LR | | | | LR | | | L | Т | TR | | L | Т | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) | | 14 | | 6 | | 11 | | 11 | 0 | 15 | 779 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 795 | 17 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | (| 0 | | | (| C | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | Undivided | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 4.1 | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 4.16 | | | | 4.16 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 2.2 | | | | 2.2 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 2.23 | | | | 2.23 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | 22 | | | | 24 | | | 16 | | | | 3 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | 140 | | | | 185 | | | 756 | | | | 778 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | 0.15 | | | | 0.13 | | | 0.02 | | | | 0.00 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | 0.5 | | | | 0.4 | | | 0.1 | | | | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | 35.3 | | | | 27.3 | | | 9.9 | | | | 9.6 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | E | | | | D | | | А | | | | А | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 35 | 5.3 | | | 27 | 7.3 | | | 0. | 2 | | | 0 | .0 | |
| Approach LOS | | I | E | | | [|) | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/S. Glencoe Dwy | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Southerly Glencoe Dwy | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue | | | | | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Future + Project - AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Lanes



| Approach | Eastbound Westbound U L T R U L T | | | | | | | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
|---|---|-------|--------|------|---|------|------|------|----|-------|-------|----|----|-------|-------|----|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | LR | | | | LR | | | L | Т | TR | | L | Т | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) | | 36 | | 64 | | 11 | | 11 | 0 | 57 | 776 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 794 | 61 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | (|) | | | (| C | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | Undivided | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 4.1 | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 4.16 | | | | 4.16 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 2.2 | | | | 2.2 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 2.23 | | | | 2.23 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | 109 | | | | 24 | | | 62 | | | | 3 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | 182 | | | | 140 | | | 725 | | | | 780 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | 0.60 | | | | 0.17 | | | 0.09 | | | | 0.00 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | 3.3 | | | | 0.6 | | | 0.3 | | | | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | 50.7 | | | | 36.0 | | | 10.4 | | | | 9.6 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | F | | | | E | | | В | | | | А | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 50 |).7 | | | 36 | 5.0 | | | 0. | .7 | | | 0 | .0 | |
| Approach LOS | | I | F | | | I | E | | | | | | | | | |

| | | 1103 | / Sig | nanze | u mu | el sec | | lesu | its Sui | iiiiiai j | у | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|--------|--------------------------|----------|-------------|----------|---------------|-----------|-------------|----------|-------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|
| 0 | | | | Intersection Information | | | | | | | | | T n | | . T |
| General Inforn | nation | | | | | | | \rightarrow | Intersec | tion Inf | ormatio | on | - 1 | 444 | * ' <u>*</u> |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Duration | , h | 0.250 | | | | × |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | Dec 1 | , 2020 | | Area Typ | e | Other | | | | * }_ |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e with | | PHF | | 0.92 | | * | w∓e ° | |
| | | | | | | (Impro | vement | ts) | | | | | ار الح | | 과 ~ |
| Urban Street | | Glencoe Avenue | | Analys | sis Year | 2026 | | , | Analysis | Period | 1> 7:4 | 15 | | ግተዮ | |
| Intersection | | Glencoe/N. Dwy-V\ | / Dwy | File Na | ame | 08AM | - Future | e with | Project - | Option | B (Impr | ovem | | *I T *** Y F | * [|
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | | , | • | <u> </u> | | 1 | | |
| , , | | - 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | В | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 36 | 0 | 64 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 57 | 776 | 3 | 3 | 794 | 61 |
| | | | | 10 | | | | | ii- | | | | | | 1 |
| Signal Informa | ition | | | | 245a | 3 | | | | | | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 517 | "R" | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | € ₄ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 54.6 | 25.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | 5 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | $\mathbf{\nabla}$ | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 0.7 | 1./ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timer Beaulte | | | | EDI | | грт | | | | ND | | NDT | CDI | _ | ODT |
| Assigned Phase | 0 | | | EDI | - | | VVD | | | IND | - | 6 | 361 | - | 2 |
| Coso Number | | | | <u> </u> | | 4 0 0 | <u> </u> | + | 0 | <u> </u> | | 6.0 | <u> </u> | _ | 2 |
| Dhose Number | | | | | - | 21.0 | | | 21.0 | <u> </u> | | 50.0 | | | 50.0 |
| Change Period | | | · | 51.0 | | | 53 | | | 09.0 1 1 | | | 39.0 4 4 | | |
| | $\frac{1}{1}$ | (), S | | | | 3.3 3.4 | | | 3.0 | | | 4.4 | | | 4.4 |
| | oo Timo | (α, β) | | <u> </u> | | 5.4 6.5 | <u> </u> | + | 2.4 | <u> </u> | | 0.0 | <u> </u> | | 0.0 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | $(g_s), s$ | | | | 0.5 | | - | 2.9 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Bhase Call Bro | hability | (<i>g</i> , s | | | | 0.Z 1.00 | | | 1.00 | <u> </u> | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | | | | | | |
| Max Out 110ba | onity | | | | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate(<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | | 109 | | | 24 | | 62 | 424 | 423 | 3 | 471 | 459 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | | 1561 | | | 1502 | 2 | 612 | 1900 | 1897 | 661 | 1900 | 1852 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), s | | | 0.9 | | | 0.0 | | 5.3 | 10.2 | 10.2 | 0.2 | 11.7 | 11.7 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | | 4.5 | | | 0.9 | | 17.0 | 10.2 | 10.2 | 10.4 | 11.7 | 11.7 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | 0.29 | | | 0.29 | | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | | 500 | | | 489 | | 372 | 1153 | 1151 | 406 | 1153 | 1123 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | itio(X) | | | 0.217 | | | 0.049 | 9 | 0.167 | 0.368 | 0.368 | 0.008 | 0.408 | 0.408 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) |) | | 79.8 | | | 16.7 | | 36.1 | 183 | 182.8 | 1.6 | 205.8 | 202 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | 3.2 | | | 0.7 | | 1.4 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 0.1 | 8.2 | 8.1 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | tile) | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay | (d1), s | /veh | | | 24.5 | | | 23.3 | | 13.7 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 11.6 | 9.3 | 9.3 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | | 0.1 | | | 0.0 | | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| 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 (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | | 24.6 | | | 23.3 | | 14.7 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 11.6 | 10.3 | 10.4 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | С | | | С | | В | A | A | В | В | В |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 24.6 | 6 | С | 23.3 | 3 | С | 10.2 | 2 | В | 10.3 | 3 | В |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 11 | .2 | | | | | | В | | |
| Multimodal Reculta | | | | | EP | | | | | | NID | | | CD | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Multimodal Results | | | | | B | 2.25 | 3 | R | 1 7' | | B | 1 70 | | B |
| Bicycle I OS Sc | ore / I C |) <u></u>)S | | 0.67 | , | A | 0.53 | 3 | A | 1.72 | - | A | 1.72 | - ; | A |
| ,00000 | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/S. Glencoe Dwy | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Southerly Glencoe Dwy | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue | | | | | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Existing - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Lanes



| Approach | Eastbound Westbound U L T R U L T | | | | | | | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
|----------------------------------|---|---------|--------|------|---|------|------|------|----|-------|-------|----|----|-------|-------|----|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | LR | | | | LR | | | L | Т | TR | | L | Т | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) | | 71 | | 32 | | 6 | | 6 | 0 | 41 | 474 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 913 | 51 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | (|) | | | (| C | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | Undivided | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 4.1 | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 4.16 | | | | 4.16 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 2.2 | | | | 2.2 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 2.23 | | | | 2.23 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | 112 | | | | 13 | | | 45 | | | | 11 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | 126 | | | | 232 | | | 654 | | | | 1030 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | 0.89 | | | | 0.06 | | | 0.07 | | | | 0.01 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q_{95} (veh) | | | 5.7 | | | | 0.2 | | | 0.2 | | | | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | 118.5 | | | | 21.4 | | | 10.9 | | | | 8.5 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | F | | | | С | | | В | | | | А | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 11 | 8.5 | | | 21 | 1.4 | | | 0. | .9 | | | 0 | .1 | |
| Approach LOS | | I | F | | | (| 2 | | | | | | | | | |

| | | e control hepoirt | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/S. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Southerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2020 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Existing + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



| Approach | Eastbound Westbound | | | | | | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------|--------|------|---|------|------|------|-------|-------|-----|----|-------|-------|-----|----|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | LR | | | | LR | | | L | Т | TR | | L | Т | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) | | 75 | | 77 | | 6 | | 6 | 0 | 63 | 464 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 878 | 89 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | (| C | | | (|) | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | Undivided | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 4.1 | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 4.16 | | | | 4.16 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 2.2 | | | | 2.2 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 2.23 | | | | 2.23 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | 165 | | | | 13 | | | 68 | | | | 11 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | 150 | | | | 201 | | | 652 | | | | 1040 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | 1.10 | | | | 0.07 | | | 0.11 | | | | 0.01 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | 8.9 | | | | 0.2 | | | 0.4 | | | | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | 162.8 | | | | 24.2 | | | 11.2 | | | | 8.5 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | F | | | | С | | | В | | | | А | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 16 | 2.8 | | | 24 | 1.2 | | | 1. | 3 | | | 0. | .1 | |
| Approach LOS | | F C | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/S. Glencoe Dwy | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | | | | | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 8/13/2020 | East/West Street | Southerly Glencoe Dwy | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue | | | | | | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | Future - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Lanes



| Approach | Eastbound Westbound U L T R U L T | | | | | | | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
|---|---|-------|--------|------|---|------|------|------|----|-------|-------|----|----|-------|-------|----|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | LR | | | | LR | | | L | Т | TR | | L | Т | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) | | 75 | | 34 | | 6 | | 6 | 0 | 44 | 538 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 1000 | 54 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | (| C | | | (| C | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | Undivided | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 4.1 | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 4.16 | | | | 4.16 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 2.2 | | | | 2.2 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 2.23 | | | | 2.23 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | 118 | | | | 13 | | | 48 | | | | 12 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | 99 | | | | 188 | | | 600 | | | | 969 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | 1.19 | | | | 0.07 | | | 0.08 | | | | 0.01 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | 8.0 | | | | 0.2 | | | 0.3 | | | | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | 230.9 | | | | 25.5 | | | 11.5 | | | | 8.8 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | F | | | | D | | | В | | | | А | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 23 | 0.9 | | | 25 | 5.5 | | | 0 | .9 | | | 0 | .1 | |
| Approach LOS | F D | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | e control hepoirt | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | JAS | Intersection | Glencoe/S. Glencoe Dwy |
| Agency/Co. | Linscott, Law & Greenspan | Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles |
| Date Performed | 12/1/2020 | East/West Street | Southerly Glencoe Dwy |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Glencoe Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Future + Project - PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Option B | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
|----------------------------------|------|-------|--------|------|-------|------|-------|------|----|-------|-------|----|----|-------|-------|----|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | LR | | | | LR | | | L | Т | TR | | L | Т | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) | | 79 | | 79 | | 6 | | 6 | 0 | 66 | 528 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 965 | 92 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | (|) | | | (| C | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 7.5 | | 6.9 | | 4.1 | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 7.56 | | 6.96 | | 4.16 | | | | 4.16 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | 2.2 | | | | 2.2 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 3.53 | | 3.33 | | 2.23 | | | | 2.23 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | 172 | | | | 13 | | | 72 | | | | 12 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | 118 | | | | 160 | | | 598 | | | | 978 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | 1.45 | | | | 0.08 | | | 0.12 | | | | 0.01 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q_{95} (veh) | | | 12.0 | | | | 0.3 | | | 0.4 | | | | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | 311.3 | | | | 29.5 | | | 11.8 | | | | 8.7 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | F | | | | D | | | В | | | | А | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 31 | 1.3 | | | 29 | 9.5 | | | 1. | .3 | | | 0 | .1 | |
| Approach LOS | | | - | | | [|) | | | | | | | | | |

| | | 1103 | 7 Sig | nanze | u mu | ersec | | .est | 1113 | Sui | iiiiai j | y | | | | |
|-------------------|--|------------------------|--------|----------|----------|--------|----------|---------------|--------|---------|----------|----------|-------|-----------|--------------|------------|
| O an and he fam | 4' | | | | | | | | Inte | | | | | T D | | . T. |
| General Inform | hation | | | <u> </u> | | | | | Inte | ersect | | ormatic | on | - 1 | 444 | - <u>-</u> |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | eers | | | | Dur | ration, | h | 0.250 | | | | <u>*</u> |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | Dec 1 | , 2020 | | Area | а Тур | e | Other | | <u>→</u> | | 4 }_ |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e with | | PHF | F | | 0.92 | | ** | w∓e € | |
| | | | | | | (Impro | vement | ts) | | | | | | الم 14 | | 과 ~ |
| Urban Street | | Glencoe Avenue | | Analys | sis Year | 2026 | | , | Ana | alvsis | Period | 1> 17 | :00 | | ግተዮ | |
| Intersection | | Glencoe/N. Dwy-V\ | / Dwy | File Na | ame | 08PM | - Future | e with | n Proj | ject - | Option | B (Impro | ovem | - " | *I T *** Y F | * [|
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | | | , | | <u> </u> | | 1 | | |
| · · -, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Г | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 79 | 0 | 79 | 6 | (|) (| 6 | 66 | 528 | 11 | 11 | 965 | 92 |
| | | | | 1 | | | _ | | | 1 | _ | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | 144 | 3 4 | | | | | | | | | | _ |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 512 | •R ° | | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | € ₄ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 54.6 | 25.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | 5 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | * | | 7 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 0.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | _ | | _ | | 1 | _ | | _ | | _ | _ | | _ | _ |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | - | EBT | WB | | WE | BT | NBL | | NBT | SBL | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 4 | | _ | 8 | 3 | | | 6 | <u> </u> | | 2 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 8.0 | | \rightarrow | 8. | .0 | | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | ase Duration, s ange Period,(Y+ <i>R</i> c), s | | | | | 31.0 | | \rightarrow | 31 | .0 | | | 59.0 | | | 59.0 |
| Change Period | nange Period, (Y+R c), s | | | | | 5.3 | | | 5. | .3 | | | 4.4 | | | 4.4 |
| Max Allow Head | dway(A | MAH), s | | | | 3.3 | | | 3. | .3 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | 9.9 | | | 2. | .5 | | | | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | 0.3 | | | 0. | .4 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.0 | 00 | | | | | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | 0.0 | 00 | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | | 18 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |), veh/h | | | 172 | | | 13 | | | 72 | 294 | 292 | 12 | 583 | 566 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | | 1533 | | | 150 | 5 | | 497 | 1900 | 1886 | 843 | 1900 | 1841 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), s | | | 5.9 | | | 0.0 |) | | 8.6 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 0.6 | 15.7 | 15.7 |
| Cycle Queue C | learance | e Time (g c), s | | | 7.9 | | | 0.5 | 5 | | 24.3 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 7.1 | 15.7 | 15.7 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | 0.29 | | | 0.29 | 9 | | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | | 498 | | | 490 |) | | 295 | 1153 | 1144 | 531 | 1153 | 1117 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | itio(X) | | | 0.345 | | | 0.02 | 27 | | 0.243 | 0.255 | 0.255 | 0.023 | 0.506 | 0.506 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) |) | | 132.5 | | | 9 | | | 49.8 | 116 | 115.4 | 5.3 | 261.7 | 256 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | 5.3 | | | 0.4 | - | | 2.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 0.2 | 10.5 | 10.2 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | tile) | | 0.00 | | | 0.0 | 0 | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay | (d1), s | /veh | | | 25.7 | | | 23. | 1 | | 17.0 | 8.2 | 8.2 | 9.9 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Incremental De | Uniform Delay (d 1), s/veh | | | | | | | 0.0 |) | | 2.0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Initial Queue De | elay (d | 3), s/veh | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |) | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| | | 25.9 | | | 23.2 | 2 | | 18.9 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 10.0 | 11.6 | 11.7 | | |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | | С | | | С | | | В | А | Α | Α | В | В |
| Approach Delay | | 25.9 |) | С | 23.2 | 2 | C | ; | 9.9 | | А | 11.6 | ; | В | | |
| Intersection De | | | | 12 | 2.4 | | | | | | | В | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | | | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.28 | 3 | В | 2.28 | 3 | В | 3 | 1.72 | 2 | В | 1.72 | 2 | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ale LOS Score / LOS | | | | | А | 0.51 | | A | ۹ | 1.03 | 5 | А | 1.45 | 5 | А |

| | | | Ū | | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|----------|----------|-----------|---------|----------|----------|-----------|---------|-------------|---------|-------|------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | ersect | ion Info | ormatio | on | | 4 사수 + 1 | × l <u>x</u> |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Du | ration, | h | 0.250 | | 1 | 444 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Date | Aug 1 | 3, 2020 | | Are | ea Typ | е | Other | | 4 | | <u>∼</u> |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existir | ng - AM | | PH | IF | | 0.96 | | $\Rightarrow - $ | w | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | is Yea | r 2020 | 0 | | Ana | alysis | Period | 1> 7:4 | 45 | | | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/Glencoe | | File Na | ame | 09AM | - Existi | ng.xu | JS | | | | | | 545 | |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | <u> </u> | | | | | | | ▲ ↑ 4 * 171 | × (* |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | ٧ | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | | Т | R |
| Demand (<i>v</i>), v | eh/h | | | 73 | 138 | 454 | 45 | 2 | 03 | 14 | 429 | 585 | 84 | 8 | 384 | 105 |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | - | | | | | | | | K | | |
| | | Poforonco Phaso | 2 | | | eta. | в | | | | | | | \rightarrow | | ት |
| Offset s | 90.0 | Reference Point | Z End | | | | 7 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult Gap E/W | On | Green | 44.6 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | _ | | |
| Eorce Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Ped | 3.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | _ | Ð " | 7 | ·Ψ |
| T OFCE MODE | TIXCU | olindit. Cap N/C | OII | Ticu | 1.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 10. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | Ŭ | | , | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | _ | EBT | WB | L | W | /BT | NBL | | NBT | SBI | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 6 | | | 2 | 2 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | \neg | 6 | 6.0 | | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 50.0 | | | 50 | 0.0 | | | 40.0 | | | 40.0 |
| Change Period | , (Y+R) | c), S | | | | 5.4 | | | 5 | 5.4 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Head | x Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 0.0 | | | 0 | 0.0 | | | 3.5 | | | 3.5 |
| Queue Clearan | ueue Clearance Time (g s), s | | | | | | | | | | | | 36.9 | | | 15.5 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0 |).0 | | | 0.0 | | | 4.8 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.11 |
| Manager | | - 14 - | | _ | ED | | _ | 14/ | P | _ | | | | | 00 | |
| Approach Mayo | oup Res | suits | | | EB | D | 1 | VV T | в | Р | | | Р | | 5B T | Р |
| Approach Move | mont | | | | 6 | 16 | | 2 | + | 12 | L 2 | Q | 19 | | 1 | <u>к</u> |
| Adjusted Flow | |) voh/h | | 76 | 111 | 10 | 47 | 2 11 | 1 | 12 | 3 | 356 | 2/1 | 7 | 4 | 247 |
| Adjusted Flow I | | y, ven/n | n | 1172 | 1000 | 473 | 47 | 100 | 4)0 / | 1957 | 447 004 | 1000 | 1916 | 760 | 1000 | 1760 |
| | Time (/ | π_{α}) s | | 31 | 37 | 18.9 | 1204 | 20 | a | 2.9 | 904 25.9 | 12 7 | 12 7 | 0.8 | 8.8 | 9.0 |
| | learance | $g = Time(\alpha_{a}) = s$ | | 63 | 3.7 | 18.9 | 5.6 | 2. | a | 2.0 | 34.0 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 13.5 | 8.8 | 9.0 |
| Green Ratio (| | e fille (<i>g c</i>), s | | 0.5 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.5 | 9 10 | 0.50 | 0 39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.0 | 9.0 0.39 |
| Capacity (c) y | /0) /eh/h | | | 623 | 942 | 798 | 654 | 94 | 2 | 920 | 340 | 737 | 704 | 267 | 737 | 682 |
| Volume-to-Can | acity Ra | tio (X) | | 0.122 | 0 153 | 0.593 | 0.072 | 0.13 | 21 (| 0 122 | 1 313 | 0 483 | 0 484 | 0.031 | 0.356 | 0.362 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | (In (95 th percentile) | | 42.5 | 73.6 | 295.3 | 25.8 | 57 | 7 | 56.7 | 892.7 | 233 | 225.5 | 6.1 | 171.2 | 161.9 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 1.7 | 2.9 | 11.8 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 3 | 2.3 | 35.7 | 9.3 | 9.0 | 0.2 | 6.8 | 6.5 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | , | 13.9 | 12.4 | 16.2 | 13.9 | 12. | 2 | 12.2 | 35.1 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 25.9 | 19.6 | 19.6 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | 0.4 | 0.3 | 3.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.3 | 160.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Initial Queue De | cremental Delay (d ₂), s/veh itial Queue Delay (d ȝ), 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 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| ontrol Delay (d), s/veh | | | 14.3 | 12.7 | 19.4 | 14.1 | 12. | .4 | 12.5 | 195.5 | 20.9 | 21.0 | 25.9 | 19.7 | 19.7 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | В | В | В | В | | В | F | С | С | С | В | В |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 17.5 | 5 | В | 12.7 | 7 | Ē | В | 89.2 | 2 | F | 19.8 | | В |
| Intersection De | | | | 48 | 3.7 | | | | | | | D | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Iultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.30 | | В | 2.30 |) | E | В | 2.13 | | В | 2.30 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS So | ore / LC | DS | | 1.63 | 5 | В | 0.71 | | ŀ | A | 1.43 | | А | 0.91 | | А |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS™ Streets Version 7.8.5

| | | | - | | | | | | | | - | - | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|----------|----------|----------------|--------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|------------|---------|----------------|------|------------------------|------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inters | ecti | ion Info | ormatio | on | | ~~~~ | s La |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | eers | | | | Durati | on, l | h | 0.250 | | 1 | 414 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | e Dec 2 | , 2020 | | Area 1 | Гуре | 9 | Other | | 4 | | |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existin | ng with ct - AM | | PHF | | | 0.96 | | | ₩ e | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | sis Yea | r 2020 | | | Analys | sis F | Period | 1> 7:4 | 45 | | | <u> </u> |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/Glencoe | | File Na | ame | 09AM | - Existi | ng wi | th Proje | ect - | Option | B.xus | | | 1 / 1 + + + + + + | - ا ^م |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | л | | | | | | | | | | 1 7 | | |
| | | · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | T I | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 82 | 144 | 496 | 45 | 2 | 08 1 | 4 | 453 | 585 | 84 | 8 | 384 | 114 |
| | | | | | · | D C C C | - | _ | | | _ | _ | | | | - |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | <u> </u> | | | | | | | | ð- | | \mathbf{k} |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | HR • | 1 SA | 7 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 44.6 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 0 | .0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 0 | .0 | 0.0 | | | 2 | | N |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.8 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 0 | .0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | WBT | | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | Э | | | | | 6 | | | 2 | | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 | | | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 50.0 | | | 50.0 | | | | 40.0 | | 4 | 40.0 |
| Change Period, | (Y+R | c), S | | | | 5.4 | | | 5.4 | | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Head | ax Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | | 3.6 | | | 3.6 |
| Queue Clearan | ueue Clearance Time (g s), s | | | | | | | | | | | | 36.9 | | | 15.5 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (g e), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | | 0.0 | | | 5.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | | | | | Т | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probal | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | - (| 0.12 |
| | _ | | _ | | == | | | | _ | _ | | | _ | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Kes | ults | | | EB | D | | | 5 | + | - | | Р | | SB | Р |
| Approach Move | ment | | | | I C | К 16 | _ L | 1 | <u>к</u> | _ | L 2 | 0 | <u>Г</u> 10 | | 1 | <u>к</u> |
| Assigned Move | ment |) | | 1 | 0 | 10 | 5 47 | | | | 3 | 8 | 18 | / | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow F | |), ven/n | | 85 | 150 | 517 | 47 | 110 | | 5 | 472 | 350 | 341 | 8 | 268 | 251 |
| Adjusted Satura | | w Rale (s), ven/n/l | n | 1167 | 1900 | 1610 | 1257 | 190 | | 8 | 897 | 1900 | 1810 | 760 | 1900 | 1/51 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | j s), S Time (| | 3.8 | 3.9 | 21.5 | 1.9 | 3.0 |) 3.0 | | 25.7 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 0.8 | 9.0 | 9.2 |
| | | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 0.8 | 3.9 | 21.5 | 5.8 | 3.0 |) 3.0 |) | 34.9 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 13.5 | 9.0 | 9.2 |
| Green Ratio (g. | /C) | | | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.5 | 0 0.5 | 1 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 |
| Volume to Con | en/n | tio (X) | | 020 | 942 | 798 | 049 | 94 | 2 92 | 1 | 330 | 131 | 704 | 207 | 131 | 079 |
| Pook of Ououo | | $(0 (\Lambda))$ | | 0.130 | 0.159 | 220.7 | 25.0 | 50 | 23 0.12 5 50 | 20 | 1.405 | 0.400 | 0.404 | 6.1 | 175 4 | 164.9 |
| Dack of Queue | (Q), II/ | in (95 in percentile) | | 40.2 | 11 | 330.7 | 25.9 | 50. | 5 50 |) | 1037. 7 | 233 | 225.5 | 0.1 | 175.4 | 104.0 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 1.9 | 3.1 | 13.2 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 3 2.3 | 3 | 41.5 | 9.3 | 9.0 | 0.2 | 7.0 | 6.6 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | | 14.0 | 12.4 | 16.9 | 14.0 | 12. | 2 12. | 2 | 35.2 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 25.9 | 19.6 | 19.7 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | 0.5 | 0.4 | 4.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 3 0.3 | 3 | 199.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Initial Queue De | itial Queue Delay ($d z$), 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 (| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | 14.5 | 12.8 | 20.9 | 14.2 | 12. | 5 12. | 5 | 234.5 | 20.9 | 21.0 | 25.9 | 19.7 | 19.8 |
| Level of Service | Level of Service (LOS) | | | В | В | С | В | В | В | | F | С | С | С | В | В |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 18.6 | ; | В | 12.8 | 3 | В | | 107.2 | 2 | F | 19.9 | | В |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 56 | 6.2 | | | | | - | | E | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | /ultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.30 |) | В | 2.30 |) | В | | 2.13 | ; | В | 2.30 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | | 1.73 | 3 | В | 0.72 | 2 | А | | 1.45 | ; | А | 0.92 | 2 | А | |

Copyright @ 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

| Inter=settion Information Analysis Data Aug 13. 2020 Area Type Other Analysis Analysis Data Aug 13. 2020 Area Type Other Discription Interaction Discription Discription Discription | | | | Ū | | | | | | | | - | , | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---------|-------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| Agency Linecolt, Law & Greenspan, Engineers Duration, h 0.250 Analysis Duration, h 0.270 Analysis Duration, h 0.270 Analysis Duration, h 0.270 Duration, h Du | General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | ersect | tion Info | ormatio | on | 2 | 4241 | ⊾ Ļ |
| Analysis UAS Analysis Della Juli 13, 2020 Area Type Other Other <th< td=""><td>Agency</td><td></td><td>Linscott, Law & Gre</td><td>enspan</td><td>, Engine</td><td>eers</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Du</td><td>iration.</td><td>h</td><td>0.250</td><td></td><td></td><td>444</td><td></td></th<> | Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | eers | | | | Du | iration. | h | 0.250 | | | 444 | |
| Jurisdiction Off of Los Angeles Time Priod Future - AM PHF D.0.6 Unan Street Mindanao Way Analysis Year 2026 Analysis Period 1>7.45 Infersection Mindanao Glencoe Pisot 1>7.45 1>7.45 1>7.45 Approach Movement L T R L T R L T R T R L </td <td>Analvst</td> <td></td> <td>JAS</td> <td></td> <td>Analys</td> <td>is Dat</td> <td>te Aua 1</td> <td>3. 2020</td> <td></td> <td>Are</td> <td>ea Tvp</td> <td>e</td> <td>Other</td> <td></td> <td>4</td> <td></td> <td>₹</td> | Analvst | | JAS | | Analys | is Dat | te Aua 1 | 3. 2020 | | Are | ea Tvp | e | Other | | 4 | | ₹ |
| Urban Street Mindana/Gencee Fie Name 2026 Analysis Period 1>7.45 Intersection Mindana/Gencee Fie Name 09AM - Future .xus Umban Street Umban Street <td>Jurisdiction</td> <td></td> <td>City of Los Angeles</td> <td></td> <td>Time F</td> <td>Period</td> <td>Future</td> <td>e - AM</td> <td></td> <td>PH</td> <td>IF</td> <td></td> <td>0.96</td> <td></td> <td>⇒</td> <td>wļe</td> <td></td> | Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e - AM | | PH | IF | | 0.96 | | ⇒ | wļe | |
| Intersection Mindanao/Gencoe File Name 09AM - Future.xus N N N Demand Information EB WB T R L T R < | Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | sis Yea | ar 2026 | | | Ana | alysis | Period | 1> 7:4 | 45 | * | | |
| Project Description Passeo Marina Fill Fill NB NB SB Approach Movement L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R R L T R R L T R R L T R R L T R R L T R R L T R S R S R S R S R S R S R S R S R S R S R S R S R S R | Intersection | | Mindanao/Glencoe | | File Na | ame | 09AM | - Future | e.xus | \$ | | | | | | <u> ኘ ቶ ቱ</u> | |
| Demand Information L T R L R L | Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | - E | | • ا |
| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c } \hline Part or howement is a proper by the $ | | | 1 | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Movement L T R <thl< th=""> <thl< th=""> <tht< th=""></tht<></thl<></thl<> | Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | ۷ | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Demand (v), veh/h 87 159 496 50 218 15 467 624 96 9 419 113 Signal Information Cycle, s 00.0 Reference Phase 2 Offset, s 0 Reference Point End Green Mode Kinuit. Gap E/W On Red 18 14 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Force Mode Fixed Simuit. Gap E/W On Red 18 14 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Time Results EBL EBT WBL WBL WBL NBL NBL SBL SBT Assigned Phase EBL EBT 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Change Period, (Y+R c), s 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.1 5.1 Max Out Probability D.0 D.0 D.0 D.0 D.0 D.0 0.0 0.0 Max Out Probability D L T R L T R L T R Agsigned Movement L L T R L T R L T R Agsi | Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Signal Information Cycle, s 0.0 Reference Phate 2 Offset, s 0.0 Reference Phate End Ouncoordinated No Simuit. Gap E/N On Red 1.8 1.4 0.0 | Demand (<i>v</i>), v | eh/h | | | 87 | 159 | 9 496 | 50 | 2 | 18 | 15 | 467 | 624 | 96 | 9 | 419 | 113 |
| Signal information Signal information Reference Phase 2 Cree Mode Reference Paine E Cree Mode Reference Paine E Cree Mode Red Signal (Sample A) On Concordinate A A O 0.0< | | | | | I | | | | | | | | | | _ | 1 | |
| Cycle, s 90.0 Neterace Paint Enc. Creen 44.8 34.9 0.0 0 | Signal Informa | tion | | - | | л | 205 | | | | | | | | \rightarrow | | \mathbf{A} |
| Offset N N Herence Pont End Creen A4 6 94 9 0.0 | Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | B | 1 51 | 2 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| $ \begin{array}{ $ | Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 44.6 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Proce Mode File File Title Total Total <thtotal< th=""> <</thtotal<> | Uncoordinated | NO | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | a | | ₩. |
| Timer Results EBL EBL WBL WBL NBL NBT SBL SBT Assigned Phase - 6 - 2 8 - 4 Case Number - 5.0 - 6.0 - 6.0 - 6.0 - 6.0 Phase Duration, s - 5.0 - 5.0 - 6. | Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.8 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | | 7 | 8 |
| Immer Kesturs LEDI UBL WBL WBL WBL WBL WBL WBL SBI Cold SBI Cold SBI Cold SBI Cold SBI Cold SBI Cold SBI | Timer Deculto | | | | | | EDT | | | 10/ | | NDI | | NDT | CDI | | ODT |
| Assignment index 0 2 0 2 0 1 4 Case Number 50.0 50.0 50.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 Phase Duration, s 50.0 50.0 50.0 50.0 40.0 40.0 Max Allow Hadway (MAH), s -5.4 5.4 5.4 5.1 -5.1 -5.1 Queue Clearance Time (g z), s $$ | Assigned Dhose | | | | EBL | - | EBI | VVB | | | уВТ 2 | NBL | - | | SBL | - | 381 |
| Case Multified 3.0 5.0 5.0 4.0 4.0 5.0 Phase Duration, s 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.4 40.0 40.0 Change Period, $(Y+R_c)$, s 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.1 5.1 5.1 Max Allow Headway (MAH), s 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.4 7.6 1.0 5.4 7.6 1.0 7.6 | Assigned Phase | e | | | <u> </u> | - | 5.0 | | \rightarrow | 6 | 2 | | | 0 | <u> </u> | | 4 |
| Private Duration, 'S 50.0 90.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 Change Perioda (, Y+R c), s 5.4 5.4 5.4 5.1 5.1 Max Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s 0.0 0.0 0.0 3.6 3.6 Green Extension Time (g s), s 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 5.4 Phase Call Probability 0.0 0.0 0.0 1.00 1.00 Max Out Probability 0.0 0.0 0.0 1.00 0.19 Movement Group Results EB WB NB T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R L T R R R R </td <td>Bhase Duration</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>+</td> <td>50.0</td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td>50</td> <td>0.0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.0 40.0</td> <td><u> </u></td> <td></td> <td>0.0</td> | Bhase Duration | | | | | + | 50.0 | | - | 50 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 40.0 | <u> </u> | | 0.0 |
| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | Change Duration | (V±D | -) c | | <u> </u> | + | 50.0 | | + | 50 | 5.4 | | | 40.0 5.1 | <u> </u> | | +0.0 5 1 |
| Max Autor Trading (Math), is and), is and (Math), is and (Math), is a | | Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 0.0 | | - | 0 |).4) () | | | 3.6 | | | 3.6 |
| Construct (g +), for the (g +), for the equation of the equatic the equatic the equatic the equation of the equatic the equati | | ax Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s ueue Clearance Time (<i>g</i> s), s | | | | - | 0.0 | | + | 0 | | | | 36.9 | | | 16 9 |
| Order Lakarian Order Order <thorder< th=""> Order <thorder< th=""></thorder<></thorder<> | Green Extensio | ueue Clearance Time (g_s) , s | | | | - | 0.0 | - | - | 0 | | | | 0.0 | | | 54 |
| Max Out Probability Image of the second conditional structure of the second condit structure of the second conditional structur | Phase Call Pro | bability | (9,0), 3 | | | + | 0.0 | | \rightarrow | 0 | /.0 | | | 1.00 | <u> </u> | | 1 00 |
| Movement Group Results L T R A 14 14 14 14 123 1900 1817 23.3 14.0 0.9 8.8 9.9 0 0 14.0 14.9 9.8 9.9 0 0.39 | Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | | _ | | | 1.00 | | |) 19 |
| Movement Group ResultsII <t< td=""><td>Max Out Propa</td><td>Sinty</td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1.00</td><td></td><td></td><td>5.10</td></t<> | Max Out Propa | Sinty | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 5.10 |
| Approach MovementI.I.I.R.I.T.R.I.I.R.I.I.R.I. | Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Assigned Movement 1 I <thi< th=""> <thi< th=""> <thi< th=""> <</thi<></thi<></thi<> | Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Adjusted Flow Rate (v), veh/h 91 166 517 52 122 121 486 384 366 9 286 200 Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate (s), veh/h/in 1155 9 0 101 123 9 0 187 868 190 181 723 190 73 Queue Service Time (g e), s 4.1 4.3 21.5 2.2 3.1 3.2 28.0 13.9 14.0 0.9 8.8 9.9 Green Ratio (g/C) 0.50 | Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate (s), ven/h/ln 1155 1900 1610 1239 1900 1857 868 1900 1811 723 1900 1761 Queue Service Time (g e), s 4.1 4.3 21.5 2.2 3.1 3.2 25.0 13.9 14.0 0.9 9.8 9.9 Cycle Queue Clearance Time (g c), s 7.3 4.3 21.5 6.5 3.1 3.2 34.9 13.9 14.0 14.9 9.8 9.9 Green Ratio (g/C) 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.39 <td>Adjusted Flow I</td> <td>Rate (<i>v</i></td> <td>), veh/h</td> <td></td> <td>91</td> <td>166</td> <td>517</td> <td>52</td> <td>12</td> <td>2</td> <td>121</td> <td>486</td> <td>384</td> <td>366</td> <td>9</td> <td>286</td> <td>268</td> | Adjusted Flow I | Rate (<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | 91 | 166 | 517 | 52 | 12 | 2 | 121 | 486 | 384 | 366 | 9 | 286 | 268 |
| Queue Service Time (g s), s4.14.321.52.23.13.225.01.3.914.00.99.89.9Cycle Queue Clearance Time (g c), s7.34.321.56.53.13.234.91.3.914.014.99.89.9Green Ratio (g/C)0.500.500.500.500.500.500.39 <td>Adjusted Satura</td> <td>ation Flo</td> <td>ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l</td> <td>n</td> <td>1155</td> <td>1900</td> <td>) 1610</td> <td>1239</td> <td>190</td> <td>)0 [,]</td> <td>1857</td> <td>868</td> <td>1900</td> <td>1811</td> <td>723</td> <td>1900</td> <td>1761</td> | Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1155 | 1900 |) 1610 | 1239 | 190 |)0 [,] | 1857 | 868 | 1900 | 1811 | 723 | 1900 | 1761 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time (g c), s 7.3 4.3 21.5 6.5 3.1 3.2 34.9 13.9 14.0 14.9 9.8 9.9 Green Ratio (g/C) 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.39 0.30 <t< td=""><td>Queue Service</td><td>Time (</td><td>g s), S</td><td></td><td>4.1</td><td>4.3</td><td>21.5</td><td>2.2</td><td>3.</td><td>1</td><td>3.2</td><td>25.0</td><td>13.9</td><td>14.0</td><td>0.9</td><td>9.8</td><td>9.9</td></t<> | Queue Service | Time (| g s), S | | 4.1 | 4.3 | 21.5 | 2.2 | 3. | 1 | 3.2 | 25.0 | 13.9 | 14.0 | 0.9 | 9.8 | 9.9 |
| Green Ratio (g/C) 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.30 0.39 0.30 0.30 0.30 0.10 < | Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 7.3 | 4.3 | 21.5 | 6.5 | 3. | 1 | 3.2 | 34.9 | 13.9 | 14.0 | 14.9 | 9.8 | 9.9 |
| Capacity (c), veh/h 612 942 798 634 942 920 321 737 702 248 737 683 Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (X) 0.148 0.176 0.648 0.082 0.130 0.131 1.516 0.521 0.522 0.038 0.38 0.388 0.393 Back of Queue (Q), th/ln (95 th percentile) 51.8 8 30.7 29.3 61.6 61 1182 251.8 243 7 18.9 178.3 Back of Queue (Q), veh/ln (95 th percentile) 2.0 3.4 13.2 1.2 2.5 2.4 47.3 10.1 9.7 0.3 7.6 7.1 Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile) 0.00 0.0 0.00 | Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.5 | 50 | 0.50 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (X) 0.148 0.176 0.648 0.082 0.131 1.516 0.521 0.522 0.538 0.388 0.388 0.393 Back of Queu (Q), ft/ln (95 th percentile) 51.8 $\otimes 6$ 30.7 29.3 61.6 61 1182 251.8 243 7 189.3 178.3 Back of Queu (Q), veh/ln (95 th percentile) 2.1 3.4 13.2 1.2 2.5 2.4 47.3 10.1 9.7 0.3 7.6 7.1 Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile) 0.00 </td <td>Capacity (c), v</td> <td>/eh/h</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>612</td> <td>942</td> <td>798</td> <td>634</td> <td>94</td> <td>2</td> <td>920</td> <td>321</td> <td>737</td> <td>702</td> <td>248</td> <td>737</td> <td>683</td> | Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 612 | 942 | 798 | 634 | 94 | 2 | 920 | 321 | 737 | 702 | 248 | 737 | 683 |
| Back of Queue (Q), ft/ln (95 th percentile)51.886330.729.361.6611182251.82437189.3178.3Back of Queue (Q), veh/ln (95 th percentile)2.1 3.4 13.21.2 2.5 2.447.3 10.1 9.70.3 7.6 7.1Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile)0.00 0.0 | Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | itio (X) | | 0.148 | 0.176 | 6 0.648 | 0.082 | 0.1 | 30 0 | 0.131 | 1.516 | 0.521 | 0.522 | 0.038 | 0.388 | 0.393 |
| Back of Queue (Q), veh/ln (95 th percentile)2.13.413.21.22.52.447.310.19.70.37.67.1Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile)0.000.00.00.000. | Back of Queue | (Q), ft | In (95 th percentile) | | 51.8 | 86 | 330.7 | 29.3 | 61. | .6 | 61 | 1182 | 251.8 | 243 | 7 | 189.3 | 178.3 |
| Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile)0.00 | Back of Queue | (Q), Ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 2.1 | 3.4 | 13.2 | 1.2 | 2. | 5 | 2.4 | 47.3 | 10.1 | 9.7 | 0.3 | 7.6 | 7.1 |
| Uniform Delay (d 1), s/veh14.212.516.914.312.212.235.621.121.126.919.919.9Incremental Delay (d 2), s/veh0.50.44.00.30.30.3247.50.30.30.00.10.1Initial Queue Delay (d 3), s/veh0.0 <t< td=""><td>Queue Storage</td><td>Ratio (</td><td>RQ) (95 th percent</td><td>ile)</td><td>0.00</td><td>0.00</td><td>0.00</td><td>0.00</td><td>0.0</td><td>0</td><td>0.00</td><td>0.00</td><td>0.00</td><td>0.00</td><td>0.00</td><td>0.00</td><td>0.00</td></t<> | Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Incremental Delay (d 2), s/veh0.50.44.00.30.30.3247.50.30.30.00.10.1Initial Queue Delay (d 3), s/veh0.0 <td>Uniform Delay (</td> <td>(d1), s</td> <td>/veh</td> <td></td> <td>14.2</td> <td>12.5</td> <td>16.9</td> <td>14.3</td> <td>12.</td> <td>.2</td> <td>12.2</td> <td>35.6</td> <td>21.1</td> <td>21.1</td> <td>26.9</td> <td>19.9</td> <td>19.9</td> | Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | | 14.2 | 12.5 | 16.9 | 14.3 | 12. | .2 | 12.2 | 35.6 | 21.1 | 21.1 | 26.9 | 19.9 | 19.9 |
| Initial Queue Delay (d 3), s/veh0.0 | Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | 0.5 | 0.4 | 4.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.3 | 247.5 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh14.713.020.914.612.512.5283.121.421.526.920.020.0Level of Service (LOS)BBCBBBBFCCCBCApproach Delay, s/veh / LOS18.5B12.9B124.4F20.1CIntersection Delay, s/veh / LOS18.5B12.9B124.4F20.1CIntersection Delay, s/veh / LOS53.9 -63.9 <td< td=""><td>Initial Queue De</td><td>elay (d</td><td>3), s/veh</td><td></td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>υ</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></td<> | Initial Queue De | elay (d | 3), s/veh | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | υ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Level of Service (LOS)BBCBBFCCCBCBCApproach Delay, s/veh / LOS18.5B12.9B124.4F20.1CIntersection Delay, s/veh / LOS $$ | Control Delay (| d), s/ve | əh | | 14.7 | 13.0 | 20.9 | 14.6 | 12. | .5 | 12.5 | 283.1 | 21.4 | 21.5 | 26.9 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS 18.5 B 12.9 B 124.4 F 20.1 C Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS 63.9 63.9 E <td< td=""><td>Level of Service</td><td colspan="3">evel of Service (LOS)</td><td>В</td><td>B</td><td></td><td>В</td><td>B</td><td></td><td>В</td><td>F</td><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>В</td><td>C</td></td<> | Level of Service | evel of Service (LOS) | | | В | B | | В | B | | В | F | C | C | C | В | C |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS 63.9 E Multimodal Results EB WB NB SB Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS 2.30 B 2.30 B 2.13 B 2.30 B Biovole LOS Score / LOS 1.76 B 0.73 A 1.51 B 0.95 A | Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 18.5 | | В | 12.9 | 1 | E | В | 124.4 | 1 | F | 20.1 | | С |
| Multimodal Results EB WB NB SB Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS 2.30 B 2.30 B 2.13 B 2.30 B Biovole LOS Score / LOS 1.76 B 0.73 A 1.51 B 0.95 A | Intersection De | ntersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | 63 | 3.9 | | | | | | | E | _ | |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS 2.30 B 2.30 B 0.73 A 1.51 B 0.95 A | Multimodal Ba | ultimodal Posults | | | | ED | | | \^/ | B | | | ND | | | CD | |
| Biovole LOS Score / LOS 1.76 B 0.73 A 1.51 B 0.95 A | Pedestrian LOS | Score | /1.05 | | 2 30 | | R | 230 | vv ر | | B | 2 12 | | B | 2 30 | | B |
| | Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / I (|)S | | 1 76 | , ; | B | 0.73 | 3 | | A | 1.51 | | B | 0.95 | | A |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS™ Streets Version 7.8.5

| | | | | | | | | | 1- | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|------------------------------|--------|----------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|------------|---------|-------|---------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | ersect | tion Inf | ormatio | on | 2 | 4 7 40 1 1 | ⊾ L _k |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | eers | | | | Du | ration, | h | 0.250 | 1 | | 4+5 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | e Dec 2 | , 2020 | | Are | еа Тур | е | Other | | × | | ≛ |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future Projec | e with ct - AM | | PH | lF | | 0.96 | | 4 M 4 | W = E | ↓ ↓ ↓ |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | sis Yea | · 2026 | | | Ana | alysis | Period | 1> 7:4 | 45 | | 5 4 4 | <u> </u> |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/Glencoe | | File Na | ame | 09AM | - Future | e with | n Pro | oject - | Option | B.xus | | - 1 | 1 1 1 + 4 + 7 + | - * |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | | | - | | | | 1 7 | | |
| | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | ٧ | VB | 12 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand(<i>v</i>), v | eh/h | | | 96 | 165 | 538 | 50 | 2 | 23 | 15 | 491 | 624 | 96 | 9 | 419 | 122 |
| | | | | | | | _ | | | | _ | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | - | | | 215 | | | | | | | ~ | \rightarrow | | \mathbf{A} |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | B _* | 1 50 | 7 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 44.6 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 4 | | _ • ↓ • |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.8 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | Y 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | _ | | 14/2 | | | (D T | | | | 0.51 | _ | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | | EBI | WB | | VV | /BT | NBI | | NBT | SBL | - | SBI |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | \rightarrow | 6 | | _ | 2 | 2 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6 | 5.0 | | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 50.0 | | _ | 50 | 0.0 | | | 40.0 | | | 40.0 |
| Change Period, | nge Period, (Y+R c), s (Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 5.4 | | | 5 | 5.4 | | _ | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Head | Allow Headway (MAH), s | | | | | 0.0 | | _ | 0 | 0.0 | | | 3.6 | | | 3.6 |
| Queue Clearan | ueue Clearance Time (g_s), s | | | | | | | \rightarrow | | | | | 36.9 | | | 16.9 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (g _e), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 5.6 |
| Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probal | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.20 |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | W | B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | | 100 | 172 | 560 | 52 | 12 | 5 | 123 | 511 | 384 | 366 | 9 | 291 | 272 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1150 | 1900 | 1610 | 1232 | 190 |)0 ⁻ | 1858 | 860 | 1900 | 1811 | 723 | 1900 | 1753 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | | 4.6 | 4.5 | 24.2 | 2.2 | 3.2 | 2 | 3.2 | 24.8 | 13.9 | 14.0 | 0.9 | 10.0 | 10.1 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 7.9 | 4.5 | 24.2 | 6.7 | 3.2 | 2 | 3.2 | 34.9 | 13.9 | 14.0 | 14.9 | 10.0 | 10.1 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.50 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 |
| Capacity (<i>c</i>), v | /eh/h | | | 609 | 942 | 798 | 629 | 94 | 2 | 921 | 317 | 737 | 702 | 248 | 737 | 680 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | itio(X) | | 0.164 | 0.183 | 0.702 | 0.083 | 0.13 | 32 C | 0.134 | 1.615 | 0.521 | 0.522 | 0.038 | 0.395 | 0.401 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) | | 57.9 | 89.5 | 369.6 | 29.4 | 63. | .1 | 62.5 | 1333. 7 | 251.8 | 243 | 7 | 192.7 | 181.6 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 2.3 | 3.6 | 14.8 | 1.2 | 2. | 5 | 2.5 | 53.3 | 10.1 | 9.7 | 0.3 | 7.7 | 7.3 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | | 14.4 | 12.6 | 17.6 | 14.5 | 12. | .3 | 12.3 | 35.7 | 21.1 | 21.1 | 26.9 | 19.9 | 20.0 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | 0.6 | 0.4 | 5.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.3 | 290.9 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Initial Queue De | itial Queue Delay (d 2), 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 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | 15.0 | 13.0 | 22.7 | 14.7 | 12. | .5 | 12.6 | 326.7 | 21.4 | 21.5 | 26.9 | 20.0 | 20.1 |
| Level of Service | Level of Service (LOS) | | | В | В | С | В | В | | В | F | С | С | С | С | С |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 19.8 | 3 | В | 12.9 |) | Ē | В | 145. | 2 | F | 20.2 | 2 | С |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 72 | 2.5 | | | | | | | E | | |
| ,, · · · · · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Iultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.30 |) | В | 2.30 |) | E | В | 2.13 | 3 | В | 2.30 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 1.86 | 3 | В | 0.74 | ł | ŀ | A | 1.53 | 3 | В | 0.96 | ; | А |

| | | 1103 | / Sig | nanze | a mu | 51360 | | test | intə t | Sun | mai | y | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------|--------|----------|----------|-------------|----------|---------------|--------|---------|----------|---------|---------|------------|------------|----------|
| Gonoral Inform | ation | | | | | | | | Intor | react | ion Inf | ormatio | 20 | | * | s la |
| | lation | Lincott Low & Gro | onenan | Engin | ore | | | | Dura | ation | b | 0 250 | <i></i> | | 444 | |
| Apolyot | | | enspan | | | | 2020 | | Aroo | | <u></u> | Othor | | 1 | | ۲_ ۲_ |
| Analysi | | City of Los Angeles | | Time | | Eutur | , 2020 | | | атур | 6 | | | _ → _* | w↓e | ≮_ ↓ |
| Junsaiction | | City of Los Angeles | | | enou | Projec | t - AM | | FHF | | | 0.90 | | 4 m | | |
| | | | | <u> </u> | | (Impro | ovemen | ts) | | | | | | | KAŁ | <u>~</u> |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | sis Year | 2026 | | | Analy | lysis | Period | 1> 7:4 | 45 | | | ∗ ا* |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/Glencoe | | File Na | ame | 09AM | - Future | e with | Proje | ect - (| Option I | B (Impr | ovem | 4 | | |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Domand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | ١٨. | 'R | | T | NR | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | | Т | R | | | - | R | | Т | R | | Т | R |
| Demand (v) , v | eh/h | | | 96 | 165 | 538 | 50 | 22 | 23 | 15 | 491 | 624 | 96 | 9 | 419 | 122 |
| (, , , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | | 215 | | | | | | | <u>A</u> | - | Υ |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | i∰ è | N 50 | z st | 2 | | | | | 4 | Y _ | ו (ר | (TX |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 35.4 | 22.0 | 18.1 | 0.0 |) (| 0.0 | 0.0 | | | ~ . | ↓ Ⅰ ° | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 0.0 |) (| 0.0 | 0.0 | | | <u>a</u> | | N |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.8 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 |) (| 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | Y 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | _ | _ | | | _ | | | | | _ | 1 | _ | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | | EBT | WB | L | WB | BT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 6 | | \rightarrow | 2 | | 3 | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | - | | | | _ | 5.0 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 6.0 |) | 1.0 | | 4.0 | <u> </u> | | 6.3 |
| Change Duration | ase Duration, s ange Period, ($Y+Rc$), s | | | | + | 40.8 5.4 | <u> </u> | + | 40.8 | 8 | 20.0 | , | 49.Z | <u> </u> | - | 23.Z |
| | nange Period, (Y+R c), s ax Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 0.0 | - | -+- | 0.0 | + 1 | 4.0 | | 3.1 | | | 3.1 |
| | lax Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 5 | 20.0 | | 13.7 | | | 15.2 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | $(q_{s}), s$ | | | | 0.0 | | - | 0.0 |) | 1 1 | | 29 | | | 2.8 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | (9,0), 3 | | | | 0.0 | | -+ | 0.0 | | 1.00 | , – | 1 00 | | | 1 00 |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 |) | 0.00 | | | 0.00 |
| | , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | F | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | · · · · | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |), veh/h | | 100 | 172 | 560 | 52 | 125 | 5 12 | 23 | 511 | 384 | 366 | 9 | 291 | 272 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Fic | w Rate (s), ven/n/l | n | 1150 | 1900 | 1610 | 1232 | 190 | 0 18 | 858 | 1810 | 1900 | 1811 | 723 | 1900 | 1753 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | J_s), S | | 5.0 | 5.4 | 17.4 | 2.0 | 3.8 | 3 | 3.9 | 18.9 | 11.0 | 11.7 | 0.9 | 13.0 | 13.2 |
| Green Ratio (| | e fille (<i>g c</i>), s | | 9.4 | 0.30 | 0.64 | 0.1 | 0.30 | | 3.9 | 0.47 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.9 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| Capacity (c) | /o/) /eh/h | | | 483 | 748 | 1028 | 491 | 748 | 3 7: | 732 | 568 | 930 | 887 | 225 | 381 | 352 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | itio (X) | _ | 0.207 | 0.230 | 0.545 | 0.106 | 0.16 | 7 0.1 | 169 | 0.900 | 0.412 | 0.413 | 0.042 | 0.764 | 0.774 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | (In (95 th percentile) | | 72.7 | 112.8 | 252.7 | 36.9 | 79.4 | 1 78 | 8.9 | 308.2 | 209.1 | 201.8 | 7.4 | 250.7 | 238.7 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 2.9 | 4.5 | 10.1 | 1.5 | 3.2 | 3 | 3.2 | 12.3 | 8.4 | 8.1 | 0.3 | 10.0 | 9.5 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 |) (). | .00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay | (d1), s | /veh | , | 20.8 | 18.2 | 9.0 | 20.9 | 17. | 7 17 | 7.7 | 19.8 | 14.7 | 14.7 | 29.1 | 34.0 | 34.0 |
| Incremental Delay (<i>d</i> 2), s/veh | | | | 1.0 | 0.7 | 2.1 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.5 | 2.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 1.4 |
| 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 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | 21.8 | 18.9 | 11.1 | 21.3 | 18.2 | 2 18 | 8.2 | 22.0 | 14.8 | 14.8 | 29.2 | 35.2 | 35.4 |
| Level of Service | | С | В | В | С | В | E | В | С | В | В | С | D | D | | |
| Approach Dela | | 14.0 |) | В | 18.7 | 7 | В | | 17.7 | · | В | 35.2 | 2 | D | | |
| Intersection De | Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | 20 |).2 | | | | | | | С | | |
| Multiment | | | | | | 14/5 | , | | | | | | 05 | | | |
| Dedestriar L CC | Aultimodal Results | | | | EB | D | 0.00 | VVE | | | 0.40 | NB | D | 0.00 | SB | D |
| Bicycle I OS Sc | | / LU3 | | 2.30 | , | B | 2.30 | 1 | B | | 2.13 | 2 | B | 2.30 | , | Δ |
| | | | | 1.00 | | 0 | 0.72 | | ~ | | 1.00 | | U | 0.90 | | ~ |

| | | | Ū | | | | | | | | - | , | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------|----------|---------|---------------|----------|---------------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
| General Inform | ation | | | | | | | | Int | tersect | tion Infe | ormatio | on | | 4241 | يد لي |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | eers | | | | Du | uration. | h | 0.250 |) | | 444 | |
| Analvst | | JAS | | Analys | is Da | te Aua 1 | 3. 2020 | | Are | ea Tvp | e | Other | - | | | <i>د</i> 4 |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existin | na - PM | | РН | HF // | | 0.94 | | \rightarrow \rightarrow | WÌE | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | sis Yea | ar 2020 | .9 | | An | nalvsis | Period | 1> 17 | 2:00 | | | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/Glencoe | | File Na | ame | 09PM | - Existi | na xi | IS | | | <u> </u> | | | KAL | |
| Project Descript | ion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | .9 | | | | | | - 1 | <u>। r</u> च † के फे 1 | × (* |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | ; | | ٧ | VB | | T | NB | | T | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), ve | eh/h | | | 133 | 213 | 3 616 | 122 | 2 | 15 | 27 | 225 | 346 | 45 | 10 | 514 | 96 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | 245 | | | | | | | | ð- | | \mathbf{L} |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | Ħ. | * 1 54 | 2 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 44.6 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | - | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | <u>a</u> | | √ > |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.8 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | 1 | | _ | _ | | _ | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | W | VBT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | ; | | | | _ | 6 | | | | 2 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6 | 5.0 | | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 50.0 | | | 50 | 0.0 | | | 40.0 | | · | 40.0 |
| Change Period, | ge Period, (Y+R c), s Ilow Headway (MAH), s | | | | | 5.4 | | | 5 | 5.4 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Head | (Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 0.0 | | | 0 |).0 | | | 3.5 | | | 3.5 |
| Queue Clearand | ieue Clearance Time (g_s), s | | | | | | | | | | | | 36.9 | | | 13.8 |
| Green Extension | n Time | (ge),s | | | _ | 0.0 | | \rightarrow | 0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 3.5 |
| Phase Call Prob | bability | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probat | oility | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.03 |
| Movement Gro | un Pos | sulte | | | EB | | | \٨/ | B | | | NB | _ | | SB | _ |
| Approach Move | mont | | | | Т | R | 1 | Т | | R | | Т | R | | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | + | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |) veh/h | | 141 | 227 | 655 | 130 | 13 | 0 | 128 | 239 | 211 | 205 | , 11 | 333 | 316 |
| Adjusted Satura | tion Flo | w Rate (s) veh/h/li | 1 | 1140 | 1900 | 1610 | 1172 | 190 | 0 | 1826 | 795 | 1900 | 1823 | 986 | 1900 | 1796 |
| Queue Service | Time (d | γ_{s}) s | | 6.9 | 6 1 | 31.2 | 6.4 | 3 | 3 | 3.4 | 23.1 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 0.7 | 11 7 | 11.8 |
| Cycle Queue Cl | earance | e Time (a_c) s | | 10.3 | 6.1 | 31.2 | 12.6 | 3 | 3 | 3.4 | 34.9 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 7.7 | 11.7 | 11.8 |
| Green Ratio (a | /C) | o milo (g c), o | | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.50 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 |
| Capacity (c) y | eh/h | | | 602 | 942 | 798 | 581 | 94 | 2 | 905 | 284 | 737 | 707 | 386 | 737 | 696 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | itio (X) | | 0.235 | 0.24 | 1 0 821 | 0.223 | 0.1 | - 38 (| 0 141 | 0.842 | 0.286 | 0.290 | 0.028 | 0 451 | 0.454 |
| Back of Queue | (Q) ft/ | (In (95 th percentile) | | 86.1 | 122 | 1 473.9 | 83 | 66 | 3 | 64.9 | 276.3 | 133.3 | 129.9 | 7 | 218.4 | 210 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/ln (95 th percentil | e) | 3.4 | 4.9 | 19.0 | 3.3 | 2 | 6 | 2.6 | 11.1 | 5.3 | 5.2 | 0.3 | 8.7 | 8.4 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | le) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| d 1). s | /veh | , | 15.1 | 13.0 | 19.3 | 16.6 | 12 | .3 | 12.3 | 35.1 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 21.6 | 20.4 | 20.5 |
| Incremental Del | av (d 2 |), s/veh | | 0.9 | 0.6 | 9.3 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.3 | 19.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Initial Queue De | cremental Delay (d ₂), 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 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| itial Queue Delay (d ₃), s/veh | | | 16.0 | 13.6 | 28.6 | 17.5 | 12 | .6 | 12.6 | 54.1 | 19.1 | 19.1 | 21.7 | 20.6 | 20.6 |
| Level of Service | evel of Service (LOS) | | | B | B | C | В | B | - | В | D | В | В | С | C | C |
| Approach Delay | Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | 23.5 | ; | C | 14 2 | | | B | 31.9 |) | C | 20.6 | | C |
| Approach Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | 20.0 | | - 23 | 3.5 | | | - | 0110 | | - | C | | - |
| | ntersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | | 20 | | | | | | | | - | | |
| Multimodal Res | lultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LOS | | 2.30 |) | В | 2.30 |) | | В | 2.13 | ; | В | 2.30 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC |)S | | 2.18 | 3 | В | 0.81 | | | A | 1.03 | ; | А | 1.03 | ; | А |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS[™] Streets Version 7.8.5

| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intersec | tion Inf | ormatio | on | 2 | * | يد لي |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|----------|----------|---------|--------------------|-------|-----------|----------|---------|-------|---------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | eers | | | | Duration | , h | 0.250 | | | 4 + 4 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Date | e Dec 2 | , 2020 | | Area Typ | e | Other | | 4 | | |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existin | ng with ct - PM | | PHF | | 0.94 | | | W∔E | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | sis Yea | 2020 | | | Analysis | Period | 1> 17 | :00 | | | Ē |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/Glencoe | | File Na | ame | 09PM | - Existi | ng wi | h Project | - Optior | n B.xus | | | <u>ן ן (</u> המשירה | × (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | • | - | | | | 1 | | |
| | | | | 1- | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | 'B | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | L | Т | R | L | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (<i>v</i>), v | eh/h | | | 134 | 214 | 624 | 122 | 21 | 7 27 | 232 | 346 | 45 | 10 | 514 | 99 |
| | | | | | | - | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | 0 | | | - etta | | | | | | | \rightarrow | | \mathbf{A} |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | B. | 1 51 | 2 | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 44.6 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | NO | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | A | | Ψ. |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.8 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | Y 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | - | EBT | WB | L | WBT | NBI | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | Э | | | | | 6 | | | 2 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 50.0 | | | 50.0 | | | 40.0 | | | 40.0 |
| Change Period, | (Y+R | c), S | | | | 5.4 | | | 5.4 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| Max Allow Head | dway (/ | ИАН), s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 3.5 | | | 3.5 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | | | | | 36.9 | | | 13.9 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 3.6 |
| Phase Call Pro | oability | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probal | oility | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.03 |
| | | - | | | | | | | | _ | | _ | 1 | | _ |
| Movement Gro | up Res | sults | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | <u> </u> | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | | R | | | R | L | 1 | R | | | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | <u> </u> | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 1 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow F | |), veh/h | | 143 | 228 | 664 | 130 | 131 | 129 | 247 | 211 | 205 | 11 | 335 | 318 |
| Adjusted Satura | | w Rate (s), ven/n/i | n | 7138 | 1900 | 1610 | 1171 | 190 | 0 1827 | 792 | 1900 | 1823 | 986 | 1900 | 1793 |
| Queue Service | nme (g | J_s), S | | 10.4 | 6.2 | 31.8 | 0.4 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 23.0 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 0.7 | 11.8 | 11.9 |
| Croop Patia (a | | e fille (<i>g</i> c), s | | 0.50 | 0.2 | 0.50 | 12.0 | 0.5 | 0.50 | 0.20 | 0.9 | 7.0 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| Green Ratio (g | $\frac{1}{2}$ | | | 600 | 0.50 | 708 | 580 | 0.5 | 0.50 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 707 | 0.39 | 737 | 605 |
| Volume to Can | city Ra | tio (X) | | 0.00 | 942 | 0.832 | 0.224 | 942 | 903 | 203 | 0.286 | 0.200 | 0.028 | 0.454 | 0.457 |
| Back of Queue | (O) ft | (In (95 th percentile) | | 87 | 122 7 | 485.7 | 83 | 66 | 5 65 6 | 293.5 | 133.3 | 129.9 | 7 | 219.4 | 211 |
| Back of Queue | $(\mathbf{Q}), \mathbf{u}$ | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 3.5 | 4 9 | 19.4 | 3.3 | 27 | 26 | 11 7 | 5.3 | 52 | 0.3 | 8.8 | 84 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1000 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| d_1 , s | /veh | | 15.1 | 13.0 | 19.5 | 16.6 | 12.3 | 3 12.3 | 35.5 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 21.6 | 20.5 | 20.5 |
| Incremental De | av (d 2 |), s/veh | | 0.9 | 0.6 | 9.9 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 23.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Initial Queue De | itial 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 Delav (| control Delay (d 3), s/ven | | | | | 29.4 | 17.5 | 12.0 | 3 12.6 | 59.2 | 19.1 | 19.1 | 21.7 | 20.6 | 20.7 |
| Level of Service | evel of Service (LOS) | | | | | С | В | В | B | E | В | В | С | С | С |
| Approach Delay | | 24.1 | | C | 14.3 | 3 | B | 34.0 |) | C | 20.7 | 7 | С | | |
| Intersection Del | | | | 24 | 1.3 | | | | | | С | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.30 |) | В | 2.30 |) | В | 2.13 | 3 | В | 2.30 |) | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 2.19 |) | В | 0.81 | | A | 1.03 | 3 | Α | 1.03 | 3 | A |

| | | - | - 5 | | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|----------|----------|---------------|--------------------|----------|---------------|---------|-----------|----------|----------|-------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Int | tersect | ion Info | ormatio | on | 2 | 4 24 4 1 | u l <u>u</u> |
| Agency | | Linscott. Law & Green | span | . Engine | eers | | | | Du | uration. | h | 0.250 | | | 414 | |
| Analvst | | JAS | <u> </u> | Analys | sis Da | te Aua 1 | 3. 2020 | | Ar | rea Tvp | e | Other | | | | <i>د</i> 4 |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e, PM | | PH | HF | - | 0.94 | | \rightarrow \rightarrow | w∔e | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | sis Yea | ar 2026 | | | Ar | nalvsis | Period | 1> 17 | :00 | * * | | *⊊ |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/Glencoe | | File Na | ame | 09PM | - Futur | | \$ | | | <u> </u> | | | K A | <u> </u> |
| Project Descript | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | - atar | o.nac | | | | | | - 5 | 111 141411 | * /* |
| i rojoot booonp | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | 5 | | V | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 147 | 233 | 3 673 | 140 | 2 | 42 | 30 | 251 | 385 | 54 | 12 | 561 | 112 |
| 0 | <u></u> | | | F | | | _ | | | _ | _ | | | _ | | - |
| Signal Informa | tion | | 0 | | | 205 | | | | | | | | \rightarrow | | ሐ |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | E. | | 2 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point E | nd | Green | 44.6 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | ĺ | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | Un | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | 4 | | ∇ |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | Jn | Red | 1.8 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | | 7 | 8 |
| Timer Desults | | | - | EDI | | EDT | | | 10 | | NDI | | NDT | CDI | | ODT |
| Timer Results | | | _ | EBL | - | EBI | VVB | | V | VBI | NBL | | NBI | SBL | - | SBI |
| Assigned Phase | 9 | | _ | | \rightarrow | 6 | | | | 2 | | _ | 8 | | | 4 |
| | | | | <u> </u> | _ | 5.0 | <u> </u> | | 6 | 6.0 | | | 6.0 | <u> </u> | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | \ \ | _ | | \rightarrow | 50.0 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 5 | 50.0 | | - | 40.0 | <u> </u> | | 40.0 |
| Change Period, | ange Period, (Y+ <i>R c</i>), s x Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | - | 5.4 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 5 | 5.4 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 |
| | ax Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s ieue Clearance Time (<i>g</i> s), s | | | | + | 0.0 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | | 0.0 | | | 3.0 | | | 3.0 15.3 |
| Green Extensio | Here Clearance Time (g_s) , s | | | | - | 0.0 | - | - | (| 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 4 1 |
| Phase Call Prot | bability | (9,0),0 | | | - | 0.0 | | | | 0.0 | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.07 |
| | j | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | W | 'B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | · | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | 156 | 248 | 716 | 149 | 14 | .6 | 143 | 267 | 237 | 230 | 13 | 368 | 348 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/ln | | 1107 | 1900 |) 1610 | 1150 | 190 | 00 | 1827 | 747 | 1900 | 1818 | 940 | 1900 | 1790 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | | 8.1 | 6.8 | 36.3 | 7.8 | 3. | 8 | 3.9 | 21.6 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 0.9 | 13.2 | 13.3 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 12.0 | 6.8 | 36.3 | 14.6 | 3. | 8 | 3.9 | 34.9 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 8.8 | 13.2 | 13.3 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.5 | 50 | 0.50 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 |
| Capacity (<i>c</i>), v | eh/h | | | 581 | 942 | 798 | 563 | 94 | .2 | 905 | 259 | 737 | 705 | 361 | 737 | 694 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | itio (X) | | 0.269 | 0.26 | 3 0.897 | 0.265 | 0.1 | 55 | 0.158 | 1.030 | 0.322 | 0.326 | 0.035 | 0.499 | 0.501 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | _ | 98.6 | 135.4 | 4 567.3 | 99.3 | 74 | .8 | 73.7 | 397.3 | 152.4 | 147.9 | 8.6 | 240.8 | 230.8 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), Ve | PO(0.5 th percentile) | | 3.9 | 5.4 | 22.7 | 4.0 | 3. | 0 | 2.9 | 15.9 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 0.3 | 9.6 | 9.2 |
| Queue Storage | | web |) | 15.7 | 13.2 | 20.6 | 17.4 | 12 | 1 | 12.4 | 37.5 | 10.00 | 10.00 | 22.4 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| Incremental Del | (u +), s | | _ | 1.1 | 0.7 | 1/ 0 | 17.4 | 0. | .4 1 | 0.4 | 63.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 20.9 | 20.9 |
| | cremental Delay (<i>d z</i>), s/veh | | | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0. | 4 0 | 0.4 | 00.9 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Control Delay (| d) elu | ah | _ | 16.8 | 13.0 | 35.5 | 18.5 | 12 | 8 | 12.8 | 101 / | 10.0 | 10 / | 22.4 | 21.1 | 21.2 |
| Level of Service | evel of Service (LOS) | | | R | R | , <u>35.5</u> П | R | R | | 12.0 R | F | R | R | C. | C. | <u> </u> |
| Approach Delay | pproach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | 28.1 | | 6 | 14 7 | | · | B | 40.2 | | | 21.2 | | C |
| ntersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | 20.1 | | 20 | 9.6 | | | 5 | -J.Z | | | <u> </u> | | - |
| | itersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | 2. | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | W | 'B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.30 |) | В | 2.30 |) | | В | 2.13 | | В | 2.30 |) | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | LOS Score / LOS Score / LOS | | | | | В | 0.85 | 5 | | А | 1.09 | | А | 1.09 |) | А |

| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Interse | ction I | nforma | tion | | 14741 | te l <u>e</u> |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------|------------|------------|--------|-------------------|--------|---------|---------|--------|----------|---------------|------------------|----------------|
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | eers | | | | Duratio | n, h | 0.2 | 50 | | 444 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | • | Analys | sis Date | Dec 2 | , 2020 | | Area T | /pe | Otł | er | 4 | | |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e with ct - PM | | PHF | | 0.9 | 4 | ↓ ↓↓↓ | W 1 E | 1 1 1 1 1 1 |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | is Yea | 2026 | | | Analys | s Perio | d 1> | 17:00 | | | Ē |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/Glencoe | | File Na | ame | 09PM | - Future | e with | Project | - Optio | า B.xu | ; | | 117 141499 | ۲ r |
| Project Descript | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | л | | _ | | | | - | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | В | | N | В | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | | | г R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 148 | 234 | 681 | 140 | 24 | 4 30 | 25 | 8 3 | 35 54 | 12 | 561 | 115 |
| 0 | <u></u> | | | . <u> </u> | | - | Г | | Γ | Г | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | Defense Dhara | 0 | | | 215 | | | | | | | \rightarrow | | \mathbf{A} |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | Z | | E . | | 2 | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Ulisel, s | | Simult Cap E/M | Ena | Green | 44.6 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) 0.0 |) 0. | 0 | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | INO Fixed | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) 0.0 |) 0. | 0 | _ | - | _ | ₩. |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Rea | 1.8 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 0.0 |) [0. | 0 | 5 | | 1 | 8 |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | WBT | N | BL | NBT | SB | L | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 6 | | | 2 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 50.0 | | | 50.0 | | | 40.0 | | | 40.0 |
| Change Period, | (Y+R | c), S | | | 5.4 | | | 5.4 | | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 | |
| Max Allow Head | ow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 3.6 | | | 3.6 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | | | | | 36.9 | | | 15.4 |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 4.2 |
| Phase Call Prot | oability | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probat | oility | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | | 0.07 |
| Mayamant Cra | un Dee | | _ | | | | | \A/E | , | | NI | . | _ | S P | |
| Approach Move | mont | suits | | | ED | D | | | | | | | | | D |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 1 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |) veh/h | _ | 157 | 249 | 724 | 149 | 147 | 144 | 274 | 23 | 7 230 | 13 | 370 | 349 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s) veh/h/l | n | 1105 | 1900 | 1610 | 1149 | 190 |) 1827 | 745 | 190 | 0 1818 | 940 | 1900 | 1787 |
| Queue Service | Time (a | σ_s) s | | 8.2 | 6.8 | 37.1 | 7.8 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 21.5 | 5 7.9 | 8.0 | 0.9 | 13.3 | 13.4 |
| Cycle Queue Cl | learanc | e Time (<i>q</i> _c), s | | 12.1 | 6.8 | 37.1 | 14.6 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 34.9 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 8.8 | 13.3 | 13.4 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.39 | 0.3 | 9 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 |
| Capacity (c), v | , eh/h | | | 580 | 942 | 798 | 562 | 942 | 906 | 258 | 73 | 7 705 | 361 | 737 | 693 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | itio(X) | | 0.272 | 0.264 | 0.908 | 0.265 | 0.15 | 6 0.15 | 9 1.06 | 4 0.32 | 2 0.32 | 6 0.035 | 0.502 | 0.504 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) | | 99.3 | 136 | 583.1 | 99.3 | 75.6 | 6 74.2 | 427. | 1 152 | .4 147.9 | 8.6 | 242.2 | 231.6 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 4.0 | 5.4 | 23.3 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 17.1 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 0.3 | 9.7 | 9.3 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| d 1), s | /veh | | 15.7 | 13.2 | 20.8 | 17.4 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 37.6 | i 19. | 3 19.3 | 22.4 | 20.9 | 21.0 |
| Incremental Del | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | 1.2 | 0.7 | 16.0 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 73.9 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Initial Queue De | al 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 |
| Control Delay (| ontrol Delay (d), s/veh | | | | | 36.9 | 18.6 | 12.8 | 3 12.8 | 111. | 5 19. | 4 19.4 | 22.4 | 21.1 | 21.2 |
| Level of Service | Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | D | В | В | В | F | В | В | С | С | С |
| Approach Delay | | 29.0 |) | С | 14.7 | 7 | В | 53 | 5.5 | D | 21. | 2 | С | | |
| Intersection Del | | | | 3′ | 1.0 | | | | | | С | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | FB | | | WF | | | N | 3 | | SB | |
| Pedestrian I 0.9 | Score | /LOS | | 2.30 |) | В | 2 30 |) | B | 2 | 13 | B | 2.3 | 0 | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC |)S | | 2.35 | 5 | B | 0.85 | 5 | A | 1. | 10 | A | 1.0 | 9 | A |

| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intersed | tion Inf | K | 4741 | þa l _a | | | | | |
|--|-----------|------------------------|-------|----------|----------|--------|----------------------|--------|-----------|----------|---------|---------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| Agency Linscott Law & Greenspan | | | | . Engine | ers | | | | Duration | h | 0.250 | 0 250 | | 417 | | | | |
| Analyst JAS | | | | Analys | is Date | Dec 2 | 2020 | | Area Tvr | ,)e | Other | | | | <u>بر</u> لا | | | |
| lurisdiction City of Los Angeles | | | | Time F | Period | Future | , <u>_o_</u> with | | PHF | | 0.94 | | → - [*] -> | w‡e | ≮↓ ∳ | | | |
| builduididin | | | | | onou | Projec | ct - PM | | | | 0.01 | | 4 M | | | | | |
| | | | | | (Impro | ovemen | ts) | | | | | | K A 4. | <u> </u> | | | | |
| Urban Street Mindanao Way | | | | Analys | sis Year | 2026 | | | Analysis | Period | 1> 17 | :00 | | 1 1 **** | ۳ ₁ ۲ | | | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/Glencoe | | File Na | ame | 09PM | - Future | e with | Project - | Option | B (Impr | ovem | | | | | | |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 41 | | | | ED | | | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | VV | B | <u> </u> | | | . | | D | | | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L 140 | 1 | R | L | 1 | K 20 | L | 205 | R F4 | L 12 | 1 | R 115 | | | |
| Demand (V), V | en/n | | | 148 | 234 | 681 | 140 | 24 | 4 30 | 258 | 385 | 54 | 12 | 501 | 115 | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | | | | | | | | К | | I | | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | 1 | 📑 🖥 | | 7 54 | 7 | | | | | 7_ | י <i>ר</i> י | Φ | | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | | | | | | | - 0.0 | | 1 | 2 | ↓ 3 | 4 | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 42.0 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | - | | | | r†a | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.8 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | € 6 | 7 | | | | |
| | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | - | EBT | WB | L | WBT | NB | - | NBT | SBI | - | SBT | | | |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 6 | | | 2 | 3 | | 8 | | | 4 | | | |
| Case Number | | | | | | 5.0 | | | 6.0 | 1.0 | | 4.0 | | | 6.3 | | | |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 47.4 | | | 47.4 | 16.3 | | 42.6 | | 26.3 | | | | |
| Change Period | , (Y+R) | c), S | | | | 5.4 | | | 5.4 | 4.0 | | 5.1 | | | 5.1 | | | |
| Max Allow Headway (MAH), s | | | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 3.2 | | | 3.2 | | | |
| Queue Clearance Time (g s), s | | | | | | | | | | 11.7 | 11.7 | | | | 18.7 | | | |
| Green Extension Time (g e), s | | | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.5 | | 2.5 | | | 2.5 | | | |
| Phase Call Probability | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 |) | 1.00 | | | 1.00 | | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | | 0.00 |) | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | | | |
| Movement Gro | | ulte | _ | | FR | | | \//B | | | NB | | | SB | _ | | | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | 1 | Т | R | | Т | R | 1 | Т | R | L T | | R | | | |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 1 | 14 | | | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |) veh/h | | 157 | 249 | 724 | 149 | 147 | 144 | 274 | 237 | 230 | 13 | 370 | 349 | | | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo |), ven/n | n | 1105 | 1000 | 1610 | 11/10 | 1000 | 1827 | 1810 | 1000 | 1818 | 940 | 1900 | 1787 | | | |
| | Time ((| σ_{s}) s | • | 87 | 7.2 | 29.2 | 82 | 4 0 | 4 1 | 97 | 7.5 | 7.6 | 09 | 16.6 | 16.7 | | | |
| Cvcle Queue C | learanc | e Time (| | 12.8 | 7.2 | 29.2 | 15.5 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 9.7 | 7.5 | 7.6 | 0.9 | 16.6 | 16.7 | | | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | - ····· (3 ·), - | | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.60 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.39 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.24 | | | |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 545 | 887 | 971 | 524 | 887 | 853 | 364 | 791 | 757 | 302 | 448 | 421 | | | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | itio(X) | | 0.289 | 0.281 | 0.746 | 0.284 | 0.16 | 6 0.169 | 0.754 | 0.300 | 0.303 | 0.042 | 0.826 | 0.829 | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) | | 106.7 | 146 | 409.3 | 106.6 | 81 | 79.6 | 183.2 | 143.7 | 139.5 | 9.5 | 304.2 | 290.9 | | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 4.3 | 5.8 | 16.4 | 4.3 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 7.3 | 5.7 | 5.6 | 0.4 | 12.2 | 11.6 | | | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | íle) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | , | 17.6 | 14.7 | 12.9 | 19.5 | 13.9 | 13.9 | 22.2 | 17.5 | 17.5 | 26.7 | 32.6 | 32.7 | | | |
| Incremental De | lay (d 2 |), s/veh | | 1.3 | 0.8 | 5.2 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 1.6 | | | |
| Initial Queue Delay (<i>d</i> 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 | | | | 18.9 | 15.5 | 18.1 | 20.8 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 23.4 | 17.6 | 17.6 | 26.7 | 34.1 | 34.3 | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | В | В | С | В | В | С | В | В | С | С | С | | | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | 17.6 | 5 | В | 16.5 | 5 | В | 19.7 B | | | 34.1 | | С | | | | |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | h / LOS | | | | 21 | 1.9 | | | | | | С | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | | | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LOS | | 2.30 |) | В | 2.30 |) | В | 2.13 | 3 | В | 2.30 |) | В | | | |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | | | | 2.35 | 5 | В | 0.85 | 5 | А | 1.10 |) | А | 1.09 |) | А | | | |

| General Information | | | | | | | | Inte | areact | ion Inf | | ** | <u>د اړ</u> | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---------|---------|--------------------------|-------|-----------|-------------|------------------|---------|---------|----------|--|-------------|----------------------|-----------------|--|
| Agonov Lincont Low & Croonenen | | | | ore | | | | Duration b 0.250 | | | | <i>,</i> ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | | 4 4 4 | | |
| Agency Linscott, Law & Greenspan, | | | | | Aug 2 | 1 2020 | | | | | Othor | | <u>_</u> | | ۲. ۲. | |
| Analyst | Analys | is Dale | Aug 3 | 1, 2020 | | Area Type | | | Other | | | w ^N r∈ | | | | |
| Caltrans | | | | | | | ling - Alvi | | | | 0.93 | 0.93 | | 8 W + F | ר זיי זיי | |
| Urban Street | SR-90 Westbound | | Analys | is Year | 2020 | | | Ana | alysis | Period | 1> 8:0 | 00 | | 5 + + | | |
| Intersection | Mindanao/SR-90 W | 'B | File Na | Name 10AM - Existing.xus | | | | | | | | | Υ. | 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 | * (* | |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Information | | | | EB | | | V | /B | | | NB | | | SB | | |
| Approach Movement | | | L | Т | R | L | Τ. | τТ | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | |
| Demand (v), veh/h | | | | | | 665 | 12 | 268 | 709 | 7 | 547 | | | 863 | 23 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Information | | | | | 11 | | - | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | |
| Cycle, s 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | 1 | 54 | • | l é | 7 | | | | | | 1 I | | Y | |
| Offset, s 0 | Reference Point | End | Croon | 14.0 | | 227 | | 0 | 0.0 | | _ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Uncoordinated No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 37 | 4.8 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | | | | |
| Force Mode Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| | | | 16 | | - | | | | | | | - | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | EBL | | EBT | WB | L | W | BT | NBL | - | NBT | SBI | - | SBT | |
| Assigned Phase | | | | | | | | 4 | 1 | 5 | | 2 | | | 6 | |
| Case Number | | | | | | | | 9. | .0 | 2.0 | | 4.0 | | | 8.3 | |
| Phase Duration, s | | | | | | | | 40 | 0.0 | 20.0 |) | 50.0 | | | 30.0 | |
| Change Period, (Y+R | c), S | | | | | | | 6. | .3 | 5.1 | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 | |
| Max Allow Headway (I | MAH), s | | | | | | | 3. | .0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | |
| Queue Clearance Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | | 35 | 5.7 2.3 | | | | | | | |
| Green Extension Time | (ge),s | | | | | | | | .0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | |
| Phase Call Probability | | | | | | 1.0 | | 00 | 1.00 | | | | | | | |
| Max Out Probability | | | | | | | | 1.0 | 00 | 0.00 |) | | | | | |
| Meyement Crewn Dee | | _ | _ | | | | 10/1 | D | _ | | | | | 00 | | |
| Approach Movement | suits | | | EB | D | | | в | D | 1 | | D | | <u>5</u> в | D | |
| Approach Novement | | | | 1 | N. | | 1 | + | 14 | 5 | ו ר | N. | <u> </u> | 6 | 16 | |
| Adjusted Flow Date () |) vob/b | | | | | / | 4 | | 14 | 0 | 2 500 | | <u> </u> | 629 | 215 | |
| Adjusted Flow Rate (V |), ven/n | - | | | | 479 | 109 | | 102 | 0 | 000 | | <u> </u> | 030 | 315 | |
| | | n | | | | 1010 | 100 | 7 7 | | 1010 | 1009 | | | 1900 | 10/4 | |
| Queue Service Time () | g_{s} , s | | | _ | | 20.3 | 33. 22 | 7 3 | 22.7 | 0.3 | 0.0 | <u> </u> | | 12.2 | 13.2 | |
| Cycle Queue Clearand | e fille (<i>g</i> c), s | | | | | 20.3 | 0.2 | 7 0 | 0.27 | 0.3 | 0.0 | | | 0.28 | 0.28 | |
| Capacity (c) yeh/h | | | | _ | | 678 | 1/1 | 3 6 | 603 | 300 | 1801 | | | 1047 | 516 | |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ra | atio (X) | | | _ | | 0 707 | 1 13 | 32 1 | 264 | 0.025 | 0.327 | | | 0.609 | 0.610 | |
| Back of Queue (Q) ft | (In (95 th percentile) | | | | | 330 | 969 | .8 1 | 250 | 6.2 | 158 | | | 257.8 | 267.8 | |
| | | | | | | | | | 5 | 0.2 | | | | | 201.0 | |
| Back of Queue (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | | | 13.2 | 38. | 85 | 50.0 | 0.2 | 6.3 | | | 10.3 | 10.7 | |
| Queue Storage Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | | | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay (d 1), s/veh | | | | _ | | 24.0 | 28. | 2 2 | 28.2 | 31.5 | 13.6 | | | 28.4 | 28.4 | |
| Incremental Delay (<i>d</i> ₂), s/veh | | | | - | | 2.9 | 68. | 8 1 | 31.9 | 0.0 | 0.5 | | | 2.6 | 5.3 | |
| Initial Queue Delay (<i>d</i> ₃), s/veh | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | | | 26.8 | 97. | 0 1 | 60.0 | 31.5 | 14.0 | | | 31.0 | 33.7 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | C | F | | F | C | В | <u> </u> | | C | C | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 102. | 1 | F | F 14.3 | | B | | 31.9 |) | С | |
| Intersection Delay, s/ve | en / LOS | | | | 74 | 1.9 | | | | | | | E | | | |
| Multimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | /B | | | NB | | S | | | |
| Pedestrian LOS Score | /LOS | | 2.46 | | В | 2.30 | | B | 3 | 2.13 | ; | В | 1.70 |) | В | |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LO | DS | | | | | 2.83 | 3 | C | ; | 0.98 | ; | А | 1.01 | | А | |

| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Interse | ction Inf | ormatio | <i>w</i> | *** | × l <u>x</u> | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------------|-------|----------|--|-------------------|--------------------|----------|---------|-----------|---------|----------|----------|--------------|--------------|--|--|
| Agency Linscott, Law & Greenspan | | | | , Engine | ers | | | | Duratio | n, h | 0.250 | 0.250 | | ~{ ↓ ↓ | | | |
| Analyst JAS | | | | Analys | is Date | Dec 2 | , 2020 | | Area Ty | ре | Other | Other | | | <u>م</u> گ | | |
| Jurisdiction City of Los Angeles / Caltrans | | | | Time F | Period | Existir Projec | ng with st - AM | | PHF | | 0.93 | 0.93 | | w ‡ e | ┺┓ ┺ ┺ | | |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Westbound | | Analys | is Year | 2020 | | | Analysi | s Period | 1> 8: | 00 | | | <u>_</u> | | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 W | Έ | File Na | e Name 10AM - Existing with Project - Option B xus | | | | | | | | | | × (* | | |
| Proiect Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | <u> </u> | , | | | | - | | | | |
| , , | | · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | В | | NB | | | SB | | | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Г | - R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | | |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | | | | 665 | 12 | 85 72 | 37 | 554 | | | 905 | 23 | | |
| | | | | 1/ | _ | | | | 15 | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | 14 | - K | 3 | | | | | • | | Ð- | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | ST. | t t | Ľ | Γ | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | ¥ 4 | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 14.9 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0.0 |) 0.0 | 0.0 | | く IA | | | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 |) 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | . 1 | EBT | WB | L | WBT | NB | L | NBT | SBI | - | SBT | | |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | | | | 4 | 5 | | 2 | | | 6 | | |
| Case Number | | | | | | | | | 9.0 | 2.0 |) | 4.0 | | | 8.3 | | |
| Phase Duration | i, s | | | | | | | | 40.0 | 20. | 0 | 50.0 | | 30.0 | | | |
| Change Period | , (Y+R (| c), S | | | | | | | 6.3 | 3 5.1 | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 | | |
| Max Allow Head | dway(A | <i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | | | 3.0 | 3.2 | 2 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (<i>g</i> s), s | | | | | | | 35.7 | 2.3 | ; | | | | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (g _e), s | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | |
| Phase Call Probability | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 1.0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 0.0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| Movement Gre | | | | | ER | | | \٨/٢ | 2 | | NR | | | S B | | | |
| Approach Move | ment | Suits | | | т | R | | | , R | 1.1 | Т | R | | Т | R | | |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | | | TX . | 7 | 4 | 14 | 5 | 2 | | | 6 | 16 | | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |) veh/h | | | | | 479 | 161 | 8 781 | 8 | 596 | | | 668 | 330 | | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s) veh/h/l | n | | | | 1810 | 188 | 7 1610 | 1810 | 1809 | | | 1900 | 1875 | | |
| | Time ((| π_{c}) s | | | | | 20.3 | 33 7 | 7 337 | 0.3 | 89 | | <u> </u> | 13.0 | 13.9 | | |
| | learance | e Time (a_c) s | | | | | 20.3 | 33.7 | 7 33 7 | 0.3 | 8.9 | | | 13.9 | 13.9 | | |
| Green Ratio (a | V(C) | 5 mile (9 c), c | | | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 7 0.37 | 0.17 | 0.50 | | | 0.28 | 0.28 | | |
| Capacity (c) | /eh/h | | | | | | 678 | 141 | 3 603 | 300 | 1801 | | | 1047 | 517 | | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acitv Ra | tio (X) | | | | | 0.707 | 1.14 | 5 1.295 | 0.025 | 0.331 | | | 0.638 | 0.639 | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q) ft/ | (In (95 th percentile) | | | | | 330 | 1009 |). 1337 | 6.2 | 160.4 | | | 270.7 | 282.1 | | |
| Duck of Quodo | (), 10 | | | | | | | 1 | 4 | . 0.2 | | | | 210.1 | 202.1 | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | | | 13.2 | 40.4 | 4 53.5 | 0.2 | 6.4 | | | 10.8 | 11.3 | | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | | |
| Uniform Delay (| (d 1), si | /veh | | | | | 24.0 | 28.2 | 2 28.2 | 31.5 | 13.6 | | | 28.7 | 28.7 | | |
| Incremental Delay (d ₂), s/veh | | | | | | | 2.9 | 74.0 |) 144.7 | 0.0 | 0.5 | | | 3.0 | 5.9 | | |
| Initial Queue Delay (d 3), s/veh | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | | | | 26.8 | 102. | 2 172.8 | 31.5 | 14.1 | | | 31.6 | 34.6 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | С | F | F | С | В | | | С | С | | |
| Approach Delay | y, s/veh | / LOS | | 0.0 | | | 108. | 8 | F | 14. | 3 | В | 32.6 | ; | С | | |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | h / LOS | | | | 79 | 9.1 | | | | | | E | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | _ | | WE | 3 | | NB | - | | SB | | | |
| Pedestrian LOS | S Score | /LOS | | 2.46 | | В | 2.30 |) | В | 2.1 | 3 | В | 1.70 | | В | | |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | | | | | | | 2.86 | 5 | С | 0.9 | 9 | А | 1.04 | | А | | |

Copyright @ 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intersor | tion Inf | ormatio | | **** | بد لي | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|---------|--------------------|------------------------|----------|------------|-----------|------------------|----------|---------|------|------------------|--------------|---|--|--|
| Agonov Linscott Law & Groonspan | | | | Engine | ore | | | | Duration h 0 250 | | | | | 4 4 4 | | | |
| Analyst IAS | | | | | ic Data | | 1 2020 | | | on Other | | | _7 _4 | | <u>ال</u> | | |
| Jurisdiction City of Los Angeles / | | | | Time F | Period | Future | e - AM | | PHF | 0.93 | | | - ↑ | w ∔ E | | | |
| Caltrans | | | | Anglugia Vega 2020 | | | | | Analyzia | Dariad | 1 > 0.0 | 20 | | | یہ کا در ان | | |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Westbourid | | | is rear | 2020 | F 1 | | Analysis | Penou | 12 0.0 | 0 | - 7 | 511 | | | |
| Dreiset Deserin | t io 10 | Decce Marine | D | File INa | Name 10AM - Future.xus | | | | | | | | - " | A ↑ \$P\$*Y1 | × 1* | | |
| Project Descrip | lion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | В | | NB | | | SB | | | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | - R | L | Т | R | <u> </u> | Т | R | | |
| Demand (v), v | reh/h | | | | | | 720 | 13 | 55 762 | 7 | 592 | | | 943 | 24 | | |
| Signal Informa | ation | | | | Γ | IJ | | | | | | | | | ĸ | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | 1 | | Ľ. | i ž | 7 | | | | | 1 | | * | | |
| Offset s | 0 | Reference Point | End | L | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult Gap E/W | On | Green | 14.9 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | | | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult Gap N/S | On | Red | 3.0 | 1.5 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | ┓╴ | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| T OFCE MODE | TIXCU | oindit. Oup N/O | OII | Tteu | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | - | | - | | |
| Timer Results | _ | | | EBL | | EBT | WB | L | WBT | NB | L | NBT | SB | - | SBT | | |
| Assigned Phas | е | | | | | | | | 4 | 5 | | 2 | | | 6 | | |
| Case Number | | | | | | | | | 9.0 | 2.0 | | 4.0 | | | 8.3 | | |
| Phase Duration | 1, S | | | | | | | | 40.0 | 20.0 | | 50.0 | | | 30.0 | | |
| Change Period | , (Y+ R | c), S | | | | | | | 6.3 | 5.1 | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 | | |
| Max Allow Hea | dway (/ | MAH), s | | | | | | | 3.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | | 35.7 | 2.3 | | | | | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 1.00 |) | | | | | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 0.00 |) | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | | aulte | | | EB | | | \//F | 2 | | NB | | | SB | | | |
| Approach Move | ement | Suits | | | Т | R | | | , R | | Т | R | | Т | R | | |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | - | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 5 | 2 | | | 6 | 16 | | |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |) veh/h | | | | | 519 | 171 | 2 819 | 8 | 637 | | | 696 | 344 | | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s) veh/h/l | n | | | | 1810 | 188 | 7 1610 | 1810 | 1809 | | | 1900 | 1875 | | |
| | Time ((| $\alpha_{\rm s}$) s | | | | | 22.6 | 33 7 | 7 33 7 | 0.3 | 97 | | | 14.6 | 14.6 | | |
| Cvcle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>q</i> _c). s | | | | | 22.6 | 33.7 | 7 33.7 | 0.3 | 9.7 | | <u> </u> | 14.6 | 14.6 | | |
| Green Ratio (o | I/C) | | | | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 7 0.37 | 0.17 | 0.50 | | | 0.28 | 0.28 | | |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | | | | 678 | 141 | 3 603 | 300 | 1801 | | | 1047 | 517 | | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | atio (X) | | | | | 0.766 | 1.21 | 2 1.359 | 0.025 | 0.353 | | | 0.665 | 0.665 | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) |) | | _ | | 369.5 | 1222 9 | 2. 1525. 8 | 6.2 | 174 | | | 282.9 | 295.5 | | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | | | 14.8 | 48.9 | 61.0 | 0.2 | 7.0 | | | 11.3 | 11.8 | | |
| Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile) | | | | | _ | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | | |
| Uniform Delay (<i>d</i> 1), s/veh | | | | | | | 24.7 | 28.2 | 2 28.2 | 31.5 | 13.8 | | | 28.9 | 28.9 | | |
| Incremental Delay (d ₂), s/veh | | | | | | | 4.7 | 102. | 3 172.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 | | | 3.3 | 6.6 | | |
| Initial Queue Delay (d 3), s/veh | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | | | | 29.4 | 130. | 4 200.3 | 31.5 | 14.3 | | | 32.2 | 35.6 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | | С | F | F | С | В | | | С | D | | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 0.0 | | | 132. | 0 | F | 14.5 | 5 | В | 33.3 | 3 | С | | |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | eh / LOS | | | | 94 | 4.4 | | | | | F | | | | | |
| Multimodal Posulta | | | | | FR | | | | 3 | | NR | | 00 | | | | |
| Pedestrian I OS | S Score | /105 | | 2 46 | | B | 2.30 | | B | 2 13 | 3 | В | 1 70 | | В | | |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | core / I C |)S | | 2.70 | | 5 | 3.00 |) | C | 1.02 | 2 | A | 1.06 | ; | A | | |
| , | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | |
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intersed | tion Inf | ormatio | on | 2 | 4 244 1 | × L |
|--------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--------|----------|---------|------------------|-------------------|----------|---------------|----------|---------|------|-------|---------|-------------|
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Duratior | ı, h | 0.250 | | | 4++ | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Date | Dec 2 | , 2020 | | Area Ty | с | Other | | 4 | | ~ |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles Caltrans | / | Time P | eriod | Future Projec | e with ct - AM | | PHF | | 0.93 | | 4 4 4 | W F E | ┺ ┺ ┺ |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Westbound | | Analys | is Year | 2026 | | | Analysis | Period | 1> 8:0 | 00 | | | <u>_</u> |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 W | В | File Na | ime | 10AM | - Future | e with | Project - | Option | B.xus | | | | * (* |
| Proiect Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | | , | | | | 1 - | | |
| · · · | | · · · · | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | В | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | T | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | | | | 720 | 13 | 72 779 | 7 | 599 | | | 985 | 24 |
| | | | | | | | | m | | | | | | | 1 |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | 14 | | 3 | | | | | • | | ð- |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 177 | 1 1 | ¥ | 7 | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 14.9 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | く IA | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | _ | | | _ | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | | EBT | WB | L | WBT | NB | L | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | Э | | | | | | | | 4 | 5 | | 2 | | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | | | | 9.0 | 2.0 | | 4.0 | | | 8.3 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | | | | 40.0 | 20.0 |) | 50.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period | (Y+R | e), S | | | | | | | 6.3 | 5.1 | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Head | ow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | | | | 3.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | eue Clearance Time (g s), s | | | | | | | | 35.7 | 2.3 | | | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 1.00 |) | | | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 0.00 |) | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | _ | | EB | | | WE | } | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 5 | 2 | | | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |), veh/h | | | | | 519 | 173 | 1 838 | 8 | 644 | | | 726 | 359 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | | | | 1810 | 188 | 7 1610 | 1810 | 1809 | | | 1900 | 1876 |
| Queue Service | Time (d | 7 s), S | | | | | 22.6 | 33.7 | 7 33.7 | 0.3 | 9.8 | | | 15.4 | 15.4 |
| Cycle Queue C | learance | e Time (<i>g</i> c), s | | | | | 22.6 | 33.7 | 7 33.7 | 0.3 | 9.8 | | | 15.4 | 15.4 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 7 0.37 | 0.17 | 0.50 | | | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| Capacity (c), v | , eh/h | | | | | | 678 | 141 | 3 603 | 300 | 1801 | | | 1047 | 517 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | tio (X) | | | | | 0.766 | 1.22 | 5 1.389 | 0.025 | 0.358 | | | 0.694 | 0.694 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | | | | 369.5 | 1265 | 5. 1616. 4 | 6.2 | 176.5 | | | 296.2 | 310.6 |
| Back of Queue | (Q). ve | h/ln (95 th percenti | le) | | _ | _ | 14.8 | 50.6 | 64.7 | 0.2 | 7.1 | | | 11.8 | 12.4 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay | (d 1), s/ | /veh | | | - | | 24.7 | 28.2 | 28.2 | 31.5 | 13.8 | | | 29.2 | 29.2 |
| Incremental De | niform Delay (d 1), s/veh cremental Delay (d 2), s/veh | | | | | | 4.7 | 107. | 8 185.3 | 0.0 | 0.6 | | | 3.8 | 7.5 |
| Initial Queue De | tial Queue Delay (d_3), s/veh | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | | | 29.4 | 135. | 9 213.4 | 31.5 | 14.4 | | | 33.0 | 36.7 |
| Level of Service | evel of Service (LOS) | | | | | | C | F | F | C | B | | | C | D |
| Approach Delay | Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | 0.0 | | | 139 | 0 | F | 14 (| 3 | В | 34.2 | | C |
| ntersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | 0.0 | | QS | 3.6 | - | | | | - | F | | - |
| | nersection Delay, siven / LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | ultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | 2.46 | | В | 2.30 |) | В | 2.13 | 3 | В | 1.70 |) | В | | |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | | | 3.03 | 3 | С | 1.03 | 3 | А | 1.08 | 3 | А | |

Copyright @ 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

| | | | , eig | | • • | | tion | | | men | , | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|----------|---------|--------|-----------|---------------|----------|----------|----------|-------------|----------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Gonoral Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intersor | tion Inf | ormatic | n | | 4,44,4 | þ. lu |
| | lation | Linscott Law & Gre | onenan | Engine | ore | | | | Duration | b | 0 250 | <i>/</i> // | | 411 | |
| Agency | | | enspan | | | Aug 2 | 1 2020 | | | , 11 | Othor | | 1 | | ۲. ۲. |
| Analyst | | JAO City of Loo Angoloo | 1 | Time D | | Evicti | DA DM | | | | | | → | w Ťe | |
| Junsalction | | Caltrans | / | | enou | Existi | ig - Pivi | | PHF | | 0.90 | | 4 4 | | ⁴ 1 ~ |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Westbound | | Analys | is Year | 2020 | | | Analysis | Period | 1> 17 | :00 | | 5 † † | <u></u> _ |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 W | 'B | File Na | me | 10PM | - Existi | ng.xu | s | | | | | । । । । ব ↑ क Ÿ ′ | ۳ <u></u> ۲ |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | 7 | | |
| | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | /B | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | r R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | | | | 552 | 99 | 90 346 | 17 | 449 | | | 1394 | 42 |
| | tion | | | 1 | 1 | - II | | | | | | | | | _ |
| Signal morma | | Deference Dhase | 2 | | | 14 | E St | Ħ | | | | | Ť | | \rightarrow |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | Z | | 17 | 1 1 | × | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 14.9 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | _ | | | |
| Uncoordinated | NO | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | \ < | l | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | | EBT | W/B | | WBT | NB | | NRT | SB | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | <u>م</u> | | | | - | | | | 4 | 5 | - | 2 | | - | 6 |
| Case Number | <u> </u> | | | <u> </u> | - | | | \rightarrow | 9.0 | 2.0 | | 4.0 | | | 83 |
| Phase Duration | | | | | | | | | 40.0 | 2.0 | | 50.0 | | _ | 30.0 |
| Change Duration | I, S | | | | - | | | \rightarrow | 40.0 | 20.0 | , | 5.2 | | | 50.0 |
| Max Allow Hoo | (I + K) | c), S | | | | | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 2.0 | 2.1 | | 0.0 | | _ | 0.0 |
| | uway (<i>1</i> | иап), s | | <u> </u> | | | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 3.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 | <u> </u> | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | $(g_s), s$ | | | _ | | | \rightarrow | 28.9 | 2.7 | | 0.0 | | _ | 0.0 |
| Green Extensio | | (<i>g</i> e), s | | <u> </u> | _ | | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 2.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | <u> </u> | | 0.0 |
| Max Out Droke | | | | | _ | | | -+- | 0.75 | 1.00 | , , | | <u> </u> | _ | |
| Max Out Proba | DIIILY | | | | | | | | 0.75 | 0.00 |) | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 5 | 2 | | | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |), veh/h | | | | | 385 | 122 | 1 360 | 18 | 468 | | | 1002 | 493 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | | | | 1810 | 188 | 6 1610 | 1810 | 1809 | | | 1900 | 1870 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), s | | | | | 15.2 | 26. | 9 16.2 | 0.7 | 6.7 | | | 23.4 | 23.4 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (g c), s | | | | | 15.2 | 26. | 9 16.2 | 0.7 | 6.7 | | | 23.4 | 23.4 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | | | 0.37 | 0.3 | 7 0.37 | 0.17 | 0.50 | | | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | | | | 678 | 141 | 2 603 | 300 | 1801 | | | 1047 | 515 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | itio(X) | | | - | | 0.569 | 0.86 | 5 0.598 | 0.059 | 0.260 | | | 0.957 | 0.957 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | (In (95 th percentile) |) | | | | 251.9 | 442 | .1 243.7 | 14.6 | 120.6 | | | 478.2 | 520.3 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | | | 10.1 | 17. | 7 9.7 | 0.6 | 4.8 | | | 19.1 | 20.8 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | , tile) | | | | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| Jniform Delay (d_1), s/veh | | | | | | 22.4 | 26. | 0 22.7 | 31.6 | 13.0 | | | 32.1 | 32.1 |
| Incremental De | | | | | 0.7 | 5.6 | 5 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 | | | 19.3 | 30.4 | | |
| Initial Queue De | nitial Queue Delay (d ȝ), s/veh | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 |) 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| d), s/ve | əh | | | | | 23.1 | 31. | 6 23.8 | 31.7 | 13.4 | | | 51.3 | 62.4 |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | | | | С | С | С | С | В | | | D | E |
| Approach Delay | Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 28.5 | 5 | С | 14.1 | 1 | В | 55.0 |) | E |
| Intersection De | | | | 36 | 5.8 | | | | | | D | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Iultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | strian LOS Score / LOS | | | | | В | 2.30 |) | В | 2.13 | 3 | В | 1.70 |) | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | | | | 2.11 | | В | 0.89 |) | А | 1.31 | 1 | A |

| | | _ | - 5 | | | | | | | - | , | | | | |
|-------------------|---|--------------------------|----------|----------|---------|--------------|------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|---------|-----------------|----------|------------|-------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Interse | ction Inf | ormati | on | K | ** *** * · | ja l _a |
| Agency | lution | Linscott Law & Gre | enspan | Engine | ers | | | | Duratio | h h | 0 250 |) | | -↓↓↓ | |
| Analyst | | | enepan | Δnalvs | is Date | Dec 2 | 2 2020 | | | ne | Othe | r | | | <u>.</u> |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | 1 | Time P | | Evisti | na with | | PHE | <u>pc</u> | 0.96 | | | w‡e | |
| Jungaletion | | Caltrans | / | | chou | Proje | ct - PM | | | | 0.30 | | the free | | |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Westbound | | Analys | is Yea | r 2020 | | | Analysi | s Period | 1> 17 | 7:00 | | 5 4 4 | ×~ |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 W | 'B | File Na | ime | 10PN | 1 - Existi | ng wi | th Projec | t - Optio | n B.xus | | | | ۳ ₁ א |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | ′B | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | r R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | | | | 552 | 99 | 96 35 | 2 17 | 451 | | | 1402 | 42 |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | Γ | <u> </u> | | , | 1 | _ | | | | | |
| | | Poforonco Phaso | 2 | 1 | | _ ∠ + | E X | Ħ | | | | | Ť | | \rightarrow |
| Offect o | 90.0 | Reference Pridse | Z End | | Sî | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Unseerdingtod | U | Simult Can E/M | Enu | Green | 14.9 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | - | | | |
| | | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | ╲╏ ^ĸ | t | _ | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 | J 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | | FBT | WB | 1 | WBT | NB | | NBT | SBI | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | | | | | | | | | 4 | 5 | - | 2 | | | 6 |
| Case Number | <u> </u> | | | | + | | <u> </u> | + | 9.0 | 20 | | 4.0 | <u> </u> | | 83 |
| Phase Duration | e | | | | | | | - | 40.0 | 2.0 | , 1 | 50.0 | | _ | 30.0 |
| Change Deried | , 3 (V+D | -) C | | | | | | \rightarrow | 40.0 | 5.1 | 5 | 50.0 | | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Hoor | | (c), s | | | | | | -+- | 2.0 | 3.1 | , | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| | oo Timo | (α) | | | | | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 20.2 | 3.2 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce nine n Timo | $(g_s), s$ | | <u> </u> | - | | | | 29.2 | 2.1 | | 0.0 | | _ | 0.0 |
| Bhase Cell Brok | | (ge), s | | <u> </u> | | | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 1.00 | 1.0 | 2 | 0.0 | <u> </u> | | 0.0 |
| Max Out Broba | | | | <u> </u> | - | | | | 0.79 | 1.0 | 5 | | <u> </u> | _ | |
| Max Out Proba | onity | | | | | | | | 0.78 | 0.0 | J | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 5 | 2 | | | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | | | | | 385 | 122 | 7 367 | 18 | 470 | | | 1008 | 496 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | | | | 1810 | 188 | 6 1610 | 1810 | 1809 | | | 1900 | 1870 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | | | _ | | 15.2 | 27.3 | 2 16.6 | 0.7 | 6.7 | <u> </u> | | 23.5 | 23.5 |
| Cycle Queue C | learance | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | | | | 15.2 | 27. | 2 16.6 | 0.7 | 6.7 | | | 23.5 | 23.5 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | | | 0.37 | 0.3 | 7 0.37 | 0.17 | 0.50 | | | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | | | | 678 | 141 | 2 603 | 300 | 1801 | | | 1047 | 515 |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | atio(X) | | | | | 0.569 | 0.86 | 9 0.608 | 0.059 | 0.261 | | | 0.963 | 0.963 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) |) | | _ | | 251.9 | 446. | 8 248.7 | 14.6 | 121.1 | | | 484.8 | 527.4 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | | | 10.1 | 17.9 | 9 9.9 | 0.6 | 4.8 | | | 19.4 | 21.1 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | | | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.00 C | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | | | | | 22.4 | 26. | 1 22.8 | 31.6 | 13.0 | | | 32.1 | 32.1 |
| Incremental De | ncremental Delay (<i>d</i> ₂), s/veh | | | | | | 0.7 | 5.8 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.4 | | | 20.2 | 31.4 |
| Initial Queue De | nitial Queue Delay (<i>d</i> ₃), s/veh | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| d), s/ve | eh | | | | | 23.1 | 31.9 | 9 24.1 | 31.7 | 13.4 | | | 52.3 | 63.5 |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | | | | С | С | С | С | В | | | D | E |
| Approach Delay | Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 28.8 | 3 | С | 14. | 1 | В | 56.0 |) | Е |
| Intersection De | | | | 3 | 7.3 | | | | | | D | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | ultimodal Results | | | | | | | WE | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.46 | | В | 2.30 |) | В | 2.1 | 3 | В | 1.70 |) | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | | | | 2.12 | 2 | В | 0.8 | 9 | А | 1.31 | | А |

| | | nee | r olg | nunze | u iiit | 01000 | | 1050 | | innai j | , | | | | |
|------------------|--|---------------------------------|--------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|------------------|----------|------------|---------|----------|--------------------|--------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intersec | tion Inf | ormatio | n | | at 22 ata 1 . | به لړ |
| | lation | Lincott Low & Cro | ononon | Enging | oro | | | | Duration | <u>ь</u> | 0 250 | <i></i> | - 1 | 4 4 4 | |
| Agency | | LINSCOLL, LAW & GIE | enspan | , Engine | | A | 1 0000 | | | , 11 | 0.250 | | | | K |
| Analyst | | JAS City of Los Annalas | 1 | | is Dale | Aug 3 | T, 2020 | | Агеа тур | e | Other | | | wÌr | |
| Jurisaiction | | City of Los Angeles Caltrans | / | l lime P | erioa | Future | e - Pivi | | PHF | | 0.96 | | 4 4 4 | ** T = 8 | * <mark>*</mark> * |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Westbound | | Analys | is Year | 2026 | | | Analysis | Period | 1> 17 | :00 | | <u> </u> | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 W | 'B | File Na | ime | 10PM | - Future | e.xus | | | | | | 414Y | *) * |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | _ | | | _ | | - | - | | | _ | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | <u> </u> | W | B | <u>.</u> | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | <u> </u> | | R | L | | R | L | 1 | R | | 1 | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | | | | 635 | 112 | 20 384 | 18 | 496 | | | 1521 | 47 |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | IJ | 1 | | Γ | | | | | | ĸ |
| Cvcle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | 1 | . | | E E | 7 | | | | | 1 | | 7 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | | <u> </u> | L T | <u> </u> | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult, Gap F/W | On | Green | 14.9 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | _ | | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 4.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | _ | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | TIXOU | olinial. Cup 14/C | OII | | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Timer Results | _ | | | EBL | . | EBT | WB | L | WBT | NB | _ | NBT | SBI | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | | | | 4 | 5 | | 2 | | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | | | | 9.0 | 2.0 | | 4.0 | | | 8.3 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | | | | 40.0 | 20.0 |) | 50.0 | | | 30.0 |
| Change Period, | , (Y+R | c), S | | | | | | | 6.3 | 5.1 | | 5.2 | | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Head | dway(/ | <i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | | | 3.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | | 34.7 | 2.8 | | | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 1.00 |) | | | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 0.00 |) | | | | |
| | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | <u> </u> | EB | | <u> </u> | WB | | <u> </u> | NB | | <u> </u> | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | | 1 | R | | | R | | | R | <u> </u> | | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | <u> </u> | | | _ | ļ | 7 | 4 | 14 | 5 | 2 | | | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v | '), veh/h | | | | <u> </u> | 443 | 1385 | 5 400 | 19 | 517 | | | 1095 | 539 |
| Adjusted Satura | | ow Rate (s), ven/n/i | n | | | <u> </u> | 1810 | 1886 | 5 1610 7 10 0 | 1810 | 1/18 | | <u> </u> | 1900 | 1869 |
| Queue Service | learanc | g_s , s | | | | | 10.3 | 32.7 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 8.0 | | | 20.4 | 24.0 24.8 |
| Green Ratio (a | | e nine (<i>g</i> ;), s | | | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 10.0 2 0.37 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| | | | | | | | 678 | 1/11 | 2 603 | 300 | 1711 | | | 1047 | 515 |
| Volume to Can | acity Ra | atio (X) | | | | | 0.654 | 0.08 | 1 0 663 | 0.063 | 0.302 | | | 1 0 4 5 | 1.046 |
| Back of Oueue | (0) ft | /In (95 th percentile) | | | | | 207.5 | 594 | 9 277 | 15 / | 136.0 | | | 607 | 650.1 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), R | eh/ln (95 th percenti | le) | | | | 11 9 | 23.8 | 3 277 | 0.6 | 5.5 | | | 24.3 | 26.0 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | tile) | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| Queue Storage Ratio (<i>RQ</i>) (95 th percentile) | | | | | | 23.3 | 27.8 | 3 23.4 | 31.7 | 13.4 | | | 32.6 | 32.6 |
| Incremental De | | | | | 1.8 | 19.4 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.5 | | | 40.4 | 52.1 | | |
| Initial Queue De | nitial Queue Delay (d ȝ), s/veh | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| d), s/ve | eh | | | | | 25.1 | 47.2 | 2 25.6 | 31.7 | 13.8 | | | 73.0 | 84.7 |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | | | | С | D | С | С | В | | | F | F |
| Approach Delay | Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 38.9 | | D | 14.4 | 1 | В | 76.9 |) | E |
| Intersection De | | | | 50 |).0 | | | | | | D | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Aultimodal Results | | | | | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | 2.46 | | В | 2.30 |) | В | 2.13 | 3 | В | 1.70 |) | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | | | | 2.33 | 3 | В | 0.93 | 3 | А | 1.39 |) | А |

| | | | Ū | | | | | | | | - The second sec | - | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------|----------|---------|----------|---------------|---------------|--------|----------|--|---------|------|----------------|------------------|----------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | ersect | ion Infe | ormatio | on | | | la la |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Dur | ration, | h | 0.250 | | | -4↓↓ | |
| Analvst | | JAS | | Analvs | s Date | e Dec | 2. 2020 | | Are | a Type | e | Other | | - ⁻ | | د. م_ الح |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | / | Time P | eriod | Futur | e with | | PHI | F | | 0.96 | | <u> </u> | W + E | 14 14 14 |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Westbound | | Analys | s Yea | r 2026 | | | Ana | alysis l | Period | 1> 17 | :00 | | 5 4 4 | e e |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 W | ′B | File Na | me | 10PN | 1 - Futur | e witł | n Pro | ject - (| Option I | B.xus | | | + + | ግ ተ |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | | | - | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | ∕B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | т | R | L | Т | R | L | T | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | | | | 635 | 11 | 26 | 390 | 18 | 498 | | | 1529 | 47 |
| | | | | 1e | | | | | | -1 | _ | | | | | 1 |
| Signal Informa | tion | | - | | | 14 | | 1 | | | | | | + | | Ð- |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 51 | 1 | ¥ ۱ | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 14.9 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | < ⊻ | 1 | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timer Deservice | | | | EDI | | EDT | | | 14/ | DT | NDI | | | 0.0 | . 1 | ODT |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | _ | ERI | VVB | L | VV | BI | NBL | | NBI | SB | | SBI |
| Assigned Phase | 9 | | | | - | | | \rightarrow | 4 | 4 | 5 | _ | 2 | | _ | 6 |
| | | | | <u> </u> | _ | | | | 9. | .0 | 2.0 | | 4.0 | | | 8.3 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | _ | | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 40 | 0.0 | 20.0 |) | 50.0 | - | _ | 30.0 | |
| Change Period, | (Y+R | c), S | | | | | \rightarrow | 6. | .3 | 5.1 | | 5.2 | - | | 5.2 | |
| Max Allow Head | dway(/ | ИАН), s | | | _ | | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 3. | .0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 | | _ | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | | | \rightarrow | 34 | 1.9 | 2.8 | | | | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | _ | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | | | \rightarrow | 1.0 | 00 | 1.00 |) | | <u> </u> | | |
| Max Out Probal | bility | | | | | | | | 1.(| 00 | 0.00 |) | | | | |
| Movement Gro | | aulte | | | FB | | | \٨/ | R | _ | | NB | | _ | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | | | | т | R | 1 | Т | | R | 1 | Т | R | | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | | - | | 7 | | + | 14 | 5 | 2 | | | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |) veh/h | | | | - | / | 130 | 1 | 406 | 10 | 510 | | - | 1100 | 5/1 |
| Adjusted Flow I | tion Ele |), ven/n w Rate (s) veh/h/l | n | | | | 1810 | 188 | 1 | 1610 | 1810 | 1718 | | - | 100 | 1870 |
| | Time (/ | | 11 | | | | 18.3 | 32 | | 10.0 | 0.8 | 8.0 | | - | 26.6 | 24.8 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (a_c) s | | | | - | 18.3 | 32 | 9 9 | 19.0 | 0.8 | 8.0 | | <u> </u> | 26.6 | 24.0 |
| Green Ratio (a | /C) | o milo (g o), o | | | | | 0.37 | 0.3 | 7 (| 0.37 | 0.17 | 0.50 | | | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| Capacity (c) y | /eh/h | | | | | | 678 | 141 | 2 | 603 | 300 | 1711 | | | 1047 | 515 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | itio (X) | | | | - | 0.654 | 0.98 | 35 0 |) 674 | 0.063 | 0.303 | | | 1 051 | 1 051 |
| Back of Queue | (Q) ft | (In (95 th percentile) | | | | - | 297.5 | 603 | 6 2 | 282.6 | 15.4 | 137.5 | | | 616.3 | 659.2 |
| Back of Queue | $(\mathbf{Q}), \mathbf{R}$ | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | | | 11.9 | 24 | 1 | 11.3 | 0.6 | 5.5 | | | 24.7 | 26.4 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | tile) | | | | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| d 1). s | /veh | | | | | 23.3 | 27. | 9 2 | 23.6 | 31.7 | 13.4 | | <u> </u> | 32.6 | 32.6 |
| Incremental De | ntal Delay (<i>d</i> 1), s/ven ntal Delay (<i>d</i> 2), s/veh | | | | | | 1.8 | 20. | 3 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.5 | | | 42.1 | 53.7 |
| Initial Queue De | I Queue Delay (d 3), s/veh | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 |) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delav (| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | | | 25.1 | 48. | 2 2 | 26.0 | 31.7 | 13.8 | | | 74.7 | 86.3 |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | | | | С | D | | С | С | В | | | F | F |
| Approach Delay | Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 39.6 | ;] | | - | 14.4 | | В | 78 | 5 | E |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 5.0 | | 5 | 1.0 | | | | | | _ | D | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LOS | _OS | | | | 2.30 |) | E | 3 | 2.13 | ; | В | 1.7 | 0 | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | | | | 2.34 | 1 | E | 3 | 0.93 | ; | А | 1.3 | 9 | А |

| | | or org | manze | a mi | 000 | | | anto | oun | innar <u>-</u> | , | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------|----------|---------------|----------|-----------|-------|------|----------|----------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|----------|--------------------|
| General Information | n | | | | | | | Inte | ersecti | ion Infe | ormatio | on | | 4741 | s l <u>s</u> |
| Agency | Linscott, Law & 0 | Greenspan | . Engine | ers | | | | Du | ration. | h | 0.250 | | | ++ L L | |
| Analyst | JAS | | Analys | is Date | e Sep 1 | 2020 | | Are | a Type | <i>د</i> | Other | | | | ار ا |
| Jurisdiction | City of Los Angel | es/ | Time F | Period | Existi | ng - AM | | PH | IF | | 0.98 | | 1 ↓ ↓ 1 ↓ ↓ | w∔e s | 4.4 |
| Urban Street | SR-90 Eastboun | d | Analys | is Yea | r 2020 | | | Ana | alvsis F | Period | 1> 8:0 | 00 | | | |
| Intersection | Mindanao/SR-90 | EB | File Na | ame | 11AM | - Existir | ıa.xı | JS | | | | | | 기지 [| |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 " | | |
| , , | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Demand Informatio | n | | | EB | | | ۷ | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Movemen | t | | L | Т | R | L | Т | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), veh/h | | | 30 | 1226 | 5 20 | | | | | | 527 | 752 | 487 | 1043 | |
| | | | 1- | _ | | | | | - | | | | | | |
| Signal Information | | | | | 17 | a | | | | | l | | + - | | _ |
| Cycle, s 90. | 0 Reference Phas | e 2 | | ľ 🕇 | 7 | Ŕ | | | | | | > | 2 | 3 | € ₄ |
| Offset, s 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 14.8 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | | | |
| Uncoordinated No | Simult. Gap E/W | / On | Yellow | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Force Mode Fixe | ed Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | _ | | | | | | | _ | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | EBL | | EBI | WBI | - | VV | ві | NBL | - | NBI | SBL | - | SBI |
| Assigned Phase | | | | \rightarrow | 4 | | _ | | _ | | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | 10.0 | | | | _ | | | 7.4 | 2.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | | | | | 40.0 | | | | _ | | | 20.0 | 30.0 |) : | 50.0 |
| Change Period, (Y+ | -R c), s | | | \rightarrow | 6.3 | | | | | | \rightarrow | 5.2 | 5.2 | _ | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Headway | ow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | 3.0 | | | | _ | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearance III | the Clearance Time (g_s) , s | | | | 30.4 | <u> </u> | | | | | _ | 0.0 | 12.7 | / | 0.0 |
| Green Extension Tin | ne (ge), s | | | + | 1.2 | | _ | | - | | + | 0.0 | 3.9 | <u> </u> | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probabili | ly | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 1.00 | , | |
| Max Out Probability | | | | | 0.93 | | | | | | | | 0.10 | | |
| Movement Group R | Results | | | EB | | | W | 'B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Movemen | t | | L | Т | R | L | Т | · | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Movement | t | | 7 | 4 | 14 | | | | | | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | |
| Adjusted Flow Rate | (<i>v</i>), veh/h | | 31 | 637 | 634 | | _ | | | | 791 | 514 | 497 | 1064 | |
| Adjusted Saturation | Flow Rate (s), veh | /h/ln | 1810 | 1900 | 1889 | | | | | | 1807 | 1610 | 1757 | 1809 | |
| Queue Service Time | e (g s), s | | 1.0 | 28.4 | 28.4 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 10.7 | 18.8 | |
| Cycle Queue Cleara | nce Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 1.0 | 28.4 | 28.4 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 10.7 | 18.8 | |
| Green Ratio (g/C) | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | | | | | | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.50 | |
| Capacity (c), veh/h | | | 678 | 711 | 707 | | | | | | 594 | 265 | 968 | 1801 | |
| Volume-to-Capacity | Ratio (X) | | 0.045 | 0.896 | 0.896 | | | | | | 1.331 | 1.942 | 0.513 | 0.591 | |
| Back of Queue (Q) | , ft/ln (95 th percent | ile) | 17.3 | 518.7 | 517.7 | | | | | | 760.8 | 1498. 1 | 197.3 | 304.5 | |
| Back of Queue (Q) | , veh/ln (95 th perce | entile) | 0.7 | 20.7 | 20.7 | | | | | | 30.4 | 59.9 | 7.9 | 12.2 | |
| Queue Storage Ratio | o(<i>RQ</i>)(95 th perc | entile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay (d 1) | | 17.9 | 26.5 | 26.5 | | | | | | 37.6 | 37.6 | 27.5 | 16.1 | | |
| Incremental Delay (| | 0.0 | 13.6 | 13.8 | | | | | | 160.2 | 437.3 | 0.2 | 1.4 | | |
| Initial Queue Delay (| | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (d), s | | 17.9 | 40.1 | 40.3 | | | | | | 197.8 | 474.9 | 27.7 | 17.5 | | |
| Level of Service (LO | | В | D | D | | | | | | F | F | С | В | | |
| Approach Delay, s/v | | 39.7 | | D | 0.0 | | | | 307. | 0 | F | 20.8 | 3 | С | |
| Intersection Delay, s | | | | 11 | 6.3 | | | | | | | F | | | |
| Multimodal Results | | | FR | | | \/\/ | ′B | | | NR | | | SB | | |
| Pedestrian I OS Sco | modal Results strian LOS Score / LOS | | | | B | 2 47 | , | - | B | 1 70 | | В | 1 94 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Score / | LOS | .OS | | | B | , | | | | 1.56 | | B | 1.78 | 3 | B |

 $Copyright @ {\tt 2020} \ University \ of \ Florida, \ All \ Rights \ Reserved.$

| | | | Ū | | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------|----------|---------|----------|-----------|-------|--------|----------|----------|---------|------------|----------|-------------|-------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Int | ersect | ion Info | ormatio | on | | 47411 | a T _{al} |
| Agency | | Linscott. Law & Gre | enspan | . Engine | eers | | | | Du | ration. | h | 0.250 | | | ↓↓└╷└ | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Dat | e Dec 2 | . 2020 | | Are | ea Tvpe | ; | Other | | | | ₹ |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles/ | 1 | Time F | Period | Existin | ng with | | PH | IF | | 0.98 | | | W € 8 | ↓ ↓ |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Eastbound | | Analys | sis Yea | r 2020 | | | An | alysis I | Period | 1> 8:0 | 00 | | | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 E | 3 | File Na | ame | 11AM | - Existin | ıg wi | ith Pi | roject - | Option | B.xus | | 1 5 | T 7 [| · (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | 0 | | <u>,</u> | | | | 1 - | | |
| | | · · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | ۷ | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 30 | 1226 | 3 20 | | | | | | 534 | 752 | 522 | 1050 | |
| | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | 1↓ | 16 | 7 | | | | | | | | | _ |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 1 | 7 | ĸ | | | | | | | N | _ | ÷ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 14.8 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | 3 | * |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | - | EBT | WBL | - | W | /BT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | е | | | | | 4 | | | | | | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 10.0 | | | | | | | 7.4 | 2.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 40.0 | | | | | | | 20.0 | 30.0 |) (| 50.0 |
| Change Period, | , (Y+R) | c), S | | | | 6.3 | | | | | | | 5.2 | 5.2 | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Head | dway (/ | vay (MAH), s | | | | 3.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s arance Time (<i>g</i> _s), s | | | | | 30.4 | | | | | | | | 13.6 | ; | |
| Green Extensio | ue Clearance Time (g s), s n Extension Time (g e), s | | | | | 1.2 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 3.9 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.93 | | | | | | | | 0.20 |) | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | | | | | | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate(<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | 31 | 637 | 634 | | | | | | 798 | 514 | 533 | 1071 | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1889 | | | | | | 1808 | 1610 | 1757 | 1809 | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | | 1.0 | 28.4 | 28.4 | | _ | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 11.6 | 19.0 | |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 1.0 | 28.4 | 28.4 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 11.6 | 19.0 | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | | | | | | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.50 | |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 678 | 711 | 707 | | | | | | 595 | 265 | 968 | 1801 | |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | itio(X) | | 0.045 | 0.896 | 0.896 | | | | | | 1.342 | 1.942 | 0.550 | 0.595 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) | | 17.3 | 518.7 | 517.7 | | | | | | 777 | 1498. 1 | 211.2 | 306.8 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/ln (95 th percenti | le) | 0.7 | 20.7 | 20.7 | | | | | | 31.1 | 59.9 | 8.4 | 12.3 | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | | 17.9 | 26.5 | 26.5 | | | | | | 37.6 | 37.6 | 27.8 | 16.1 | |
| Incremental De | ntorm Delay (d 1), s/ven cremental Delay (d 2), s/veh | | | 0.0 | 13.6 | 13.8 | | | | | | 165.1 | 437.3 | 0.4 | 1.5 | |
| Initial Queue De | itial Queue Delay (d_3), s/veh | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | _ | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Control Delay (| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | 17.9 | 40.1 | 40.3 | | | | | | 202.7 | 474.9 | 28.2 | 17.6 | |
| Level of Service | Level of Service (LOS) | | | В | D | D | | _ | | | | F | F | С | В | |
| Approach Delay | Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | 39.7 | 7 | D | 0.0 | | | | 309.3 | 3 | F | 21.1 | | С |
| Intersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | | | 11 | 6.5 | | - | | | | | F | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | ultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | an LOS Score / LOS | | | | 2 | В | 2.47 | | I | В | 1.70 | | В | 1.94 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | 1.56 | 3 | В | | | | | 1.57 | | В | 1.81 | | В | |

Copyright @ 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

| | | 1100 | i oig | nanze | a m | | | 103 | unto | oun | innar <u>.</u> | y | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|----------|------------|---------|----------|----------|-------|----------|----------|----------------|---------|------------|--|---------------|------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | ersect | ion Inf | ormatio | on | k | 4241. | × l _a |
| Agency | | Linscott. Law & Gre | enspan | . Engine | eers | | | | Du | ration. | h | 0.250 | | | + + L L | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Dat | e Sep 1 | 2020 | | Are | a Type | <u>,</u> | Other | | - <u>-</u> 7 - 4 | | <u>بر</u> ۲ |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | / | Time F | Period | Futur | e - AM | | PH | IF | | 0.98 | | → ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ | w ‡ e | *** |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Eastbound | | Analys | sis Yea | r 2026 | | | Ana | alvsis I | Period | 1> 8:(| 00 | | | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 El | В | File Na | ame | 11AM | - Future | e.xus | <u> </u> | | | | | | ۱۴۲ ۱۳۴۰ ۲ | × (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | ٧ | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 36 | 1348 | 3 21 | | | | | | 567 | 808 | 534 | 1131 | |
| Cinnel Informe | | | | . <u> </u> | 5 1 | <u> </u> | Г | - | | 1 | _ | | | | | |
| | | Reference Dhase | 2 | | + | 10 | 2 | | | | | Ļ | | tz | | X |
| Offect o | 90.0 | Reference Pridse | Z End | | 1 | 7 | R | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult Con E/W | On | Green | 14.8 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| | Tixed | Simult Cap N/S | On | Yellow | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | | | - | 0 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | Un | Rea | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 1 | 8 |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | L | W | /BT | NBI | - | NBT | SBI | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | е | | | | | 4 | | | | | | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 10.0 | | | | | | | 7.4 | 2.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | i, S | | | | | 40.0 | | | | | | | 20.0 | 30.0 |) | 50.0 |
| Change Period | , (Y+R | c), S | | | | 6.3 | | | | | | | 5.2 | 5.2 | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Head | Now Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 3.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | Allow Headway (MAH), s ue Clearance Time ($g s$), s | | | | | 34.9 | | | | | | | | 14.0 |) | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 0.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 4.1 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 0.24 | | |
| Movement Gro | | sulte | | | ER | | | ١٨/ | 'R | - | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | Suits | | | Т | R | | Т | · | R | 1 | T | R | <u> </u> | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | _ | | + | | _ | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |) veh/h | | .37 | 700 | 697 | | | - | | | 851 | 552 | 545 | 1154 | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1890 | | | - | | | 1807 | 1610 | 1757 | 1809 | |
| Queue Service | Time (a | α_s) s | | 1.2 | 32.8 | 32.9 | | | | | _ | 14.8 | 14.8 | 12.0 | 21.2 | |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>q</i> _c), s | | 1.2 | 32.8 | 32.9 | | | + | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 12.0 | 21.2 | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | | | | | | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.50 | |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 678 | 711 | 708 | | | | | | 594 | 265 | 968 | 1801 | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | atio(X) | | 0.054 | 0.984 | 0.985 | | | | | | 1.431 | 2.086 | 0.563 | 0.641 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) |) | 20.9 | 668.3 | 668.1 | | | Τ | | | 902.7 | 1683. 9 | 215.8 | 336.3 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 0.8 | 26.7 | 26.7 | | | | | | 36.1 | 67.4 | 8.6 | 13.5 | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | tile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay (| Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile) Uniform Delay ($d \tau$), s/veh | | | | 27.9 | 27.9 | | | | | | 37.6 | 37.6 | 28.0 | 16.7 | |
| ncremental Delay (d 2), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | 29.6 | 29.9 | | | | | | 203.6 | 501.5 | 0.5 | 1.8 | |
| nitial Queue Delay (<i>d</i> ₃), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | 18.0 | 57.4 | 57.8 | | | | | | 241.2 | 539.1 | 28.4 | 18.4 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | Е | E | | | | | | F | F | С | В | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 56.6 | 6 | Е | 0.0 | | | | 358. | 5 | F | 21.6 | 6 | С |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 13 | 6.9 | | | | | | | F | | |
| Multimodal Results | | | | | ED | | | 10 | 'B | | | NP | | | QP | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Itimodal Results | | | | | P | 2.47 | , | יי | B | 1 70 | | B | 1.04 | 36 | B |
| Ricycle I OS So | ore /1 C |)S | 2.32 | 7 | B | 2.47 | | E | | 1.70 | | B | 1.94 | | B | |
| 2.0,000000 | | | | 1.07 | | | | | | | 1.00 | | - | 1.00 | | - |

| | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|----------|----------|---------|----------------|-------------------|----------|---------------|-----------|----------|--------|------------|------------------|------------|------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Int | tersect | ion Inf | ormati | on | | 4 7 40 1 1 | ι Ļ |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Du | uration, | h | 0.250 |) | | ++ " | |
| Analvst | | JAS | <u> </u> | Analys | sis Dat | e Dec 2 | 2. 2020 | | Ar | ea Type | е | Othe | - | 4 | | <i>د</i> 4 |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles/ Caltrans | I | Time F | Period | Futur Proie | e with ct - AM | | PH | HF | | 0.98 | | 4 1 4 | W ↓ E 8 | 4 ↓ ↓ |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Eastbound | | Analys | sis Yea | ar 2026 | | | Ar | nalvsis l | Period | 1> 8: | 00 | | | <u> </u> |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 El | 3 | File Na | ame | 11AN | I - Futur | e wit | h Pro | oiect - (| Option I | 3.xus | | | 111 | ₹ ([₹] |
| Proiect Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | | | -j | | | | 1 " | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | ١ | NB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 36 | 134 | 8 21 | | | | | | 574 | 808 | 569 | 1138 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | | I II. | 7 | | | | | | | | | _ |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | ľ | <u>7</u> | ĸ | | | | | | | N | - | -€ ₄ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 14.8 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | _ ~ |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | - | EBT | WE | SL. | V | VBT | NBI | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | е | | | | | 4 | | | | | | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 10.0 | | | | | | | 7.4 | 2.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | I, S | | | | | 40.0 | | | | | | | 20.0 | 30.0 |) : | 50.0 |
| Change Period | , (Y+ R a | c), S | | | | 6.3 | | | | | | | 5.2 | 5.2 | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Head | ow Headway (MAH), s Clearance Time (a_s), s | | | | | 3.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | eue Clearance Time (g_s), s | | | | | 34.9 | | | | | | | | 14.9 |) | |
| Green Extensio | eue Clearance Time (g s), s een Extension Time (g e), s | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 4.0 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 1.00 | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 0.30 |) | |
| | | | | | | | _ | | | _ | | | | 1 | | _ |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | <u> </u> | W | /B | _ | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | | | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | | _ | | _ | | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |), veh/h | | 37 | 700 | 697 | <u> </u> | - | \rightarrow | | | 858 | 552 | 581 | 1161 | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1890 | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | | | 1808 | 1610 | 1757 | 1809 | |
| Queue Service | Time(g | g s), S | | 1.2 | 32.8 | 32.9 | <u> </u> | _ | _ | _ | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 12.9 | 21.4 | |
| Cycle Queue C | learance | e Tîme (<i>g c</i>), s | | 1.2 | 32.8 | 32.9 | <u> </u> | - | _ | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 12.9 | 21.4 | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | <u> </u> | | \rightarrow | | | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.50 | |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 678 | 711 | 708 | | | | | | 595 | 265 | 968 | 1801 | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | | | 0.054 | 0.984 | 1 0.985 | <u> </u> | - | | _ | | 1.443 | 2.086 | 0.600 | 0.645 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | 20.9 | 668.3 | 668.1 | | | | | | 919.4 | 1683. 9 | 230.2 | 338.6 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 0.8 | 26.7 | 26.7 | | | | | | 36.8 | 67.4 | 9.2 | 13.5 | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay (| (d 1), si | /veh | | 18.0 | 27.9 | 27.9 | | | | | | 37.6 | 37.6 | 28.3 | 16.7 | |
| Incremental De | ncremental Delay (<i>d</i> ₂), s/veh | | | 0.0 | 29.6 | 29.9 | | | | | | 208.6 | 501.5 | 0.7 | 1.8 | |
| Initial Queue De | initial Queue Delay ($d 3$), s/veh | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | 18.0 | 57.4 | 57.8 | | | | | | 246.2 | 539.1 | 29.0 | 18.5 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | Е | E | | | | | | F | F | С | В | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 56.6 | 6 | Е | 0.0 |) | | | 360. | 9 | F | 22.0 | | С |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 13 | 37.1 | | | | | | | F | | |
| 3 , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Iultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | S Score | / LOS | 2.32 | 2 | В | 2.4 | 7 | | В | 1.70 | | В | 1.94 | | В | |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC |)S | | 1.67 | 7 | В | | | | | 1.65 | 5 | В | 1.92 | 2 | В |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

| | | | | | | | | | | ••• | | , | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--------|---------|-------------------|------------|-----------|-------|------|------------|----------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------------|--------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | orsocti | ion Infr | ormatio | n | | ** | s l <u>s</u> |
| | ation | Linscott Law & Gre | onenan | Engine | ore | | | | | ration | b | 0 250 | | | ++ L L | |
| Apolyot | | | спэрап | | | Son 1 | 2020 | | Are | | \ | Othor | | 1 | | ۲. ۲. |
| Analyst | | City of Los Angeles | / | Time | | Evicti | , 2020 | | | атуре ⊏ | 5 | | | ** | w↓e | 2- * |
| Junsaiction | | Caltrans | | | Penod | Exisu | ig - Pivi | | | г | | 0.96 | | 14 Yr | | 1 1 |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Eastbound | | Analys | sis Yea | r 2020 | | | Ana | alysis F | Period | 1> 16 | :45 | | 1 10 7 | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 El | 3 | File Na | ame | 11PM | - Existir | ıg.xı | ls | | | | | 1 | 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 | * (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | /eh/h | | | 18 | 1177 | 18 | | | | | | 476 | 681 | 727 | 1154 | |
| | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | - 0. | |
| Signal Informa | ation | | | | ↓ | 16 | 7 | | | | | | | | | _ |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 1 🕇 | , 1 | ĸ | | | | | | | N | - | - € , |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 14.8 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WBI | - | W | BΤ | NBL | - | NBT | SBI | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phas | е | | | | | 4 | | | | | | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 10.0 | | | | | | | 7.4 | 2.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | 1, S | | | | | 40.0 | | | | | | | 20.0 | 30.0 |) | 50.0 |
| Change Period | , (Y+R) | c), S | | | | 6.3 | | | | | | | 5.2 | 5.2 | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Hea | Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 3.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | x Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s eue Clearance Time (g_s), s | | | | | 28.7 | | | | | | | | 19.4 | L I | |
| Green Extensio | ieue Clearance Time (g_s), s een Extension Time (g_e), s | | | | | 1.5 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 3.0 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.57 | | | | | | | | 0.72 | 2 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | | | | | | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate(<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | 18 | 611 | 608 | | | | | | 715 | 466 | 742 | 1178 | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1890 | | | | | | 1807 | 1610 | 1757 | 1809 | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | gs), s | | 0.6 | 26.7 | 26.7 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 17.4 | 21.8 | |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 0.6 | 26.7 | 26.7 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 17.4 | 21.8 | |
| Green Ratio (g | ı∕C) | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | | | | | | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.50 | |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 678 | 711 | 708 | | | | | | 594 | 265 | 968 | 1801 | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | itio(X) | | 0.027 | 0.859 | 0.859 | | | | | | 1.203 | 1.758 | 0.766 | 0.654 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | /In (95 th percentile) | | 10.3 | 474.6 | 473 | | | | | | 587.7 | 1261. 5 | 303.4 | 344.5 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q). Ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 0.4 | 19.0 | 18.9 | | | - | | | 23.5 | 50.5 | 12.1 | 13.8 | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | _ | + | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay | (d_1) s | /veh | | 17.8 | 26.0 | 26.0 | | | | _ | | 37.6 | 37.6 | 29.9 | 16.8 | |
| Uniform Delay (d 1), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | 99 | 10.0 | | | + | | | 106.8 | 356.4 | 34 | 19 | |
| Incremental Delay (d ₂), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | + | | _ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Control Delay (d 3), s/ven | | | | 17.8 | 35.0 | 35.0 | | | | | | 144 / | 394.0 | 33.3 | 18.7 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | R | - 00.9 | - л | | | | | | г тт.4 Е | 55 4 .0 | ° | R | |
| Approach Delay s/yeh / LOS | | | | 25.6 | | | 0.0 | | | | 242 | 2 | F | 24.3 | | C |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 35.0 | , | 0 | 7.0 | | | | 242.0 | 5 | F | 24.3 E | , | U |
| Intersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | | | ð | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Multimodal Re | Multimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | destrian LOS Score / LOS | | | | 2 | В | 2.47 | · | E | 3 | 1.70 | | В | 1.94 | - | В |
| Bicycle LOS So | ore / LC | DS | | 1.51 | | В | | | | | 1.46 | | А | 2.07 | 7 | В |

| | | | - | | | | | | | | - | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--------|----------|---------|----------------|----------|----------|-------|-----------|--------------|---------|------------|----------|----------------|------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | In | itersect | ion Info | ormatio | on | 2 | 4244 | s l _a |
| Agency | | Linscott. Law & Gre | enspan | . Engine | eers | | | | D | uration. | h | 0.250 | | | ∔∔⊾⊾ | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Dat | e Dec 2 | 2020 | | Ar | rea Type | , | Other | | | | <u>م</u> |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | 1 | Time F | Period | Existi | ng with | | Pl | HF | | 0.98 | | | W + E | ↓ ↓ ↓ |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Eastbound | | Analys | sis Yea | ar 2020 | | | Ar | nalysis l | Period | 1> 16 | :45 | | | م م |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 El | 3 | File Na | ame | 11PM | - Existi | ng w | ith F | Project - | Option | B.xus | | |]¶] 1944 10 | ▼ ([▼] |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | <u> </u> | | , | | | | | | |
| , , , | | - 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | ٧ | NΒ | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | /eh/h | | | 18 | 117 | 7 18 | | Τ | | | | 478 | 681 | 734 | 1156 | [|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | |
| Signal Informa | ation | | | | | - IL | 7 | | | | | | | | | _ |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | ľ | <mark>7</mark> | ĸ | | | | | | | N | - | - € ₄ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 14.8 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | L | | 1 ** |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | - | EBT | WB | L | ۷ | WBT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | е | | | | | 4 | | | | | | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 10.0 | | | | | | | 7.4 | 2.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | 1, S | | | | | 40.0 | | | | | | | 20.0 | 30.0 |) : | 50.0 |
| Change Period | ge Period, (Y+R c), s Ilow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 6.3 | | | | | | | 5.2 | 5.2 | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Head | Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 3.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | x Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s eue Clearance Time (<i>g</i> s), s | | | | | 28.7 | | | | | | | | 19.7 | , | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 1.5 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 2.9 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.57 | | | | | | | | 0.75 | 5 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | W | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | | | | | | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate(<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | 18 | 611 | 608 | | | | | | 717 | 466 | 749 | 1180 | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1890 | | | | | | 1807 | 1610 | 1757 | 1809 | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | | 0.6 | 26.7 | 26.7 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 17.7 | 21.9 | |
| Cycle Queue C | learance | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 0.6 | 26.7 | 26.7 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 17.7 | 21.9 | |
| Green Ratio (g | ı/C) | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | | | | | | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.50 | |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 678 | 711 | 708 | | | | | | 594 | 265 | 968 | 1801 | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | tio(X) | | 0.027 | 0.859 | 0.859 | | | | | | 1.206 | 1.758 | 0.773 | 0.655 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | 10.3 | 474.6 | 6 473 | | | | | | 592 | 1261. 5 | 307.3 | 345.5 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 0.4 | 19.0 | 18.9 | | | | | | 23.7 | 50.5 | 12.3 | 13.8 | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s/ | /veh | | 17.8 | 26.0 | 26.0 | | | | | | 37.6 | 37.6 | 30.0 | 16.8 | |
| Incremental De | ncremental Delay (<i>d</i> ₂), s/veh | | | 0.0 | 9.9 | 10.0 | | | | | | 108.1 | 356.4 | 3.6 | 1.9 | |
| nitial Queue Delay ($d 3$), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | | 17.8 | 35.9 | 35.9 | | | | | | 145.7 | 394.0 | 33.6 | 18.7 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | D | D | | | | | | F | F | С | В | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 35.6 | 3 | D | 0.0 | | | | 243.4 | 1 | F | 24.5 | ; | С |
| Intersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | | | 8 | 7.2 | | | | | | | F | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Aultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | timodal Results | | | | 2 | В | 2.47 | 7 | | В | 1.70 | | В | 1.94 | - | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | rian LOS Score / LOS LOS Score / LOS | | | | | В | | | | | 1.46 | | А | 2.08 | 3 | В |

Copyright $\ensuremath{\textcircled{O}}$ 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

| | | nee | r org | manize | | .01000 | | 00 | unto | oun | iiiiai j | , | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------|------------|------------|--------|------------|-------|------|----------|----------|---------|-------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|--------------|
| Gonoral Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Int | orcoct | ion Infr | ormativ | nn - | | 4.441 | يد لي |
| | ation | Lincott Low & Gro | onenan | Engin | ore | | | | | ration | | 0 250 | | | ↓↓⊾⊾ | |
| Apolyot | | | enspan | | | Son 1 | 2020 | | Arc | | | Othor | | 1 | | ۲. بر |
| Analyst | | JAO City of Loo Angoloo | 1 | Time | oriod | | , 2020 | | | за туре | ; | | | | w↓e | |
| Junsaiction | | Caltrans | / | | enou | Fulur | | | | | | 0.90 | | *** | | 4 → 12 |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Eastbound | | Analys | sis Yea | r 2026 | | | Ana | alysis F | Period | 1> 16 | :45 | | 44.8 | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 El | В | File Na | ame | 11PM | l - Future | e.xus | \$ | | | | | 5 | 1 야 [] | * (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | • | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | | | Т | R | | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 20 | 1280 |) 19 | | | | | | 523 | 772 | 794 | 1297 | |
| | 4 1010 | | | . <u> </u> | N | 5 11 | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | | Deference Dhase | 2 | | • | 10 | 2 | | | | | ļ | | ta | | ~ |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Priase | Z End | | 1 | 7 | F | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Unseed stad | U | Simult Can 5/M | Enu | Green | 14.8 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| | INO Fixed | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | | | _ | 0 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Rea | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timer Results | | | | FBI | | FBT | WB | | W | /BT | NBI | | NBT | SBI | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | | | | | | 4 | | - | | | | | 2 | 1 | - | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 10.0 | | | | | | | 74 | 2.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | s | | | <u> </u> | | 40.0 | | | | | | | 7. 4 20.0 | 30.0 | | -4.0 50.0 |
| Change Period | , 3 (V+R | a) e | | <u> </u> | | 63 | - | | | | | | 5.2 | 5.2 | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Hear | Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 3.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| | k Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s eue Clearance Time (<i>g</i> s), s | | | | | 32.3 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 21.5 | | 0.0 |
| Green Extensio | eue Clearance Time (g_s), s een Extension Time (g_e), s | | | | | 0.6 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 2.2 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | babilitv | (3) | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 1.00 | , | |
| Max Out Proba | bilitv | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 0.99 | , | |
| - | , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | - | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | | | | | | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate(<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | 20 | 664 | 661 | | | | | | 794 | 528 | 810 | 1323 | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1890 | | | | | | 1805 | 1610 | 1757 | 1809 | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | | 0.6 | 30.3 | 30.3 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 19.5 | 26.1 | |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 0.6 | 30.3 | 30.3 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 19.5 | 26.1 | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | | | | | | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.50 | |
| Capacity (<i>c</i>), v | reh/h | | | 678 | 711 | 708 | | | | | | 594 | 265 | 968 | 1801 | |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | itio(X) | | 0.030 | 0.934 | 0.934 | | | | | | 1.337 | 1.993 | 0.837 | 0.735 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | 11.5 | 574.1 | 573.4 | | | | | | 768.5 | 1564. | 343.2 | 403.2 | |
| Back of Output | (0) | ah/In (95 th paraanti | (ما | 0.5 | 23.0 | 22.0 | | | - | | | 30.7 | 62.6 | 13.7 | 16.1 | |
| | Patio (| PO(0.5 th percent) | | 0.0 | 23.0 | 22.9 | | | - | - | | 0.00 | 02.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Liniform Delay (| | /veb | | 17.8 | 27.1 | 27.1 | | | - | | | 37.6 | 37.6 | 30.7 | 17.0 | |
| Uniform Delay (d_1), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | 10.1 | 10.3 | | | | | | 162.8 | 460.2 | 6.1 | 27 | |
| Incremental Delay (d ₂), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.5 | | | - | | | 0.0 | 400.2 | 0.1 | 2.7 | |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | 17.8 | 46.2 | 46.3 | | | _ | | | 200 / | 407 R | 36.8 | 20.6 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | R | -70.2 D | | | _ | | _ | | 200.4 | -57.0 | л П | 20.0 C | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 15 9 | | | 0.0 | | | | 310 (| 2 | F | 26.9 | | C |
| Intersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | 40.0 | , | 11 | 2.6 | | | | 019.4 | - | 1 | 20.0 F | | 0 |
| Intersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | | | | 2.0 | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Results | | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | OS Score / LOS | | | | 2 | В | 2.47 | , | E | в | 1.70 | | В | 1.94 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | | 1.60 |) | В | | | | | 1.58 | | В | 2.25 | ; | В |

| | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|----------|------------|---------|----------------|-------------------|--------|-------|-----------|----------|----------|------------|------------------|------------|----------------------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | ersect | ion Inf | ormatio | on | 2 | *** | s l <u>s</u> |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engin | eers | | | | Dur | ration, | h | 0.250 | | 1 | ++ 5.5 | |
| Analvst | | JAS | <u> </u> | Analys | sis Dat | e Dec 2 | . 2020 | | Are | a Type | <u>.</u> | Other | | - ^{- 1} | | <i>د</i> لا |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles, Caltrans | 1 | Time F | Period | Futur Proie | e with ct - PM | | PH | F | | 0.98 | | 4 1 1 | W + E € | 7 4 4 4 4 4 |
| Urban Street | | SR-90 Eastbound | | Analys | sis Yea | r 2026 | | | Ana | alvsis F | Period | 1> 16 | :45 | | | <u> </u> |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/SR-90 FI | 3 | File Na | ame | 11PN | - Future | e with | n Pro | niect - (| Dotion I | B.xus | | - | <u>141</u> | * (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | | | , | | | | 1 7 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | ٧ | VB | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | T | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 20 | 128 |) 19 | | | | | | 525 | 772 | 801 | 1299 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 1 | 7 | ĸ | | | | | | | N | _ | - |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 14.8 | 24.8 | 33.7 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | 1 | | 3 | 1 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow 3.7 | | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBI | - | EBT | WB | L | W | 'BT | NBL | - | NBT | SBI | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | е | | | | | 4 | | | | | | | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 10.0 | | | | | | | 7.4 | 2.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | | | | | | 40.0 | | | | | | | 20.0 | 30.0 |) | 50.0 |
| Change Period, (Y+R c), s | | | | | | 6.3 | | | | | | | 5.2 | 5.2 | | 5.2 |
| Max Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | | 3.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time (g_s), s | | | | | | 32.3 | | | | | | | | 21.8 | 3 | |
| Green Extensio | Gueue Clearance Time (g_s), s Green Extension Time (g_e), s | | | | | 0.6 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 2.1 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | \neg | | | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| | , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | | | | | | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate(<i>v</i> |), veh/h | | 20 | 664 | 661 | | | | | | 796 | 528 | 817 | 1326 | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1810 | 1900 | 1890 | | | | | | 1805 | 1610 | 1757 | 1809 | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), S | | 0.6 | 30.3 | 30.3 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 19.8 | 26.1 | |
| Cycle Queue C | learance | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 0.6 | 30.3 | 30.3 | | | | | | 14.8 | 14.8 | 19.8 | 26.1 | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | | | | | | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.50 | |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 678 | 711 | 708 | | | | | | 594 | 265 | 968 | 1801 | |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | itio(X) | | 0.030 | 0.934 | 0.934 | | | | | | 1.340 | 1.993 | 0.844 | 0.736 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | 11.5 | 574.1 | 573.4 | | | | | | 773.1 | 1564. 6 | 348 | 404.4 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | 0.5 | 23.0 | 22.9 | | | | | | 30.9 | 62.6 | 13.9 | 16.2 | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | | 17.8 | 27.1 | 27.1 | | | | | | 37.6 | 37.6 | 30.8 | 17.9 | |
| Incremental De | lay (d 2 |), s/veh | | 0.0 | 19.1 | 19.3 | | | - | | | 164.2 | 460.2 | 6.6 | 2.7 | |
| Initial Queue De | Initial Queue Delay (<i>d</i> ₂), s/veh | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | 17.8 | 46.2 | 46.3 | | | + | | | 201.8 | 497.8 | 37.3 | 20.6 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | В | D | D | | _ | | | | F | F | D | С | |
| Approach Delay, s/yeh / LOS | | | | 45.8 | 3 | D | 0.0 | | | | 319. | 8 | F | 27.0 |) | С |
| Intersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | | | 11 | 2.8 | | | | | | | F | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | | |
| Pedestrian LOS | strian LOS Score / LOS | | | 2.32 | 2 | В | 2.47 | 7 | E | 3 | 1.70 |) | В | 1.94 | 1 | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC | DS | .OS | | | В | | | | | 1.58 | 3 | В | 2.26 | 3 | В |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

| | | | Ū | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|----------|---------------|---------|---------|-----------|---------------|----------|-----------|--------|-------|----------|-------------------------------|----------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Interse | ction Inf | ormati | on | 2 | 4241 | × Ļ |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Duratio | ո, h | 0.250 |) | | 444 | |
| Analvst | | JAS | <u> </u> | Analys | is Date | e Aua 1 | 4. 2020 | | Area Tv | pe | Othe | - | | | <u>د</u> لا |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existir | na - AM | | PHF | | 0.96 | | → | whe | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | is Yea | 2020 | 3 | | Analysis | Period | 1> 7: | 45 | 4 | | |
| Intersection | | , Mindanao/La Villa N | larina | File Na | ame | 12AM | - Existir | na.xu | is , | | | | | 5 4 17 | |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | 5 | | | | | - 5 | [1 1 1 1 1 | * /* |
| , , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | /B | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | T R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 17 | 1 | 10 | 64 | (| 0 150 | 6 23 | 1079 | 9 54 | 61 | 965 | 27 |
| | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | _ | | 215 | 2Us | 3 4 | 4 | | | | | | | _ |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | • | 1 5tř | Ř | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | € ₄ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 10.1 | 50.6 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | 5 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0 0.0 | 0.0 | | | ∇ | | 7 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.3 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | I | | | | _ | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | | WBT | NB | | NBT | SBL | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 4 | | \rightarrow | 8 | | | 6 | 5 | | 2 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 8.0 | | \rightarrow | 8.0 | | | 6.3 | 1.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | , S | | | | | 20.0 | | \rightarrow | 20.0 | | | 55.0 | 15.0 |) | 70.0 |
| Change Period, (Y+R c), s | | | | | | 5.3 | | \rightarrow | 5.3 | | | 4.4 | 4.9 | | 4.4 |
| Max Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | | 3.4 | | \rightarrow | 3.4 | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | Queue Clearance Time (<i>g</i> _s), s | | | | | 3.3 | | _ | 14.8 | | | | 3.0 | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (g e), s | | | | 0.5 | | \rightarrow | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Prol | bability | | | <u> </u> | | 1.00 | | \rightarrow | 1.00 | <u> </u> | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | 1.00 | | | | 0.00 |) | |
| Movement Gro | | ulte | | | EB | | | \//F | 2 | | NB | _ | | SB | |
| Approach Move | mont | Suits | | | | P | | | - - | 1 | | P | 1 | Т | P |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 1 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |) veh/h | | | 20 | 14 | 5 | 220 | | 24 | 505 | 585 | 64 | - <u>-</u> 510 | 51/ |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | y, ven/n w Rate (s) veh/h/li | n | | 1168 | | | 157 | у И | 555 | 1000 | 1868 | 1810 | 1900 | 1881 |
| | Time ((| π_{s}) s | | | 0.0 | | | 107 | 3 | 1.8 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 10 | 9.2 | 9.2 |
| | learance | $a = Time(a_c) s$ | | | 13 | | | 12 | 8 | 1.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 1.0 | 9.2 | 9.2 |
| Green Ratio (a | \sqrt{C} | | _ | | 0.16 | | | 0.1 | 6 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.70 | 0.73 | 0.73 |
| Capacity (c) y | /0/) /eh/h | | | | 255 | | | 309 | о а | 392 | 1068 | 1050 | 458 | 1385 | 1371 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | tio (X) | | | 0 114 | | | 0.74 | 12 | 0.061 | 0.557 | 0.557 | 0 139 | 0.375 | 0.375 |
| Back of Queue | (Q) ft/ | (In (95 th percentile) | | | 24.6 | | | 236 | .9 | 10.6 | 302.9 | 299.3 | 14.1 | 139.4 | 138.1 |
| Back of Queue | (Q) ve | eh/ln (95 th percenti | le) | | 1.0 | | | 9.5 | 5 | 0.4 | 12.1 | 12.0 | 0.6 | 5.6 | 5.5 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | 0.00 | | | 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1) s | /veh | / | | 32.0 | | | 36 | 8 | 9.0 | 12.6 | 12.6 | 6.8 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Incremental De | lav (<i>d</i> 2 |) s/veh | | | 0 1 | | | 8.2 | > | 0.3 | 21 | 21 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Initial Queue De | Incremental Delay (<i>d</i> ₂), s/veh | | | | | | | 0.0 |) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (| | | 32.1 | | | 45 | 0 | 9.3 | 14.7 | 14.7 | 6.9 | 5.3 | 5.3 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | C | | | D | | 0.0 A | B | B | A | A | A |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 32 1 | Ţ | С | 45.0 | | D | 14 (| 3 | B | 54 | | A |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 52.1 | | 19 | 36 | | | 14. | | 5 | B | | |
| Intersection Delay, siven 7 203 | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| Multimodal Results | | | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | | | | | В | 2.30 |) | В | 1.7 | 1 | В | 1.71 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | edestrian LOS Score / LOS icycle LOS Score / LOS | | | | | А | 0.87 | , | А | 1.48 | 3 | А | 1.39 |) | A |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS™ Streets Version 7.8.5

| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | ersect | tion Inf | ormatio | on | <i></i> | 4 4 1 1 1 | × l <u>x</u> |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|----------|--------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------|---------|-----------|-----------|----------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Du | ration, | h | 0.250 | | 1 | 4+4 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Date | Dec 2 | , 2020 | | Are | еа Тур | е | Other | | 4 | | ۲. ۲. |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existin | ng with ct - AM | | PH | IF | | 0.96 | | 4 1 4 | w∔e € | * - - - |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | is Year | 2020 | | | Ana | alysis | Period | 1> 7:4 | 45 | | | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/La Villa N | <i>l</i> arina | File Na | ame | 12AM | - Existir | ng wi | ith Pr | roject | - Optior | n B.xus | | | <u>]</u>]]/ ব † কাপ † | * (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | - | | | <u> </u> | | | 1 - | | |
| | | · · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | ٧B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | /eh/h | | | 17 | 1 | 10 | 64 | | 0 | 156 | 23 | 1086 | 54 | 61 | 972 | 27 |
| | | | | | F 111 | E III | _ | | | | _ | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | ation | | - | | 215 | 24 s | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | ľ | ឹកា | • <u>R</u> " | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | ╋ ₄ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 10.1 | 50.6 | 14.7 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | <u> </u> |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | > | $\mathbf{\nabla}$ | | Y |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.3 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| T . D . K | | | _ | EDI | _ | EDT | | | 14/ | (DT | ND | | NDT | 0.01 | _ | ODT |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | | EBI | WB | - | VV | /BT | NBI | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBI |
| Assigned Phase | е | | | | _ | 4 | | \rightarrow | 5 | 8 | | | 6 | 5 | | 2 |
| Case Number | | | | 8.0 | | \rightarrow | 8. | .0 | | | 6.3 | 1.0 | | 4.0 | | |
| Phase Duration | | | | 20.0 | | \rightarrow | 20 | 0.0 | | | 55.0 | 15.0 |) | 70.0 | | |
| Change Period | , (Y+ R , | c), S | | | | 5.3 | | | 5. | .3 | | | 4.4 | 4.9 | | 4.4 |
| Max Allow Head | dway(/ | <i>ИАН</i>), s | | | | 3.4 | | | 3. | .4 | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | | 3.3 | | | 14 | 4.8 | | | | 3.0 | | |
| Green Extensio | on Time | (ge),s | | | | 0.5 | | | 0. | .0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.0 | .00 | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | 1.0 | .00 | | | | 0.00 |) | |
| Movement Cre | un Dee | | _ | | ГР | | | \\/ | D | _ | | ND | | 1 | <u> </u> | _ |
| Approach Move | mont | Suits | | | ED | D | | | | D | | | D | | ЗБ | в |
| Approach Move | ment | | | | 1 | R | | 0 | + | 10 | | I G | К 16 | E | - 1 | <u>к</u> |
| Adjusted Flow | Poto (v |) vob/b | | _/ | 4 | 14 | 3 | 0 | | 10 | 1 | 500 | 10 | 5 | | 1Z 510 |
| Adjusted Flow I | nale (V |), ven/n w Poto (c) vob/b/l | n | | 29 | | | 157 | 9 74 | _ | 24 551 | 1000 | 1969 | 1910 | 1000 | 1992 |
| | Time (/ | | | | 0.0 | | | 10 | 4 | | 1.8 | 18 1 | 18 1 | 1010 | 03 | 0.3 |
| | learance | g(s), s | | | 1.3 | | | 10. | 8 | | 1.0 | 18.1 | 10.1 | 1.0 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| Green Ratio (o | | e fille (<i>g c</i>), s | | | 0.16 | | | 0.1 | 6 | | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.70 | 9.5 | 0.73 |
| Green Katio (g | /0) /0h/h | | | | 255 | | | 20 | 0 | _ | 200 | 1069 | 1050 | 456 | 1205 | 1271 |
| Volume to Cap | | ntio (X) | | | 233 | | | 0.7 | 9 12 | _ | 0.061 | 0.560 | 0.561 | 430 | 0.279 | 0.379 |
| Back of Ououo | | (0, 7) | | | 24.6 | | | 236 | +2 | | 10.6 | 205.1 | 201.5 | 14.1 | 140.4 | 120.2 |
| Back of Queue | $(\mathbf{Q}), \mathbf{u}$ | ah/In (95 th percentie) | (ما | | 24.0 | | | 230 | 5 | | 0.4 | 12.2 | 12 1 | 0.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| | Ratio (| RO (95 th percent | ile) | | 0.00 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.4 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay | (d_4) s | /veb | | | 32.0 | | | 36 | 8 | | 0.00 | 12.6 | 12.6 | 6.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Incremental De | (u/), s lav (da | | | | 0.1 | | | 80 | 2 | | 0.3 | 2.0 | 22 | 0.9 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Incrementar De | | | 0.1 | | | 0.2 | 2 | | 0.5 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| | | | 22.1 | | | 45 | 0 | _ | 0.0 | 14.7 | 14.9 | 6.0 | 5.2 | 5.4 | | |
| Lovel of Samia | | | JZ.1 | | | 40. | U | | 9.3 | 14./ D | 14.ð | 0.9 | 5.3 |).4 | | |
| | | - 20.4 | | <u> </u> | 45.0 | | | | A | В | В | A F 4 | A | A | | |
| Approach Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | 32.1 | | 0 | 45.U | | L | | 14.6 |) | В | 5.4 D | | A |
| Intersection Delay, s/ven / LOS | | | | | | 13 | 0.0 | | | | | | | D | | |
| Multimodal Re | | | EB | | | W | B | | | NB | | | SB | | | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | | | | | В | 2.30 |) | F | В | 1.71 | | В | 1.71 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | edestrian LOS Score / LOS | | | | | А | 0.87 | , | A | A | 1.49 | , | А | 1.40 |) | А |

| · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|----------|----------|--------|--------------|----------|---------------|---------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------|---------|--------------|
| General Information | | | | | | | | Interse | ction Ir | format | ion | K | * | × l <u>x</u> |
| Agency | Linscott, Law & Gree | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Duratio | n, h | 0.25 | 0 | | 445 | |
| Analyst | JAS | | Analys | is Dat | e Aug 1 | 4, 2020 | | Area Ty | /pe | Othe | ər | 4 | | ۲. ا |
| Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e - AM | | PHF | | 0.96 | i | * | W = E | |
| Urban Street | Mindanao Way | | Analys | is Yea | r 2026 | | | Analysi | s Perio | 1 1> 7 | :45 | 1 | | |
| Intersection | Mindanao/La Villa M | arina | File Na | ame | 12AM | - Future | ə.xus | a | | | | | ኻተቅ | <u>×</u> |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 1 4 Y | » ا |
| | ÷ | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Information | | | | EB | | | W | /B | _ | NE | 3 | | SB | |
| Approach Movement | | | L | Т | R | <u> </u> | | r R | | Т | R | <u> </u> | Т | R |
| Demand (v), veh/h | | | 18 | 1 | 11 | 68 | (| 0 16 | 6 24 | 116 | 3 57 | 65 | 1048 | 29 |
| Signal Information | | | | 6 | | 5 | , I | | _ | _ | | | | |
| | Deference Dhase | 2 | | 242 | ×+'× | B2 | 1 | | | | | | | ~ |
| Offect c 0 | Reference Phase | Z End | | | - 5 1 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| Ulisel, s U | | Enu | Green | 10.1 | 50.6 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |) 0.0 |) | | | | A_ |
| Checological Concological Conco | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0 0.0 | 0.0 |) | 7 | $\mathbf{\Psi}$ | - | ¥. |
| | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Rea | 1.3 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0 0.0 | 0 0. |) | 5 | 6 | / | 8 |
| Timor Results | | | EBI | | EBT | WB | | W/BT | N | 31 | NBT | SBI | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | | | | - | | VVD | | 8 | | | 6 | 5 | - | 2 |
| Case Number | | | | | 80 | | \rightarrow | 8.0 | - | | 63 | 1.0 | _ | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration s | | | | 20.0 | | - | 20.0 | - | | 55.0 | 1.0 | | 70.0 | |
| Change Period (V+R | | | | 53 | | -+ | 53 | | | 4.4 | 4 9 | , | 4.4 | |
| Max Allow Headway (| _ | | | 3.4 | | + | 3.4 | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 | |
| Queue Clearance Tim | e (gs), s | | | | 3.4 | | - | 15.8 | | | | 3.1 | | |
| Green Extension Time | (ge), s | | | | 0.5 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability | | | | | 1.00 | | - | 1.00 | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Probability | | | | | 0.00 | | | 1.00 | | | | 0.00 |) | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Group Re | sults | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Movement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Movement | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate (| /), veh/h | | | 31 | <u> </u> | | 244 | 1 | 25 | 640 | 631 | 68 | 564 | 558 |
| Adjusted Saturation Fl | ow Rate (s), veh/h/lr | 1 | | 1122 | | | 157 | 2 | 510 | 1900 | 1868 | 1810 | 1900 | 1882 |
| Queue Service Time (| g s), s | | | 0.0 | <u> </u> | | 11. | 5 | 2.0 | 20.0 | 20.1 | 1.1 | 10.3 | 10.3 |
| Cycle Queue Clearand | ce Time (g c), s | | | 1.4 | | | 13.8 | 8 | 2.0 | 20.0 | 20.1 | 1.1 | 10.3 | 10.3 |
| Green Ratio (g/C) | | | | 0.16 | <u> </u> | | 0.10 | 6 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.70 | 0.73 | 0.73 |
| Capacity (c), veh/h | | | | 247 | | | 308 | 3 | 367 | 1068 | 1050 | 433 | 1385 | 1372 |
| volume-to-Capacity R | | | | 0.126 | | | 0.79 | | 0.06 | 0.599 | 0.600 | 0.156 | 0.407 | 0.407 |
| Back of Queue (Q), f | i/in (95 th percentile) | -) | | 26.4 | | | 260 | J | 11.2 | 332.4 | + 328.7 | 15.1 | 156.3 | 155 |
| Back of Queue (Q), V | en/in (95 th percentil | e) | | 1.1 | | | 10.4 | 4 | 0.4 | 13.3 | 13.1 | 0.6 | 6.3 | 6.2 |
| Queue Storage Ratio | | ie) | | 0.00 | | <u> </u> | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d 1), s | s/ven | | | 32.1 | | | 37. | 2 | 9.1 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 7.5 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| Incremental Delay (a | | | 0.1 | | <u> </u> | 12.0 | 0 \ | 0.4 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.9 | |
| Initial Queue Delay (a | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | , | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Lovel of Service (LOS | | | 32.1 | | | 49.2 | ۷ | 9.4 | 15.5 | 15.0 | 0.1 A | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Approach Delay sheet | | 32.1 | | C | <u>40</u> 2 | | D | A 15 | 4 | R | A 57 | | | |
| Intersection Delay, s/Ver | | 52.1 | | 1. | 49.2 | - | U | 13 | .+ | J | B. 3.7 | | ~ | |
| | | | | | T.H | | | | | | U | | | |
| Multimodal Results | Multimodal Results | | | | | | WE | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS Score | | 2.30 |) | В | 2.30 | | В | 1. | 71 | В | 1.71 | | В | |
| Bicycle LOS Score / L | icycle LOS Score / LOS | | | | А | 0.89 |) | А | 1. | 56 | В | 1.47 | 7 | А |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS™ Streets Version 7.8.5

| General Information | | | | | | | | | In | tersect | tion Infe | ormatio | on | _ | | × l <u>x</u> |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------|--------------------------|----------|--------------|-----------|----------------|--------|--------------|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Agency | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | | Dı | uration, | h | 0.250 | | | 7 * 4 | |
| Analyst | JAS | | Analys | is Dat | e Dec | 2, | 2020 | | Ar | rea Typ | e | Other | | <u></u> → | | <u>≵</u> |
| Jurisdiction | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Futu Proj | ire ec | with t - AM | | Pł | HF | | 0.96 | | 4 1 4 | w ‡ e ° | |
| Urban Street | Mindanao Way | | Analys | is Yea | r 202 | 6 | | | Ar | nalysis | Period | 1> 7:4 | 45 | | 5 A tr | <u>~</u> _ |
| Intersection | Mindanao/La Villa N | larina | File Na | ame | 12A | Μ | - Future | e with | h Pr | roject - | Option I | B.xus | | 5 | 111 *****1 | × ا ^م |
| Project Description | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Information | | | | EB | | | <u> </u> | V | VB | | <u> </u> | NB | | <u> </u> | SB | |
| Approach Movement | | | L | | R | | L | + | 1 | R | L | | R | L | 1 | R |
| Demand (V), ven/n | | | 18 | 1 | 11 | I | 68 | | 0 | 100 | 24 | 1170 | 57 | 65 | 1055 | 29 |
| Signal Information | | | | ЫU | E.J.R | | 0 | | | Γ | Γ | | | | | |
| Cvcle. s 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 242 | | ×. | 1.3 E | | | | | | | | _ | |
| Offset, s 0 | Reference Point | End | | 10.1 | | Ĩ | | | _ | | | _ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Green 10.1 Yellow 3.6 | | 3.7 | 6 | 14.7 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - L | | - | | Ð- |
| Force Mode Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.3 | 0.7 | | 1.7 | 0. | .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | ™ 5 | | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | EBL | - | EBT | ٦ | WBI | - | V | NBT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | | | | | 4 | | | | | 8 | | | 6 | 5 | | 2 |
| Case Number | | | | | 8.0 | | | | 8 | 8.0 | | | 6.3 | 1.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | | | | 20.0 | | | | 2 | <u>2</u> 0.0 | | | 55.0 | 15.0 |) . | 70.0 | |
| Change Period, (Y+R | Change Period, ($Y+Rc$), s | | | | 5.3 | | | | ļ | 5.3 | | | 4.4 | 4.9 | | 4.4 |
| Max Allow Headway (I | MAH), s | | | | 3.4 | | | | ; | 3.4 | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time | e (g s), s | | | | 3.4 | | | | 1 | 15.8 | | | | 3.1 | | |
| Green Extension Time | (<i>g</i> e), s | | | | 0.5 | | | | (| 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability | | | | | 1.00 | | | | 1 | 1.00 | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Probability | | | | | 0.00 | | | | 1 | 1.00 | | | | 0.00 |) | |
| Movement Group Res | sults | | | FB | | ٦ | | W | B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Movement | | _ | L | Т | R | ٦ | L | Т | - T | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Movement | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | | 3 | 8 | - | 18 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate (v |), veh/h | | | 31 | <u> </u> | ٦ | | 24 | 4 | | 25 | 644 | 634 | 68 | 567 | 562 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flo | ow Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | | 1122 | | | | 157 | 72 | | 506 | 1900 | 1869 | 1810 | 1900 | 1882 |
| Queue Service Time (| g s), s | | | 0.0 | | ٦ | | 11. | .5 | | 2.0 | 20.2 | 20.2 | 1.1 | 10.4 | 10.4 |
| Cycle Queue Clearanc | e Time (g c), s | | | 1.4 | | | | 13. | .8 | | 2.0 | 20.2 | 20.2 | 1.1 | 10.4 | 10.4 |
| Green Ratio (g/C) | | | | 0.16 | | ٦ | | 0.1 | 6 | | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.70 | 0.73 | 0.73 |
| Capacity (c), veh/h | | | | 247 | | | | 30 | 8 | | 365 | 1068 | 1051 | 431 | 1385 | 1372 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ra | atio (X) | | | 0.126 | | | | 0.79 | 90 | | 0.069 | 0.603 | 0.604 | 0.157 | 0.410 | 0.410 |
| Back of Queue (Q), ft | /In (95 th percentile) | | | 26.4 | | | | 26 | 0 | | 11.2 | 334.7 | 331.6 | 15.1 | 158.1 | 156.7 |
| Back of Queue (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | 1.1 | | | | 10. | .4 | | 0.4 | 13.4 | 13.3 | 0.6 | 6.3 | 6.3 |
| Queue Storage Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | 0.00 | | | | 0.0 | 0 | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (<i>d</i> 1), s | /veh | | | 32.1 | | | | 37. | .2 | | 9.1 | 13.0 | 13.1 | 7.6 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| Incremental Delay (d 2 | Incremental Delay (d 2), s/veh | | | | <u> </u> | | | 12. | .0 | | 0.4 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Initial Queue Delay (d | | | 0.0 | <u> </u> | | | 0.0 | 0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Control Delay (d), s/v | | | 32.1 | | | | 49. | .2 | | 9.4 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 7.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | С | | | | D | | | A | В | В | A | A | A | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 32.1 | | С | | 49.2 | 2 | | D | 15.5 | | В | 5.7 | | A | | |
| Intersection Delay, s/ve | | | | 14 | .4 | | | | | | _ | В | | | | |
| Multimodal Results | | FB | | | | \٨/ | B | | | NR | | | SB | | | |
| Pedestrian LOS Score | 2.30 | | B | - | 2.30 |) | 5 | В | 1 71 | | B | 1 71 | | В | | |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LO | edestrian LOS Score / LOS | | | | A | | 0.89 | , | | A | 1.56 | ; | B | 1.48 | 3 | A |

| | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------|----------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|------------|--------|----------|---------|-------|-------------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inters | sect | ion Infe | ormatio | on | 2 | * *** * * | s l <u>s</u> |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | eers | | | | Durat | tion, | h | 0.250 | | 1 | 417 | |
| Analvst | | JAS | | Analys | sis Dat | e Aua 1 | 4. 2020 | | Area | | 9 | Other | | - - 1 - 4 | | <i>د</i> لا |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existi | na - PM | | PHF | 21 | | 0.99 | | ⇒ - \$ | wţe | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Wav | | Analys | sis Yea | ar 2020 | <u> </u> | | Analy | /sis F | Period | 1> 16 | :45 | * | | * |
| Intersection | | , Mindanao/La Villa N | larina | File Na | ame | 12PM | - Existi | na.xu | ls s | , | | | | | 5 4 1 | |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | - [ব ↑ ় ় প 1 | * /* |
| | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | <u>.</u> | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | Ν | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | - | Г | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 20 | 1 | 36 | 50 | | 2 | 72 | 27 | 957 | 64 | 129 | 1088 | 13 |
| | | | | | | | _ | _ | _ | | _ | _ | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | 215 | 245a | - 3 K | 4 | | | | | | | | _ |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | ľ | 1 <u>5</u> 1 | ∼ ₿ " | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | € ₄ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 10.1 | 50.6 | 14.7 | 0. | 0 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | <u> </u> |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0. | 00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ ` | | $\mathbf{\nabla}$ | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.3 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 0. | 0 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | _ | | _ | | | | | - | | | | 0.51 | _ | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WB | | WBT | T | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | \rightarrow | 4 | | _ | 8 | _ | | | 6 | 5 | | 2 |
| Case Number Phase Duration is | | | | | \rightarrow | 8.0 | | _ | 8.0 | | | | 6.3 | 1.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | | | | | \rightarrow | 20.0 | | - | 20.0 |) | | | 55.0 | 15.0 | | 70.0 |
| Change Period, (Y+R c), s | | | | | | 5.3 | <u> </u> | - | 5.3 | - | | | 4.4 | 4.9 | | 4.4 |
| | oo Timo | (α_{r}) | | | + | 3.4 | | \rightarrow | 9.4 9.4 | - | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Groop Extensio | n Timo | $(g_s), s$ | | | - | 4.0 | | - | 0.4 | - | | | 0.0 | 4.1 | _ | 0.0 |
| Bhase Call Bro | hability | (<i>g</i> e), s | | <u> </u> | + | 1.00 | | \rightarrow | 1.00 | | | | 0.0 | 1.00 | | 0.0 |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | - | 0.00 | | | 0.06 | , | | | | 0.04 | | |
| Max Out Floba | Dinty | | | | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | , | | | | 0.04 | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | W | 3 | | _ | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | F | र | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |), veh/h | | | 58 | | | 125 | 5 | T | 27 | 521 | 510 | 130 | 557 | 555 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | | 1586 | ; | | 155 | 8 | | 515 | 1900 | 1858 | 1810 | 1900 | 1892 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), s | | | 0.0 | | | 3.5 | 5 | | 2.2 | 14.9 | 14.9 | 2.1 | 10.1 | 10.1 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (g c), s | | | 2.6 | | | 6.4 | l I | | 2.2 | 14.9 | 14.9 | 2.1 | 10.1 | 10.1 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | 0.16 | | | 0.1 | 6 | | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.70 | 0.73 | 0.73 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | | 313 | | | 311 | 1 | | 369 | 1068 | 1044 | 503 | 1385 | 1379 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | atio (X) | | | 0.184 | 1 | | 0.40 |)3 | | 0.074 | 0.488 | 0.488 | 0.259 | 0.402 | 0.402 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft | /In (95 th percentile) | | | 49.3 | | | 112 | .5 | | 12.3 | 258.9 | 254.6 | 30.1 | 153.7 | 153.1 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | 2.0 | | | 4.5 | 5 | | 0.5 | 10.4 | 10.2 | 1.2 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | 0.00 | | | 0.0 | 0 | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d 1), s | /veh | | | 32.6 | | | 34. | 1 | | 9.1 | 11.9 | 11.9 | 6.5 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | | 0.1 | | | 0.3 | 3 | | 0.4 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Initial Queue De | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |) | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (| | | 32.7 | | | 34. | 4 | | 9.5 | 13.5 | 13.5 | 6.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | С | | | С | | | А | В | В | Α | А | Α |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 32.7 | 7 | С | 34.4 | 1 | С | | 13.4 | - | В | 5.7 | | А |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 1 | 1.0 | | | | | | | В | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Multimodal Results | | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | | NB | _ | | SB | _ |
| Pedestrian LOS | Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | | | | | В | 2.30 |) | B | _ | 1.71 | | В | 1.71 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | icycle LOS Score / LOS | | | | | A | 0.69 |) | A | | 1.36 | j 📃 | A | 1.51 | | В |

| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intersed | ction Inf | ormatio | on | 2 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | se l _a |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------|------------|---------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------|------------|---------|--------|------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Duratior | ո, h | 0.250 | | | *+ + 54 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Date | Dec 2 | , 2020 | | Area Ty | ре | Other | • | <u>_</u> , | | * |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Existir Projec | ng with ct - PM | | PHF | | 0.99 | | *** | w , E | + + ↓ ↓ |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | is Yea | 2020 | | | Analysis | Period | 1> 16 | :45 | | KA 4. | |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/La Villa N | /larina | File Na | ame | 12PM | - Existi | ng wi | th Projec | t - Optior | ו B.xus | | | 1 / 1 4 1 1 1 | × (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | л | | | | | | | | | 1 7 | | |
| | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | _ | | N | /B | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | - | T R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 20 | 1 | 36 | 50 | | 2 72 | 27 | 959 | 64 | 129 | 1090 | 13 |
| | | | | 1 | 6 111 | 5 16 | | | | - | | | | | 1 |
| Signal Informa | | Deference Dhase | 2 | | 245 | 14 ,2 | 1.2 5 | 1 | | | | | | | 7 |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | Z End | | ſ | - * 1 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| Unseed, s | U No | Simult Con E/W | | Green 10.1 | | 50.6 | 14.7 | 0. | 0 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | A |
| Earco Modo | Fixed | Simult Cap N/S | On | Pod | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0. | | 0.0 | _ | 5 | \mathbf{Y}_{a} | 7 | ¥ . |
| | Tixed | Sindit. Gap N/S | OII | Reu | 1.5 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 0. | 0 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | • | | 0 |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | _ | EBT | WB | LI | WBT | NB | | NBT | SBL | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | _ | | | 4 | | - | 8 | | | 6 | 5 | | 2 |
| Case Number | - | | | | | 8.0 | | \rightarrow | 8.0 | | | 6.3 | 1.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | _ | | | 20.0 | | | 20.0 | - | | 55.0 | 15.0 | , · · | 70.0 | | |
| Change Period. ($Y+R_c$), s | | | | <u> </u> | - | 5.3 | | - | 5.3 | | | 4.4 | 4.9 | | 4.4 |
| Max Allow Head | dway (/ | <i>MAH</i>), s | | | | 3.4 | | | 3.4 | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (gs), s | | | | 4.6 | | | 8.4 | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge), s | | | | 0.3 | | | 0.2 | | | 0.0 | 0.1 | — | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | 1.00 | | | | 1.00 | , | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | 0.06 | | | | 0.04 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | W | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | T | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | · · · · | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |), veh/h | | | 58 | <u> </u> | | 12: | | 27 | 522 | 511 | 130 | 558 | 556 |
| Adjusted Satura | | bw Rate (s), ven/n/l | n | | 1586 | | | 155 | - | 514 | 1900 | 1858 | 1810 | 1900 | 1892 |
| Queue Service | Time (g | gs), s a Tima (g) a | | | 0.0 | | | 3.5 | | 2.2 | 14.9 | 14.9 | 2.1 | 10.2 | 10.2 |
| Cycle Queue C | | e filme (<i>g</i> c), s | | | 2.0 | | | 0.4 | + 6 | 2.2 | 14.9 | 14.9 | 2.1 | 10.2 | 10.2 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | 212 | | | 21/ | 1 | 260 | 1069 | 1044 | 502 | 1295 | 1270 |
| Volume-to-Can | acity Ra | atio(X) | | | 0 18/ | | | 0.40 | 13 | 0.074 | 0 / 80 | 0 / 89 | 0.250 | 0.403 | 0.403 |
| Back of Queue | (Ω) ft | /In (95 th nercentile) | | | 49.3 | | | 112 | 5 | 12.3 | 259.3 | 255.5 | 30.1 | 154 | 153.4 |
| Back of Queue | $(\mathbf{Q}), \mathbf{u}$ | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | 2.0 | | | 4.5 | 5 | 0.5 | 10.4 | 10.2 | 12 | 62 | 6 1 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | 0.00 | | | 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay | (d_1) , s | /veh | | | 32.6 | | | 34 | 1 | 9.1 | 11.9 | 11.9 | 6.5 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| Incremental De | lav (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | | 0.1 | | | 0.3 | 3 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| 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 | | | | | 32.7 | | | 34. | 4 | 9.5 | 13.5 | 13.5 | 6.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | С | | | С | | Α | В | В | Α | Α | Α |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 32.7 | · | С | 34.4 | | С | 13.4 | 1 | В | 5.7 | | A |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 11 | .0 | | | | | | В | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Multimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | | | | | В | 2.30 |) | В | 1.71 | 1 | В | 1.71 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | LOS Score / LOS | | | | ; | А | 0.69 |) | A | 1.36 | 6 | А | 1.51 | | В |

| | | | Ū | | | | | | | | , | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|----------|--------------|-------------------|----------|---------------|----------|----------|---------------|----------|-------------------|-------|----------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Intersec | tion Inf | ormatio | on | | 4441 | يه لي |
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | Duration | , h | 0.250 | | 1 | 444 | |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Dat | e Aug 1 | 4, 2020 | | Area Typ | e | Other | | | | <u>ل</u> |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Future | e - PM | | PHF | | 0.99 | | † | W↓E | |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | is Yea | r 2026 | | | Analysis | Period | 1> 16 | :45 | 4 | | * |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/La Villa N | /larina | File Na | ame | 12PM | - Future | e.xus | - | | | | | ኻተቱ | |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina | | л | | | | | | | | | 5 | 41491 | × (* |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | B | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | 1 | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (<i>v</i>), v | eh/h | | | 21 | 1 | 38 | 53 | 2 | 2 76 | 29 | 1082 | 68 | 137 | 1227 | 14 |
| | | | | 1 | b 111 | F 112 | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | | | 212 | ∠ ↓ a | - 3 S | <u> </u> | | | | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | ľ | - ⁶ 51 | ŗ₿_" | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | € ₄ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 10.1 | 50.6 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | 5 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | N | $\mathbf{\nabla}$ | | Y |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.3 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | 501 | | | | | MOT | | | | 0.01 | _ | ODT |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBI | WB | | WBI | NBI | - | NBI | SBL | - | SBI |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 4 | | \rightarrow | 8 | | \rightarrow | 6 | 5 | | 2 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 8.0 | | \rightarrow | 8.0 | | | 6.3 | 1.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | | | | | - | 20.0 | | \rightarrow | 20.0 | | | 55.0 | 15.0 |) | 70.0 |
| Change Period, (Y+R c), s | | | | | _ | 5.3 | | _ | 5.3 | | | 4.4 | 4.9 | | 4.4 |
| Max Allow Head | dway (/ | ИАН), s | | <u> </u> | | 3.4 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 3.4 | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | _ | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | | (gs),s | | | | 4.8 | | \rightarrow | 8.8 | | | | 4.3 | | |
| Green Extensio | n lime | (ge), s | | <u> </u> | | 0.3 | | _ | 0.2 | | | 0.0 | 0.1 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | <u> </u> | | 1.00 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | 1.00 | <u> </u> | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | 0.10 | | | | 0.05 | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | FB | | | WF | 3 | | NB | | | SB | _ |
| Approach Move | ement | | _ | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow Flow | Rate (v |), veh/h | _ | | 61 | - | | 132 | 2 | 29 | 587 | 575 | 138 | 628 | 626 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | | 1589 | | | 155 | 6 | 450 | 1900 | 1860 | 1810 | 1900 | 1892 |
| Queue Service | Time (d | (s), S | | | 0.0 | | | 3.9 | | 2.7 | 17.6 | 17.6 | 2.3 | 12.0 | 12.1 |
| Cvcle Queue C | learance | e Time (<code>q c</code>). s | | | 2.8 | | | 6.8 | | 2.7 | 17.6 | 17.6 | 2.3 | 12.0 | 12.1 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | 0.16 | - | | 0.16 | 3 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.70 | 0.73 | 0.73 |
| Capacity (c), v | / veh/h | | | | 313 | | | 310 |) | 333 | 1068 | 1046 | 463 | 1385 | 1379 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | tio(X) | | | 0.193 | ; | | 0.42 | 6 | 0.088 | 0.549 | 0.550 | 0.299 | 0.453 | 0.454 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | | 52 | | | 119. | 6 | 13.6 | 297.6 | 293.1 | 32.1 | 183.4 | 182.8 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | 2.1 | 1 | | 4.8 | | 0.5 | 11.9 | 11.7 | 1.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 |) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s | /veh | | | 32.7 | 1 | | 34.2 | 2 | 9.2 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 7.5 | 4.9 | 4.9 |
| Incremental De | lay (d 2 |), s/veh | | | 0.1 | | | 0.3 | | 0.5 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Initial Queue De | | | 0.0 | <u> </u> | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | | 32.8 | | | 34.6 | 3 | 9.7 | 14.5 | 14.6 | 7.6 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | С | | | С | | Α | В | В | Α | А | Α |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 32.8 | ; | С | 34.6 | 3 | С | 14.4 | | В | 6.2 | | A |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | 1' | 1.6 | | | | | | B | | |
| , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Multimodal Results | | | | EB | | | WE | 3 | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | | | | 2.30 | | В | 2.30 |) | В | 1.71 | | В | 1.71 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | icycle LOS Score / LOS | | | | | А | 0.71 | 1 | А | 1.47 | 7 | А | 1.64 | | В |

Copyright © 2020 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS™ Streets Version 7.8.5

| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | | Int | tersect | tion Infe | ormatio | on | _ | | × l <u>x</u> |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------|---------------|-----------|----------------|--------|------|----------|-----------|---------|-------|-----------------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| Agency | | Linscott, Law & Gre | enspan | , Engine | ers | | | | | Du | uration, | h | 0.250 | | | 4 + 4 | <u>*_</u> |
| Analyst | | JAS | | Analys | is Dat | te Dec | 2, | 2020 | | Ar | еа Тур | е | Other | | <u></u> | | <u>&</u> 5– |
| Jurisdiction | | City of Los Angeles | | Time F | Period | Futu Proje | re ect | with : - PM | | PH | ΗF | | 0.99 | | 4 \ \ | w∔e | \$ ↓ ¥ |
| Urban Street | | Mindanao Way | | Analys | is Yea | ar 2026 | 3 | | | Ar | nalysis | Period | 1> 16 | :45 | | 5 4 4 | <u>_</u> |
| Intersection | | Mindanao/La Villa N | <i>l</i> larina | File Na | ame | 12PI | И- | - Future | e with | n Pr | oject - | Option I | B.xus | | 1 | 111 141471 | × (* |
| Project Descrip | tion | Paseo Marina - Opt | ion B | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | • | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | ; | | | N | ٧B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | | L | - | Т | R | | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (<i>v</i>), v | eh/h | | | 21 | 1 | 38 | ; | 53 | | 2 | 76 | 29 | 1084 | 68 | 137 | 1229 | 14 |
| 0: 11.6 | <i></i> | | | | F III | 5.16 | | Γ | | | Г | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | ition | | 0 | 1 | 1215 | - | • | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | ſ | 1 5 | t? | E. | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | ↔ 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green 10.1 5 | | 50.6 | 3 | 14.7 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | <u> </u> |
| Uncoordinated | | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.6 | 3.7 | | 3.6 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | Ψ. | | Y |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.3 | 0.7 | | 1.7 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | T | WBI | - | V | VBT | NBL | - | NBT | SBL | - | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 4 | Т | | | | 8 | | | 6 | 5 | | 2 |
| Case Number | | | | | + | 8.0 | t | | \neg | 6 | 8.0 | | | 6.3 | 1.0 | | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration | | | | 20.0 | T | | | 2 | 0.0 | | | 55.0 | 15.0 |) - | 70.0 | | |
| Change Period. ($Y+R_c$). s | | | | | + | 5.3 | t | | + | Ę | 5.3 | | | 4.4 | 4.9 | | 4.4 |
| Max Allow Head | Max Allow Headway (MAH), s | | | | | 3.4 | T | | | 3 | 3.4 | | | 0.0 | 3.2 | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (g s), s | | | + | 4.8 | Ť | | \neg | 8 | 8.8 | | | | 4.3 | | |
| Green Extensio | n Time | (ge),s | | | | 0.3 | Т | | | (| 0.2 | | | 0.0 | 0.1 | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | | 1 | .00 | | | | 1.00 |) | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | | 0 | .10 | | | | 0.05 | 5 | |
| Movement Gro | | sulte | _ | | EB | | Ţ | | \٨/ | R | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ment | Suits | | | Т | R | ÷ | I | T | | R | 1 | T | R | | т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | 4 | 14 | t | 3 | 8 | + | 18 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | | | 61 | <u> </u> | T | | 13 | 2 | 10 | 29 | 588 | 576 | 138 | 629 | 627 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | | 1589 |) | t | | 155 | 56 | | 449 | 1900 | 1860 | 1810 | 1900 | 1892 |
| Queue Service | Time (d | q s), S | | | 0.0 | - | T | | 3.9 | 9 | _ | 2.7 | 17.6 | 17.7 | 2.3 | 12.1 | 12.1 |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (g c), s | | | 2.8 | | 1 | | 6.8 | 3 | | 2.7 | 17.6 | 17.7 | 2.3 | 12.1 | 12.1 |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | | | | 0.16 | | Т | | 0.1 | 6 | | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.70 | 0.73 | 0.73 |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | | 313 | | Т | | 31 | 0 | | 333 | 1068 | 1046 | 462 | 1385 | 1379 |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | itio(X) | | | 0.193 | 3 | | | 0.42 | 26 | | 0.088 | 0.550 | 0.551 | 0.299 | 0.454 | 0.454 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft/ | In (95 th percentile) | | | 52 | | | | 119 | .6 | | 13.6 | 298 | 294.1 | 32.1 | 183.7 | 183.1 |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | le) | | 2.1 | | | | 4.8 | 3 | | 0.5 | 11.9 | 11.8 | 1.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | ile) | | 0.00 | | 4 | | 0.0 | 0 | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (| (d 1), s | /veh | | | 32.7 | | 4 | | 34. | 2 | | 9.2 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 7.5 | 4.9 | 4.9 |
| Incremental De | Incremental Delay (d ₂), s/veh | | | | 0.1 | | 4 | | 0.3 | 3 | | 0.5 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Initial Queue Delay (d 3), s/veh | | | | | 0.0 | | 4 | | 0.0 | 2 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | | 32.8 | | 4 | | 34. | 6 | | 9.7 | 14.5 | 14.6 | 7.6 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | С | | 4 | | С | | - | A | В | В | A | A | A |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | 32.8 | 5 | С | | 34.6 | | | C | 14.4 | | В | 6.2 | | A |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | | | | | 11. | .1 | | | | | | | В | | |
| Multimodal Results | | | | | EB | | T | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | | | | | В | T | 2.30 | | | В | 1.71 | | В | 1.71 | | В |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | icycle LOS Score / LOS | | | | , | А | 1 | 0.71 | \neg | | A | 1.47 | 7 | А | 1.64 | | В |