Mr. Mark Haupert
Rexco Development
2518 N. Santiago Boulevard
Orange, CA 92867

| Subject: | Transportation Assessment for the Proposed |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Serrano Oaks Townhomes Project |
|  | Jurupa Valley, California |

Dear Mr. Haupert:
Linscott, Law \& Greenspan, Engineers (LLG) is pleased to submit the findings of this Transportation Assessment for the proposed Serrano Oaks Townhomes Project to be located on the east side of Clay Street north of Linares Avenue in the City of Jurupa Valley, California. This analysis evaluates the potential traffic circulation impacts associated with the proposed multifamily Project consistent with Jurupa Valley requirements based on the City of Jurupa Valley Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines (August 2020).

## PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The Project site is currently vacant and will be developed with 66 townhomes within thirteen (13) buildings. In addition, median modification improvements will be installed along the Project frontage to facilitate full movement access at the primary Project driveway.

Figure 1, attached, presents a Vicinity Map that illustrates the general location of the Project site and surrounding street system while Figure 2 presents an existing site aerial.

Access for the proposed Project will be provided via one (1) primary full movement driveway and one (1) right-in/right-out emergency vehicle access (EVA) only driveway along Clay Street. Figure 3 presents the proposed site plan for the Project, prepared by Summa Architecture.
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## PROJECT TRAFFIC CHARACTERISTICS

## Trip Generation Forecast

Traffic generation is expressed in vehicle trip ends, defined as one-way vehicular movements, either entering or exiting the generating land use. Generation equations and/or rates used in the traffic forecasting procedure are found in the Eleventh $\left(11^{\text {th }}\right)$ Edition of Trip Generation, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) [Washington D.C., 2021].

Table 1, attached, summarizes the trip generation rates used in forecasting the vehicular trips generated for the proposed Project and also presents the proposed Project's forecast peak hour and daily traffic volumes. As shown in the upper portion of Table 1, the trip generation potential of the proposed Project was estimated using ITE Land Use 220: Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) Not Close to Rail Transit trip rates.

Review of the bottom of Table 1 indicates that the proposed Project is forecast to generate 445 daily trips, with 26 trips ( 6 inbound, 20 outbound) produced in the AM peak hour and 34 trips ( 21 inbound, 13 outbound) produced in the PM peak hour on a "typical" weekday.

According to the City of Jurupa Valley Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines (August, 2020), projects that will generate between 50 and 100 peak hour trips will be required to conduct a Focused Transportation Assessment (FTA). In addition, based on Section B of the TIA Guidelines, "Apartments and multi-family projects of less than 150 units" may not require a full TIA that includes LOS. As a result, based on the relatively low Project trip generation and City TIA preparation criteria, the proposed Project will not impact the surrounding transportation system and not require the preparation of a full TIA that includes LOS.

## SITE ACCESS AND ON-SITE CIRCULATION EVALUATION

Primary access for the Project is proposed via a full movement driveway along Clay Street (Project Driveway No. 1), which will necessitate a median design to accommodate southbound left turn movements and westbound left turn via an acceleration lane. The Project driveway geometry will consist of one (1) inbound lane and one (1) outbound lane. In order to determine whether left-turn ingress and egress will be acceptable, this report includes an AM peak hour and PM peak hour capacity analysis for the horizon Year 2024 traffic conditions based on the Highway Capacity Methodology (HCM) unsignalized methodology utilizing HCM 6 software.
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The traffic volume forecast data utilized in this analysis is based on the Year 2024 AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes for the intersection of Clay Street and Linares Avenue contained in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for the proposed Appaloosa Springs Project (June 25, 2021). Appendix A, attached, contains the figures presenting the Year 2024 AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes utilized as the background traffic volume data for the driveway analyses (Intersection No. 13: Clay Street at Linares Avenue). In addition, the total traffic volume data utilized for the driveway analyses consists of the Year 2024 AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes from the Appaloosa Springs TIA combined with the AM and PM peak hour Project traffic volumes presented in Table 1 applied to the driveways in a $50 \% / 50 \%$ inbound north/south Project distribution pattern ( $100 \%$ outbound Project distribution pattern). Furthermore, the lane geometry along Clay Street at the Project driveways consists of two (2) through lanes in each direction with a southbound left-turn lane in the center to provide left-turn storage for left-turn ingress operation and an acceleration lane for left-turn egress operation.

The results of the Year 2024 AM and PM peak hour HCM capacity analysis at the Project driveways is presented as follows:

YEAR 2024 WITH PROJECT

|  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Key Intersection | $\underline{\text { HCM }}$ | $\underline{\text { LOS }}$ |  | $\underline{\text { HCM }}$ | $\underline{\text { LOS }}$ |
| $>$ Clay Street at Project Driveway No. 1 (Full) | $12.5 \mathrm{~s} / \mathrm{v}$ | B |  | $14.7 \mathrm{~s} / \mathrm{V}$ | B |

As presented, Project Driveway No. 1 with full movement operation is forecast to operate at acceptable level of service (LOS) B during the Year 2024 AM and PM peak hour traffic conditions. Appendix B, attached, contains the Year 2024 AM and PM peak hour HCM/LOS calculation worksheets, which also presents the total traffic volume data and lane geometry.

Figure 4 presents the concept improvement plan for Clay Street along the Project frontage, which shows the proposed median modifications to provide the southbound left-turn pocket and acceleration lane median improvements within the center of the roadway as well as a median break to provide southbound left turn access for the existing Golden Star Hamburgers restaurant. In addition, Figure 5 presents a fire truck turning movement analysis at the main Project entrance and emergency vehicle access (EVA) along the northern boundary of the site.

The on-site circulation layout of the proposed Project as illustrated in Figure 3 and Figure 5 on an overall basis is adequate. Vehicles will be able to adequately circulate throughout the site and emergency vehicle access (EVA) is provided along the northerly driveway. The driveway widths has been confirmed and are generally adequate for small service/delivery (FedEx, UPS) trucks, trash trucks, and emergency vehicles.

## SIGHT DISTANCE EVALUATION

At intersections and/or project driveways, a substantially clear line of sight should be maintained between the driver of a vehicle waiting at the crossroad and the driver of an approaching vehicle. Adequate time must be provided for the waiting vehicle to either cross all lanes of through traffic, cross the near lanes and turn left, or turn right, without requiring through traffic to radically alter their speed. A sight distance evaluation has been performed for the unsignalized Project Driveway No. 1 located along Clay Street.

The Sight Distance Evaluation prepared for Project Driveway No. 1 is based on the criteria and procedures set forth by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the State's Highway Design Manual (HDM). Stopping sight distance was utilized for the evaluation. Stopping sight distance is defined in the Caltrans HDM to be the distance required by the driver of a vehicle, traveling at a given speed, to bring the vehicle to a stop after an object $1 / 2$-foot high on the road becomes visible. Stopping sight distance for motorists is measured from the driver's eyes, which are assumed to be $31 / 2$ feet above the pavement surface, to an object $1 / 2$-foot high on the road.

Based on the criteria set forth in Table 201.1 of the Caltrans HDM and a posted speed limit of 45 mph on Clay Street, a stop sight distance of 360 feet is required for the right-turn movements at Project Driveway No. 1.

Figure 5 presents a schematic of the sight distance evaluation performed at Project Driveway No. 1, which illustrates the actual sight distance and corresponding limited use area along Clay Street. A review of Figure 5 indicates that the sight lines at this intersection are expected to be adequate provided obstructions within the sight triangles are minimized. In addition, any future landscaping and/or hardscapes (i.e. monument signs) should be designed such that a driver's clear line of sight is not obstructed.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the aforementioned Project trip generation forecast for the proposed Serrano Oaks Townhomes Project, which is 445 daily trips, with 26 trips (6 inbound, 20 outbound) produced in the AM peak hour and 34 trips ( 21 inbound, 13 outbound) produced in the PM peak hour on a "typical" weekday, we conclude that the proposed Project's traffic circulation impact is considered "insignificant" based on the "100 peak hour trip" threshold and the activities list in Section B of the City of Jurupa Valley Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines. Therefore, the Project would not require any specific intersection analysis.

In addition, the proposed Project driveway is forecast to operate at acceptable service levels as a full movement operation at the primary driveway (Project Driveway No. 1) with the installation of a southbound left-turn pocket and acceleration lane within the center of Clay Street at Project Driveway No. 1. Lastly, The on-site circulation layout of the proposed Project as illustrated in Figure 3 and Figure 5 on an overall basis is adequate.

Lastly, adequate stopping sight distance is provided at Project Driveway No. 1 provided any future landscaping and/or hardscapes (i.e. monument signs) is designed such that a driver's clear line of sight is not obstructed.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide this Transportation Assessment. Should you need further assistance, or have any questions regarding this analysis, please call us at (949) 825-6175.

Very truly yours,

## Linscott, Law \& Greenspan, Engineers



Keil D. Maberry, P.E. Principal
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Table 1
Project Traffic Generation Rates and Forecast ${ }^{1}$
Serrano Oaks Townhomes, Jurupa Valley

| ITE Land Use Code / <br> Project Description | $\begin{gathered} \text { Daily } \\ \text { 2-Way } \end{gathered}$ | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total |
| Generation Rates: | 6.74 | 24\% | 76\% | 0.40 | 63\% | 37\% | 0.51 |
| - 220: Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) Not Close to Rail Transit (TE/DU) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed Proiect Generation Forecasts: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Townhomes (66 DU) | 445 | 6 | 20 | 26 | 21 | 13 | 34 |
| Project Trip Generation Forecast | 445 | 6 | 20 | 26 | 21 | 13 | 34 |

## Note:

- TE/DU $=$ Trip end per dwelling unit
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## ApPENDIX A

## Appaloosa Springs TIA <br> Traffic Volume Data


$\begin{aligned} \text { \#\# } & =\text { STUDY INTERSECTION } \\ +- & =\text { RALLROAD TRACKS }\end{aligned}$
$+\underset{+}{+}=$ RAILROAD TRACKS

FIGURE 6-6
YEAR 2024 CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT AM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES appaloosa springs, Jurupa valley
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FIGURE 6-7
YEAR 2024 CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT

# ApPENDIX B 

Driveway Level of Service
Calculation Worksheets

|  | Intersection Level Of Service Report |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Intersection 1: Clay Street at Project Driveway 1 |  |  |
| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay (sec / veh): | 12.5 |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 6th Edition | Level Of Service: | B |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.020 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Clay St |  | Clay St |  | Project Dwy 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Entry Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Exit Pocket Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | Yes |  |

Volumes

| Name | Clay St |  | Clay St |  | Project Dwy 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 521 | 3 | 3 | 551 | 10 | 10 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 521 | 3 | 3 | 551 | 10 | 10 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 130 | 1 | 1 | 138 | 3 | 3 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 521 | 3 | 3 | 551 | 10 | 10 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 2021 (SP 0-6)

Scenario 1: 1 AM Year 2024 Cumulative With Project

Intersection Settings

| Priority Scheme | Free | Free | Stop |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flared Lane |  |  | No |
| Storage Area [veh] | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Two-Stage Gap Acceptance |  |  | Yes |
| Number of Storage Spaces in Median | 0 | 0 | 2 |

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 8.48 | 0.00 | 12.53 | 10.10 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | B | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/ln] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.11 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft/n] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.00 | 2.63 | 2.63 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.05 |  | 11.32 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | B |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 0.23 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |

## Intersection 1: Clay Street at Project Driveway 1

Control Type: Analysis Method: Analysis Period:

Two-way stop
HCM 6th Edition
15 minutes

Delay (sec / veh):
Level Of Service:
Volume to Capacity (v/c):
14.7

B
0.016

Intersection Setup

| Name | Clay St |  | Clay St |  | Project Dwy 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Entry Pocket Length [ t ] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Exit Pocket Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | Yes |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Clay St |  | Clay St |  | Project Dwy 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 699 | 10 | 11 | 873 | 6 | 7 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 699 | 10 | 11 | 873 | 6 | 7 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 175 | 3 | 3 | 218 | 2 | 2 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 699 | 10 | 11 | 873 | 6 | 7 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

Intersection Settings

| Priority Scheme | Free | Free | Stop |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flared Lane |  |  | No |
| Storage Area [veh] | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Two-Stage Gap Acceptance |  |  |  |
| Number of Storage Spaces in Median | 0 | 0 | Yes |

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 9.12 | 0.00 | 14.75 | 10.81 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | B | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/In] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.08 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft/rn] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.94 | 0.00 | 2.06 | 2.06 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.11 |  | 12.63 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | B |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 0.16 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
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[^1]:    1 Source: Trip Generation, Ilth Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, (ITE) [Washington, D.C. (2021)].

