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## I. INTRODUCTION

This traffic impact study was prepared to determine traffic impact and potential mitigation for a proposed highway commercial development in Tulare County, sited at the northeast corner of State Highway 65 and Cedar Street, roughly one quarter mile west of the city of Lindsay. The study has been required by the California Department of Transportation.

## A. Project Description

The Project site comprises 6.28 acres and proposes a 5,439 square foot convenience market, two fast food restaurants, one with drive through service, 16 automobile fueling positions and a sixposition truck fueling facility.

The site is relatively flat and is currently vacant, but in the past was under cultivation as row crops.

The Project is bounded by State Highway 65 along its southern frontage and Cedar Avenue along its western boundary. Ingress and egress from the Project is proposed from both State Highway 65 and Cedar Avenue.

The Project is intended to attract truckers and the traveling public from State Route 65. The site is laid out to facilitate circulation through fueling stations and eliminate queuing. The access drive from SR 65 is 47 -feet wide with 50 foot radii curb returns. In addition, a 200 -foot deceleration lane is proposed for westbound traffic (technically northbound) entering the site. This configuration will rapidly remove vehicles from the SR 65 traveled way and eliminate any hindrances for trucks turning into the site. In addition, and per Caltrans' recommendation, a raised median porkchop is proposed for the SR 65 project entrance. The "porkchop" will prohibit any movement other than westbound (northbound) "right in and egress "right out". The "porkchop" will also prohibit eastbound (technically southbound) left turns into the site.

The six truck fueling positions have been aligned 240 -feet directly north of the SR 65 entrance drive. This will provide sufficient decision time for truckers to select a vacant fuel bay and will provide storage if needed. The combining benefits of a wide drive approach, large return radii, deceleration lane and on-site circulation will result in rapid processing of trucks through the fueling facility.

Similarly, a westbound (northbound) deceleration and right turn lane is proposed for Cedar Avenue, as well as an eastbound (southbound) dedicated left turn lane.

Finally, the turning wheel paths of large trucks have been superimposed on the site plan to demonstrate ease of circulation.

Additional traffic mitigation is discussed later in this report.

Figure 1, included in Appendix A, shows the project location within Tulare County and its proximity to the City of Lindsay.

An Architectural Site Plan, included in Appendix A, provides the Project's site layout.

## B. Existing and Surrounding Land Use

Surrounding land is entirely under cultivation; however, a residential neighborhood in the City of Lindsay exists about one quarter mile east of the Project.

Roughly one quarter mile to the west on the north frontage of SR 65, exists a Chevron gas station with three retail stores.

Figure 1 is a recent aerial photo showing the Project site and the surrounding area.

## II. EXISTING LOCAL STREET NETWORK

The following is a description of streets in the vicinity of the site, which may be impacted to some extent by the Project.

State Route 65: Pursuant to the Surface Transportation Act of 1982 State Route 65 is a designated route for large trucks. State Route 65 commences in Bakersfield and runs northward roughly 94 miles through the cities and communities of Oildale, Ducor, Terra Bella, Strathsmore, Lindsay, and terminates at its intersection with State Route 198 just north of Exeter and about 8 miles east of Visalia. State Route 65 transitions back and forth between a two-lane rural highway and a four lane expressway. In the vicinity of the Project, SR 65 is a two lane undivided road with dedicated left and right turn lanes at major intersections.

Caltrans and the County of Tulare have plans to re-align and reconstruct State Route 65, which will include the construction of a roundabout, located at the intersection of State Route 65 and Cedar Avenue. Construction is tentatively planned to commence in 2034.

Cedar Avenue: Cedar Avenue is as two lane County Road running between State Route 65 at its south end and terminating one mile north at its intersection with Avenue 240. Cedar Avenue is not a thoroughfare and provides access to agricultural property and less than ten residences. Cedar Avenue was surfaced in the past with asphalt concrete, but the pavement is old and in disrepair and missing in many locations. Along the Project's frontage, Cedar is planned to be improved to accommodate the anticipated Project traffic. The existing pavement structural section should be evaluated for adequacy under future truck loads.

As part of the SR 65 realignment project, Caltrans intend to realign Cedar north of it intersection (with SR 65) to tie into Oak Avenue.

As previously mentioned above, Caltrans and the County of Tulare have plans to re-align and reconstruct State Route 65. As a part of the roundabout project, Cedar Ave will be realigned to the East to connect with Oak Ave. It is recommended that the intersection of State Route 65 and Cedar Avenue be re-evaluated in the future.

North Spruce Avenue: North Spruce is a Tulare County road which commences a mile south of SR 65 and runs north 9 miles paralleling SR 65 to its terminus at its intersection with State Route 198. North Spruce Road is a two-lane paved Tulare County Road with paved shoulders and is in a good state of repair. Traffic counts indicate that this is a well-used roadway.

North Spruce Avenue is signalized at its intersection with State Route 65. A signal dedicated lane is provided for each movement from State Route 65; however, only a signal shared lane is provided for the north and south legs of this intersection.

West Tulare Avenue: West Tulare Avenue is a two lane, paved east-west road running through residential neighborhoods in the northern part of Lindsay. The west Terminus of West Tulare is its intersection with SR 65. West Tulare Avenue becomes East Tulare Avenue in the City of Lindsay and has a paved shoulder, curb, gutter and sidewalk over most of its length. Between SR 65 and 650 feet to the east, West Tulare Avenue has only paved shoulders. As part of the planned realignment of SR 65, West Tulare Avenue will be realigned to tie into Oak Avenue and its intersection with SR 65 will be removed.

## III. METHOD OF ANALYSIS \& TRAFFIC ESTIMATES

## A. General

Additional detailed descriptions of methods and "findings" are provided in the appropriate sections herein. However, as a preface to the following sections, a brief step-by-step description used for analysis in this report, as follows:

1. Existing conditions of the Project and surrounding area are surveyed, including traffic counts, laneage, and intersection control. Traffic counts were performed during periods of peak volume.
2. Using growth rates project from historical traffic data in the vicinity of the Project, existing traffic is extrapolated to future year volumes. In this case, future traffic was estimated for Year 2025 and Year 2045. Year 2025 is the anticipated "opening" day, i.e., when the development is open for business.

It is possible that opening day could be sooner than 2025. In that scenario, the theoretical traffic developed for 2025 would be larger than previous years, and the results considered conservative.
3. Project-generated traffic, based on the proposed land use, is estimated and distributed onto the street network. Project-generated traffic is added to both present day and future year scenarios described in the following step.
4. Intersections, and street segments with any significant impact from Project-generated traffic are analyzed for "Level of Service" (LOS) for the various scenarios: A) Existing conditions with No Project; B) Existing Conditions plus Project Traffic; C) Year 2025 (Assumed as "Opening Day") with No Project; D) Year 2025 plus Project traffic; E) Year 2045 with No Project; F) Year 2035 plus Project Traffic; and G) Year 2032 plus Cumulative Project traffic and proposed mitigation improvements. H) Year 2045 plus Project Traffic; and I) Year 2042 plus Cumulative Project traffic and proposed mitigation improvements.
5. Mitigation or capacity/level of service improvements are determined for any of the above scenarios which result in an unacceptable "Level of Service" (LOS). Usually, an unacceptable LOS is anything less than " C ". Given special circumstances, occasionally an agency will lower the "mitigation threshold" to a LOS of "D".
6. Resultant LOS's are calculated to determine the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation. If improvements to the facility are funded by the RTIF program, they are evaluated for adequacy under future traffic conditions. The Project's obligation for funding of any needed mitigation improvements is determined. Project-funded mitigation improvements are usually improvements that would not necessarily be needed if there was no project. In these cases, the Project's obligation, in very simplified terms, is the cost of a particular mitigation improvement multiplied by the ratio of Project-generated traffic to total estimated future year traffic volume.
7. Vehicle Miles Traveled: The total daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) is calculated for the Project. This methodology is explained later in this report, but VMT, is theoretically, the vehicle miles caused by the Project.

Again, in the following sections methodology, findings, and mitigation are discussed in further detail.

## B. Traffic Counts

Traffic counts were performed over the existing street network to determine existing intersection volumes, and traffic flow patterns. As discussed in the following section, future year traffic volumes are estimated by applying annual growth rates derived from historical growth rates.

Traffic counts were performed in February of 2023 during the morning and evening peak periods during weekdays, excluding Mondays, Fridays, holidays, and days preceding or following holidays. Weekdays before or after holidays or weekends are not representative of normal traffic patterns and thus are not counted or considered appropriate for analysis.

Specifically, traffic counts were performed during the morning peak period between 6:30 A.M. and 8:30 A.M. as well as the evening peak period between 4:00 P.M. and 6:00 P.M. Usually, the peak period for various intersections and streets are close but do not occur at identical times. In this study, conservatively, the highest one-hour volumes for each intersection or street segment within their individual peak periods were used for analysis in this report.

Figures 2 \& 3, included in Appendix "A" of this study, show the peak hour volumes during the morning and evening peak periods, respectively, for all facilities counted. These figures also show the actual turning movements at all counted intersections.

## C. Future Year Traffic Volumes

As mentioned, future traffic for the Years 2025, 2035, and 2045 were estimated by applying growth rates to existing volumes. Growth rates were extrapolated from Caltrans traffic data from years 2016 and 2018. The latest year of published traffic volumes by Caltrans is 2020. However, year 2020 data was not used since it would result in a negative growth rate, which would not be accepted by Caltrans.

Table 1 herein provides a weighted average of SR 65 between Years 2016 and 2018, yielding an average annual growth rate of 1.9 percent. This growth was applied to present day volumes and compounded annually to arrive at Year 2025, Year 2035, and Year 2045 volumes.

Figures 2 and 3, included in Appendix A, shows the morning and evening "Year 2023", or presentday peak hour volumes and turning movements used for analysis in this Study. Figures 6A and 6B show the Year 2025 morning and evening peak hour volumes and turning movements. Figures 8 A and 8 B , also in Appendix A , show the Year 2035 morning and evening peak hour volumes and turning movements. Figures 10A and 10B, also in Appendix A, show the Year 2045 morning and evening peak hour volumes and turning movements.

Project generated traffic was not added to any of the previously mentioned figures.
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## Table 1: Projected Average Annual Growth Rates

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item No. | Road Segment | From | To | Year 2016 <br> Annual Average Daily Traffic | Year 2018 <br> Annual Average Daily Traffic | Annual Average Growth Rate (\%) | Factor: Year 2023 to Year 2025 | Factor: Year 2023 to Year 2035 | Factor: Year 2023 to Year 2045 |
| 1. | State Route 65 | Hermosa Street | Oak Avenue | 21,600 | 21,800 | 0.5\% | 1.0093 | 1.0569 | 1.1067 |
| 2. | State Route 65 | Oak Avenue | Spruce Avenue | 22,250 | 22,250 | 0.0\% | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| 3. | State Route 65 | Spruce Avenue | State Route 137 | 17,500 | 18,550 | 3.0\% | 1.0600 | 1.4185 | 1.8983 |
| 4. | State Route 137 | Road 140 | Road 168 | 10,300 | 11,100 | 3.8\% | 1.0777 | 1.5664 | 2.2769 |
| 5. | State Route 137 | Road 168 | State Route 65 | 10,500 | 11,550 | 4.9\% | 1.1000 | 1.7716 | 2.8531 |
| Weighted <br> Average: |  |  |  |  |  | 1.9\% | 1.0387 | 1.2562 | 1.5192 |

Notes:

1) Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) per Caltrans Traffic Census Program
2) Due to Covid-19's effect on traffic volumes, "Pre-Covid" Traffic Census data was selected for analysis. Analysis of 2018-2020 results in negative growth for the region.

## D. Project Generated Traffic

Project generated vehicular trips were estimated using the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition, hereinafter referred to as the ITE Manual. The ITE Manual provides mathematical correlations between various land uses and trip generation, i.e., the ITE Manual provides average trip rates for many land use types. Some ITE land uses also include fitted curves for trip generation rates. As discussed in Section I, and as shown on the site plan in Appendix " $A$ ", the Project includes fueling for automobiles, a convenience market, truck fueling and fast food restaurants, one with drive through service.

The following Table 2 provides an ITE Code appropriate for each land use, provides the land use description, the independent variable, and a trip generation rate associated with each independent variable. In this case, the independent variable used for each land use is "gross leasable floor area", and "fueling positions". Table 2 also provides trip rates and total trip generation for the 24-hour average day, and the A.M. and P.M. peak hour, and the directional split for each scenario. Table 2 indicates an unadjusted total for all land uses as 8,712 average daily trips, and 765 and 655 peak hour trips for the morning and evening peak hours respectively.

The challenge in accurately estimating trips is avoiding over-estimations. However, given agency restrictions on trip adjustment factors, this is only partially obtainable. A true Project-generated primary trip is one that departs from an origin, travels to the Project, and then returns to its origin; or vise-versa. In other words, the sole purpose of the trip was to visit the project site and then return to the origin, or vice versa.

Theoretically, any visit to the site for fuel counts as two trips: the arrival and the departure. This same theory applies to any other land uses such as fast food. If a motorist stops for gas and gets fast food at the same commercial center, they have theoretically created 4 trips. In this case, without adjustment factors, 4 trips would be added to the public roadway, when in fact only two were appropriate.

Similarly, if someone stopped for fast food as part of the work to home commute, is it appropriate to state that the commercial facility caused two trips to be added to the public roadway? In this scenario, the work to home commute is the primary trip, and the only trip on the roadway. In this case the commercial center did not add traffic to the public road, and two trips should not be allocated to the project.

In another scenario, a trucker exits from a freeway to get gas and food, then returns to the freeway to continue onto their primary destination. In this case, it would be improper to add 4 project trips to the freeway. However, it is appropriate to add two trips to the freeway ramps and the cross-street since those facilities are impacted by the stop for food and gas.

To account for the above scenarios, adjustment factors have been developed which are intended to apply to basic trip generation calculation to yield realistic values.

In the following, trip types and said trip adjustment factors are discussed.
"Pass-bys": Briefly, "Pass-By" trips are intermediate trips or stops taken as part of the primary trip. As an example, stopping at a highway commercial center for fuel or fast-food while commuting between home and work, (without diverted from the primary travel route), is considered a "pass-by" trip, i.e., in a proper traffic analysis, the stop at the commercial center, not being the purpose of the primary trip, should not be considered as project-generated trips to be added to the surrounding street network. Without a reduction for "pass-by" all intermediate stops during a primary trip would be improperly included in the summation of traffic volume contributed by the Project.

As discussed further in the section below, driveway surveys of similar facilities, performed by LAV//Pinnacle Engineering, have yielded pass-by rates of close to 100 percent. For analysis of Level of Service for this Project, a "pass-by" reduction of 20 percent was selected.
"Diverted-Link trips" are similar to "pass-bys" except these trips make a slight detour to reach an interim destination, then return to the original route to continue onto their primary destination. As an example, a diverted link trip would be exiting the freeway to reach the Project site, then returning to the freeway to continue the primary trip. Although "Diverted-Link" trips are not additive to freeway traffic, they nevertheless impact the freeway ramps and the crossstreet to reach said interim destination. However, given the Project fronts State Highway 65, (the source of the majority of trips), there are no "side routes" necessary to reach the Project site, and thus "diverted-link trips" were considered unlikely and not factored into final trip generation calculations, i.e., no deductions were taken for "diverted link trips."

Captured Trips: Another traffic phenomenon, "Capture", can be described as trips that are made internally within the limits of a mix use project. "Internally" means these trips do not return to the public street network between trips within the same site. Similar to the previous example provided, captured trips would include stopping for gas and fast food at different establishments within the same commercial center. Without an adjustment for "capture", four trips attributable to the Project, would be added to the public street network, when only two trips were appropriate: the arrival and the departure from the commercial center. Capture adjustments are intended to eliminate double and trip counting of project-generated trips.

Capture is appropriately applied to all types of trips, including primary, diverted link and passbys.

## Caltrans permits a reduction of 5\% for "Capture".

Driveway Surveys: To accurately estimate "Pass-Bys", "Diverted Link" and "Captured" trips, driveway surveys were performed at a similar highway commercial establishment, located at the Southeast corner of Highway 65 and Avenue 128. Two surveys were performed during weekday
peak and non-peak hours. Non-peak hours were included since the results for "Pass-By" and "Diverted Link" would likely be conservative given a lesser make-up of commuters. At the time of this study, the Chevron Station (and C-Store) $1 / 4 /$ mile west of the Project at the intersection of North Spruce Street and State Highway 65 was under construction, invalidating it as a suitable location for a driveway survey.

In both surveys, 100 percent of survey respondents indicated that their stop at said commercial center was not the primary purpose of their trip. All respondents indicated that they were traveling to other destinations. As stated, employee arrivals and departures are primary trips; the driveway surveys were random and no respondents indicated they were employees.

Numerous surveys for establishments similar to the Project have been performed by the author of this report. These surveys were performed in both urban and rural areas. All yield similar results: nearly 100 percent of trips were either "pass-bys", "diverted link" trips, or a combination thereof. The surveys have been included in Appendix "C" herein.

Caltrans' Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies sets a limit for "pass-by" and "capture" to 15 percent and five percent respectively. However, a larger reduction can be applied on the condition that the increased reduction is justified. Given the results of the surveys discussed above, a "pass-bys" reduction of 20 percent was considered conservative, and therefore appropriate for traffic analysis. After a discussion with Caltrans, the 20 reduction was approved for use in the study. Said correspondence has been included in Appendix " $C$ " herein.

Table 2 shows said trip reduction taken for both "pass-bys" and "capture" at 20 percent and 5 percent respectively. Given these limited deductions, it is apparent that Project-generated trips allocated to the surrounding street network is certainly very conservative. Distribution and assignment of Project-generated trips are discussed in the following section.
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Table 2: Trip Generation for Commercial Development at the Northeast Corner of Ave 232 \& Cedar Ave, Lindsay


## E. Trip Distribution and Assignment

There are no known additional roadways, roadway realignments, or road closures anticipated in the near future that would significantly change existing traffic patterns. Therefore, Projectgenerated trips were distributed on the existing street network assuming they would follow existing traffic patterns well into the future. Existing traffic patterns, again, were determined from traffic counts, traffic observations, and driveway surveys of the adjacent development.

Project-generated trip distribution have been shown in Figure 4.

## F. Trip Assimilation

Based on information provided by the Tulare County Council of Government, the average work commute travel time for Tulare County is 20 minutes. At an average speed of 33 miles per hour, this yields an average work-commute trip of 11 miles. Assuming a $50 / 50$ split of work-commute trips less than and greater than 11 miles, an average trip assimilation rate of 8.33 percent per mile is derived. This rate of assimilation is likely conservative and over the years has been accepted by various reviewing agencies. The trip distribution shown in Figure 4 has been adjusted accordingly.

## IV. IMPACT OF PROJECT TRAFFIC

## A. Level of Service (LOS)

Operational analysis of streets and intersections were performed using methods outlined in the Transportation Research Board, National Research Council Highway Capacity Manual, HCM, 2016.

Level of Service (LOS) is the generally accepted gauge for describing the quality of operation of either a road segment or street intersection. Other attributes of operational quality associated with each Level of Service are v/c - volume to capacity ratio, vehicle delay through an intersection, and reserve capacity of an intersection approach. For each type of street segment or intersection analysis, the Level of Service criteria varies slightly. Levels of Service for every type of roadway or intersection are described thoroughly in the Highway Capacity Manual, however, the brief descriptions have been provided in the following:

Table 3: Level of Service for Signalized Intersections

| Level of <br> Service | Stopped Delay per <br> Vehicle (sec.) |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $<5.0$ |
| B | 5.1 to 15.0 |
| C | 15.1 to 25.0 |
| D | 25.1 to 40.0 |
| E | 40.1 to 60.0 |
| F | $>60.0$ |

Table 4: Level of Service for Un-Signalized Intersections

| Level <br> of Service | Reserve Capacity <br> (DCPH) | Expected Delay to Minor <br> Street Traffic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | $\geq 400$ | Little or no delay |
| B | $300-399$ | Short traffic delay |
| C | $200-299$ | Average traffic delay |
| D | $100-199$ | Long traffic delay |
| E | $0-99$ | Very long traffic delay |
| F | Note 1 | See Note 1 |

Note 1: When demand volume exceeds the capacity of the lane, extreme delays will be encountered. This condition usually warrants improvement to the intersection.

Table 5: Level of Service for Highways and Arterials

| Level of <br> Service | Description |
| :---: | :--- |
| A | Free flow conditions, unimpeded ability to maneuver and pass, very little <br> delay, no platoons, highest average travel speeds. |
| B | Mostly free flow conditions: presence of other vehicles begins to be <br> noticeable. Passing is required to maintain speeds, slightly less average <br> travel speeds than Level of Service "A". |
| C | Traffic density clearly affects the ability to pass and maneuver within the <br> stream. Speeds are reduced to about 50 mph on highways and to about <br> 50\% of the average on urban arterials. |
| D | Unstable flow. Speeds are reduced from 40\% to 60\% of normal. Passing <br> demand is high although mostly impossible on 2-Lane Highways. Traffic <br> disruptions usually cause extensive queues. |
| E | Very unstable flow at or near capacity. Passing and maneuvering is virtually <br> impossible. Extensive platooning on highways and queuing on arterials. <br> Speeds range from 20 mph or less on arterials and 2-Lane Highways, and <br> up to 50 mph on Multi-Lane Highways. |
| F | Forced or breakdown flow. Demand exceeds capacity. Vehicles experience <br> short spurts of movement followed by stoppages. Intersection congestion, <br> long queues and delays are common. |

## B. Traffic Impact Analysis

As discussed in Section III herein, Project-generated traffic was distributed onto the existing street network based on existing patterns. In accordance with agency criteria, any street segment or intersection, currently operating at or above a "C" Level of Service, must be analyzed if it receives 50 or more Project-generated peak hour trips. If the facility currently operates at a "D", "E" or "F", the analysis threshold drops to 40, 20 and 10 trips, respectively.

Level of Service calculations are based on methods outlined in the Highway Capacity Manual, 2016. Computer software from "McTrans Highway Capacity" package was used to facilitate extensive calculations.

In accordance with Caltrans' requirement, various traffic scenarios were analyzed to include present day traffic, and the addition of Project-generated traffic to existing (Year 2023), Project "Opening day" (Year 2025), and future traffic (Years 2035 \& 2045). The following lists the various specific scenarios that were analyzed and provides a reference to the appropriate figures.

Existing Year 2023 A.M. Peak Hour without Project-Generated Trips - (No Project Scenario). These volumes are actual traffic counts, as discussed in Section III, and are shown in Figure 2 herein.

Existing Year 2023 P.M Peak Hour- without Project-Generated Trips (No Project Scenario). These volumes are actual traffic counts, as discussed in Section III, and are shown in Figure 3 herein.

Year 2023 A.M. Peak Hour Volumes with the addition Project-Generated Trips. These volumes can be referenced in Figure 5A of this report.

Year 2023 P.M. Peak Hour Volumes with the addition of Project-Generated Trips. These volumes can be referenced in Figure 5B of this report.

Year 2025 "Opening Day" A.M Peak Hour without Project-Generated Trips - (No Project Scenario). Derivation of these volumes is discussed in Section III and is shown in Figure 6Aof this report.

Year 2025 "Opening Day" P.M Peak Hour without Project-Generated Trips. - (No Project Scenario). Derivation of these volumes is discussed in Section III and is shown in Figure 6B of this report.

Year 2025 "Opening Day" A.M. Peak Hour Volumes with the addition of Project-Generated Trips. These volumes can be referenced in Figure 7A of this report.

Year 2025 "Opening Day" P.M Peak Hour Volumes with the addition of Project-Generated Trips. These volumes can be referenced in Figure 7B of this report.

Year 2035 A.M Peak Hour without Project-Generated Trips - (No Project Scenario). Derivation of these volumes is discussed in Section III and is shown in Figure 8Aof this report.

Year 2035 P.M Peak Hour without Project-Generated Trips. - (No Project Scenario). Derivation of these volumes is discussed in Section III and is shown in Figure 8B of this report.

Year 2035 A.M. Peak Hour Volumes with the addition of Project-Generated Trips. These volumes can be referenced in Figure 9A of this report.

Year 2035 P.M Peak Hour Volumes with the addition of Project-Generated Trips. These volumes can be referenced in Figure 9B of this report.

Year 2045 A.M. Peak Hour Volumes without the addition Project-Generated Trips ("No
Project" Scenario). Derivation of these volumes is discussed in Section III of this report and can be referenced in Figure 10A herein.

Year 2045 P.M. Peak Hour Volumes without the addition of Project-Generated Trips ("No Project" Scenario). Derivation of these volumes is discussed in Section III of this report and can be referenced in Figure 10B herein.

Year 2045 A.M. Peak Hour Volumes with the addition of Project-Generated Trips. These volumes can be referenced in Figure 11A of this report.

Year 2045 P.M. Peak Hour Volumes with the addition of Project-Generated Trips. These volumes can be referenced in Figure 11B of this report.

Year 2045 A.M. Peak Hour Volumes with the addition of Project-Generated Trips - Evaluated under proposed mitigation improvements. In addition to the above scenarios, any facility needing mitigation was analyzed to determine the resultant Level of Service once proposed improvements were in-place.

Year 2045 P.M. Peak Hour Volumes with the addition of Project-Generated Trips - Evaluated under proposed mitigation improvements. In addition to the above scenarios, any facility needing mitigation was analyzed to determine the resultant Level of Service once proposed improvements were in-place. The criteria to warrant mitigation is discussed in Section V of this report.

Summaries of the Level of Service calculations for the various scenarios described have been included in the following tables:

- Table 6 shows the results of the intersection Level of Service calculations for all listed scenarios.
- Table 7 show the results of Level of Service calculations for various street segments for all listed scenarios.

The above list tables show scenarios with poor Levels of Service (below "C"), and resultant LOS with mitigation improvements. A detailed discussion of mitigation has been provided in Section VI of this report.
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TABLE 6: Intersection Level of Service (LOS) - Peak Hour

| Legend: |  | S = Signalized | 1W = One Way Stop Control |  |  |  | 4W = All Way Stop |  |  | $\mathrm{R}=$ Roundabout |  |  |  |  |  | Comp LOS | Intersection Delay (sec/veh) | Peak Hour Warrant Met (Yes/No) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. | Intersection | Time Period | Control | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |  |  |  |
| 1) |  <br> Cedar Ave | Year 2023 A.M. Existing | 1W | - | - | - | - | - | - | C | - | - | - | - | - | C | 15.4 | No |
|  |  | Year 2023 A.M. with Project | 1W | - | - | - | - | F | - | D | - | - | - | - | - | F | 2109.2 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. without Project | 1W | - | - | - | - | - | - | C | - | - | - | - | - | C | 16.0 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. with Project | 1W | - | - | - | - | F | - | D | - | - | - | - | - | F | 2482.5 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. without Project | 1W | - | - | - | - | - | - | C | - | - | - | - | - | C | 20.4 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. with Project | 1W | - | - | - | - | F | - | F | - | - | - | - | - | F | 8080.8 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. without Project | 1W | - | - | - | - | - | - | D | - | - | - | - | - | D | 27.9 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. with Project | 1W | - | - | - | - | F | - | F | - | - | - | - | - | F | 9954.1 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. with Project Mitigated | S | - | - | - | - | E | D | F | A | - | - | - | - | C | 32.5 | N/A |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Year 2023 P.M. Existing | 1W | - | - | - | - | - | - | B | - | - | - | - | - | B | 11.4 | No |
|  |  | Year 2023 P.M. with Project | 1W | - | - | - | - | F | - | B | - | - | - | - | - | F | 517.7 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. without Project | 1W | - | - | - | - | - | - | B | - | - | - | - | - | B | 11.7 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. with Project | 1W | - | - | - | - | F | - | C | - | - | - | - | - | F | 583.1 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. without Project | 1W | - | - | - | - | - | - | B | - | - | - | - | - | B | 13.4 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. with Project | 1W | - | - | - | - | F | - | C | - | - | - | - | - | F | 1080.5 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. without Project | 1W | - | - | - | - | - | - | C | - | - | - | - | - | C | 16.0 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. with Project | 1W | - | - | - | - | F | - | D | - | - | - | - | - | F | 2166.9 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. with Project Mitigated | S | - | - | - | - | E | D | B | A | - | - | - | - | B | 10.2 | N/A |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2) | Hwy 65 \& W Tulare Rd | Year 2023 A.M. Existing | 1W | - | - | - | F | - | D | D | - | - | - | - | - | D | 34.7 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2023 A.M. with Project | 1W | - | - | - | F | - | F | F | - | - | - | - | - | F | 91.2 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. without Project | 1W | - | - | - | F | - | E | D | - | - | - | - | - | E | 43.5 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. with Project | 1W | - | - | - | F | - | F | F | - | - | - | - | - | F | 138.5 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. without Project | 1W | - | - | - | F | - | F | F | - | - | - | - | - | F | 438.0 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. with Project | 1W | - | - | - | F | - | F | F | - | - | - | - | - | F | 688.1 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. without Project | 1W | - | - | - | F | - | F | F | - | - | - | - | - | F | 1365.1 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. with Project | 1W | - | - | - | F | - | F | F | - | - | - | - | - | F | 2692.4 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. with Project Mitigated | S | - | - | - | - | D | E | F | A | - | - | A | A | B | 14.8 | N/A |
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## TABLE 6: Intersection Level of Service (LOS) - Peak Hour

| Legend: |  | $s=$ Signalized | 1W = One Way Stop Control |  |  |  | 4W = All Way Stop |  |  | $\mathrm{R}=$ Roundabout |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Comp } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Intersection Delay (sec/veh) | Peak Hour Warrant Met (Yes/No) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. | Intersection | Time Period | Control | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |  |  |  |
| 2) | Hwy 65 \& W Tulare Rd | Year 2023 P.M. Existing | 1W | - | - | - | F | - | F | F | - | - | - | - | - | F | 86.0 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2023 P.M. with Project | 1W | - | - | - | F | - | F | F | - | - | - | - | - | F | 248.7 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. without Project | 1W | - | - | - | E | - | F | E | - | - | - | - | - | F | 126.8 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. with Project | 1W | - | - | - | F | - | F | F | - | - | - | - | - | F | 489.4 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. without Project | 1W | - | - | - | F | - | F | F | - | - | - | - | - | F | 1109.1 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. with Project | 1w | - | - | - | F | - | F | F | - | - | - | - | - | F | 4363.8 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. without Project | 1W | - | - | - | F | - | F | F | - | - | - | - | - | F | 8617.4 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. with Project | 1W | - | - | - | F | - | F | F | - | - | - | - | - | F | 32771.1 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. with Project Mitigated | S | - | - | - | - | D | F | F | A | - | - | A | A | B | 14.4 | N/A |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3) | Hwy 65 \& W Hermosa St | Year 2023 A.M. Existing | S | E | B | B | E | B | B | D | D | - | D | D | D | c | 28.5 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2023 A.M. with Project | S | E | C | B | E | B | B | D | D | - | D | D | D | c | 28.7 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. without Project | S | E | c | B | E | B | B | D | D | - | D | C | D | c | 29.0 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. with Project | S | E | c | B | E | B | B | D | D | - | D | c | D | c | 29.3 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. without Project | S | E | c | C | E | B | B | D | D | - | D | C | C | C | 33.2 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. with Project | S | E | c | c | E | C | B | D | D | - | D | c | c | c | 34.3 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. without Project | S | E | F | c | E | D | C | D | D | - | D | c | c | E | 62.0 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. with Project | S | E | F | c | E | C | B | D | E | - | F | c | C | E | 62.3 | N/A |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Year 2023 P.M. Existing | S | E | B | B | E | B | B | D | D | - | E | D | D | C | 26.7 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2023 P.M. with Project | S | E | B | B | E | B | B | D | D | - | E | D | D | c | 26.8 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. without Project | S | E | B | B | E | B | B | D | D | - | D | D | D | c | 27.2 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. with Project | S | E | B | B | E | B | B | D | D | - | D | D | D | c | 27.3 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. without Project | S | E | C | C | E | C | B | D | D | - | D | C | D | c | 30.6 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. with Project | S | E | C | C | E | c | B | D | D | - | D | C | D | C | 31.3 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. without Project | S | E | D | C | E | c | B | D | D | - | D | c | C | D | 36.9 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. with Project | S | E | D | c | E | c | B | D | D | - | D | c | c | D | 39.4 | N/A |
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TABLE 6: Intersection Level of Service (LOS) - Peak Hour

| Legend: |  | S = Signalized | 1W = One Way Stop Control |  |  |  | 4W = All Way Stop |  |  | $\mathrm{R}=$ Roundabout |  |  |  |  |  |  | Intersection Delay (sec/veh) | Peak Hour <br> Warrant Met (Yes/No) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Comp } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| No. | Intersection | Time Period | Control | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |  |  |  |
| 4) | Hwy 65 \& W Lindmore St | Year 2023 A.M. Existing | 1W | A | - | - | A | - | - | E | - | B | E | - | B | A | 9.8 | No |
|  |  | Year 2023 A.M. with Project | 1W | A | - | - | A | - | - | F | - | B | F | - | B | B | 10.4 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. without Project | 1W | A | - | - | A | - | - | E | - | B | E | - | B | B | 10.0 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. with Project | 1W | A | - | - | B | - | - | F | - | B | F | - | B | B | 10.6 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. without Project | 1W | A | - | - | B | - | - | F | - | B | F | - | B | B | 11.2 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. with Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | F | - | B | F | - | B | B | 12.4 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. without Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | F | - | B | F | - | B | B | 14.0 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. with Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | F | - | B | F | - | B | C | 17.0 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Year 2023 P.M. Existing | 1W | A | - | - | B | - | - | F | - | B | E | - | B | B | 11.4 | No |
|  |  | Year 2023 P.M. with Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | F | - | B | F | - | B | B | 12.7 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. without Project | 1W | A | - | - | B | - | - | F | - | B | F | - | B | B | 12.1 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. with Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | F | - | B | F | - | B | B | 13.6 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. without Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | F | - | B | F | - | B | B | 19.1 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. with Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | F | - | B | F | - | B | B | 24.3 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. without Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | F | - | B | F | - | C | F | 60.7 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. with Project | 1W | C | - | - | C | - | - | F | - | C | F | - | C | F | 85.6 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5) |  <br> Marigold St | Year 2023 A.M. Existing | 1W | A | - | - | A | - | - | C | - | A | B | - | B | B | 8.6 | No |
|  |  | Year 2023 A.M. with Project | 1W | A | - | - | A | - | - | C | - | A | C | - | B | B | 8.9 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. without Project | 1W | A | - | - | A | - | - | C | - | A | B | - | B | B | 8.6 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. with Project | 1W | A | - | - | A | - | - | C | - | A | C | - | B | B | 9.0 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. without Project | 1W | A | - | - | A | - | - | C | - | A | C | - | B | B | 9.1 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. with Project | 1W | A | - | - | A | - | - | C | - | B | C | - | B | B | 9.5 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. without Project | 1W | A | - | - | A | - | - | D | - | B | C | - | B | B | 9.6 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. with Project | 1W | A | - | - | B | - | - | D | - | B | C | - | B | B | 10.1 | No |
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TABLE 6: Intersection Level of Service (LOS) - Peak Hour

| Legend: |  | S = Signalized | 1W = One Way Stop Control |  |  |  | 4W = All Way Stop |  |  | $\mathrm{R}=$ Roundabout |  |  |  |  |  | Comp LOS | Intersection Delay (sec/veh) | Peak Hour <br> Warrant Met (Yes/No) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. | Intersection | Time Period | Control | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |  |  |  |
| 5) |  <br> Marigold St | Year 2023 P.M. Existing | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | - | - | B | E | - | B | B | 11.2 | No |
|  |  | Year 2023 P.M. with Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | - | - | B | E | - | B | B | 11.8 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. without Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | - | - | B | E | - | B | B | 11.4 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. with Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | - | - | B | F | - | B | B | 12.1 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. without Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | - | - | C | F | - | B | B | 13.7 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. with Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | - | - | C | F | - | B | B | 15.0 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. without Project | 1W | C | - | - | B | - | - | - | - | C | F | - | C | D | 26.3 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. with Project | 1W | C | - | - | B | - | - | - | - | C | F | - | C | D | 34.4 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6) | Hwy 65 \& Ave 208 | Year 2023 A.M. Existing | 1W | A | - | - | A | - | - | - | - | B | C | - | B | B | 9.2 | No |
|  |  | Year 2023 A.M. with Project | 1W | A | - | - | A | - | - | - | - | B | C | - | B | B | 9.6 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. without Project | 1W | A | - | - | A | - | - | - | - | B | C | - | B | B | 9.3 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. with Project | 1W | A | - | - | A | - | - | - | - | B | C | - | B | B | 9.7 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. without Project | 1W | A | - | - | B | - | - | - | - | B | C | - | B | B | 10.0 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. with Project | 1W | A | - | - | B | - | - | - | - | B | D | - | B | B | 10.4 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. without Project | 1W | A | - | - | B | - | - | - | - | B | D | - | B | B | 11.0 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. with Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | - | - | B | E | - | B | B | 11.6 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Year 2023 P.M. Existing | 1W | A | - | - | B | - | - | F | - | B | D | - | B | B | 10.7 | No |
|  |  | Year 2023 P.M. with Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | F | - | B | D | - | B | B | 11.2 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. without Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | F | - | B | D | - | B | B | 10.9 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. with Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | F | - | B | E | - | B | B | 11.4 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. without Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | F | - | B | E | - | B | B | 12.6 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. with Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | F | - | B | F | - | B | B | 13.2 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. without Project | 1W | B | - | - | B | - | - | F | - | C | F | - | C | C | 16.5 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. with Project | 1W | B | - | - | C | - | - | F | - | C | F | - | C | C | 19.9 | No |
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## TABLE 6: Intersection Level of Service (LOS) - Peak Hour

| Legend: |  | S = Signalized | 1W = One Way Stop Control |  |  |  | 4W = All Way Stop |  |  | $R=$ Roundabout |  |  |  |  |  | Comp LOS | Intersection Delay (sec/veh) | Peak Hour Warrant Met (Yes/No) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. | Intersection | Time Period | Control | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |  |  |  |
| 7) | Hwy 65 \& N <br> Spruce Ave | Year 2023 A.M. Existing | S | - | E | - | - | D | - | E | B | - | F | B | B | C | 24.0 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2023 A.M. with Project | S | - | E | - | - | D | - | E | C | - | E | C | C | C | 28.4 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. without Project | S | - | E | - | - | D | - | E | B | - | F | B | C | C | 25.1 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. with Project | S | - | E | - | - | D | - | E | C | - | E | C | C | C | 30.1 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. without Project | S | - | E | - | - | D | - | E | C | - | F | C | D | D | 35.7 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. with Project | S | - | E | - | - | F | - | E | D | - | E | D | D | D | 52.0 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. without Project | S | - | E | - | - | F | - | E | D | - | E | D | E | E | 69.2 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. with Project | S | - | E | - | - | F | - | E | D | - | E | F | F | F | 95.4 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. with Project Mitigated | S | - | E | - | D | D | - | C | B | - | B | C | F | C | 34.0 | N/A |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Year 2023 P.M. Existing | S | - | E | - | - | D | - | E | C | B | E | C | B | C | 25.5 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2023 P.M. with Project | S | - | E | - | - | D | - | E | C | B | E | C | C | C | 30.1 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. without Project | S | - | E | - | - | D | - | E | C | B | E | C | B | C | 26.9 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. with Project | S | - | E | - | - | D | - | E | C | B | E | C | C | C | 32.3 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. without Project | S | - | E | - | - | D | - | E | D | B | E | D | C | D | 45.0 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. with Project | S | - | E | - | - | F | - | E | F | C | E | E | B | E | 61.0 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. without Project | S | - | E | - | - | F | - | E | F | B | E | F | C | F | 88.0 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. with Project | S | - | E | - | - | F | - | E | F | B | E | F | C | F | 113.6 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. with Project Mitigated | S | - | E | - | D | D | - | C | B | B | B | C | D | C | 33.2 | N/A |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8) |  <br> Hwy 137 | Year 2023 A.M. Existing | S | D | D | - | D | D | - | E | B | B | E | C | B | C | 32.1 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2023 A.M. with Project | S | D | D | - | D | D | - | E | C | B | E | C | B | C | 32.4 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. without Project | S | D | D | - | D | D | - | E | C | B | E | C | B | C | 32.7 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. with Project | S | D | D | - | D | D | - | E | C | B | E | C | B | C | 33.0 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. without Project | S | D | D | - | D | D | - | E | C | B | E | C | C | D | 37.4 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. with Project | S | D | D | - | D | D | - | E | C | B | E | D | C | D | 38.9 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. without Project | S | D | F | - | D | D | - | E | D | C | E | E | C | E | 56.5 | N/A |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. with Project | S | D | F | - | D | D | - | E | E | C | E | F | C | E | 64.4 | N/A |

Traffic Impact Study for Gas Station, Convenience Market, Fast Food Restaurants and Truck Fueling Facility, Northeast Corner of State Highway 65 and Cedar Avenue, Tulare County, California, Revised August 14, 2023

TABLE 6: Intersection Level of Service (LOS) - Peak Hour
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TABLE 6: Intersection Level of Service (LOS) - Peak Hour

|  | Legend: | S = Signalized | 1W = One Way Stop Control |  |  |  | 4W = All Way Stop |  |  | $\mathrm{R}=$ Roundabout |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Comp } \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | Intersection Delay (sec/veh) | Peak Hour Warrant Met (Yes/No) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. | Intersection | Time Period | Control | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |  |  |  |
| 10) | Hwy 137 \& Road 180 | Year 2023 A.M. Existing | 1w | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | A | - | - | A | - | A | 3.5 | No |
|  |  | Year 2023 A.M. with Project | 1W | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | A | - | - | A | - | A | 3.6 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. without Project | 1w | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | A | - | - | A | - | A | 3.5 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. with Project | 1W | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | A | - | - | A | - | A | 3.6 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. without Project | 1W | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | A | - | - | A | - | A | 3.6 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. with Project | 1W | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | A | - | - | A | - | A | 3.7 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. without Project | 1W | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | A | - | - | A | - | A | 3.7 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. with Project | 1W | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | A | - | - | A | - | A | 3.8 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Year 2023 P.M. Existing | 1W | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | A | - | - | A | - | A | 3.6 | No |
|  |  | Year 2023 P.M. with Project | 1W | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | A | - | - | A | - | A | 3.7 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. without Project | 1W | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | A | - | - | A | - | A | 3.6 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. with Project | 1W | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | A | - | - | A | - | A | 3.7 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. without Project | 1W | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | A | - | - | A | - | A | 3.7 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. with Project | 1W | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | A | - | - | A | - | A | 3.8 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. without Project | 1W | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | A | - | - | A | - | A | 3.8 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. with Project | 1W | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | A | - | - | A | - | A | 3.9 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Year 2023 A.M. Existing | 1W | - | A | - | - | A | - | - | B | - | - | C | - | A | 4.2 | No |
|  |  | Year 2023 A.M. with Project | 1W | - | A | - | - | A | - | - | B | - | - | c | - | A | 4.4 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. without Project | 1W | - | A | - | - | A | - | - | B | - | - | c | - | A | 4.3 | No |
|  | N Spruce Ave \& | Year 2025 A.M. with Project | 1W | - | A | - | - | A | - | - | B | - | - | c | - | A | 4.5 | No |
| 11) | Acacia Ave | Year 2035 A.M. without Project | 1W | - | A | - | - | A | - | - | B | - | - | C | - | A | 4.7 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. with Project | 1W | - | A | - | - | A | - | - | C | - | - | D | - | A | 4.9 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. without Project | 1W | - | A | - | - | A | - | - | C | - | - | D | - | B | 5.3 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. with Project | 1W | - | A | - | - | A | - | - | c | - | - | E | - | B | 5.7 | No |
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TABLE 6: Intersection Level of Service (LOS) - Peak Hour

| Legend: |  | S = Signalized | 1W = One Way Stop Control |  |  |  | 4W = All Way Stop |  |  | $\mathrm{R}=$ Roundabout |  |  |  |  |  |  | Intersection Delay (sec/veh) | Peak Hour Warrant Met (Yes/No) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Comp } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| No. | Intersection | Time Period | Control | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |  |  |  |
| 11) | N Spruce Ave \& Acacia Ave | Year 2023 P.M. Existing | 1W | - | A | - | - | A | - | - | B | - | - | C | - | A | 4.1 | No |
|  |  | Year 2023 P.M. with Project | 1W | - | A | - | - | A | - | - | B | - | - | C | - | A | 4.2 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. without Project | 1W | - | A | - | - | A | - | - | B | - | - | C | - | A | 4.1 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. with Project | 1W | - | A | - | - | A | - | - | B | - | - | C | - | A | 4.2 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. without Project | 1W | - | A | - | - | A | - | - | B | - | - | C | - | A | 4.4 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. with Project | 1W | - | A | - | - | A | - | - | B | - | - | D | - | A | 4.6 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. without Project | 1W | - | A | - | - | A | - | - | B | - | - | D | - | A | 4.9 | No |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. with Project | 1W | - | A | - | - | A | - | - | C | - | - | E | - | B | 5.1 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12) | N Spruce Ave \& Sycamore Ave | Year 2023 A.M. Existing | 4W | F | - | - | F | - | - | C | - | - | C | - | - | F | 56.9 | No |
|  |  | Year 2023 A.M. with Project | 4W | F | - | - | F | - | - | C | - | - | C | - | - | F | 76.8 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. without Project | 4W | F | - | - | F | - | - | C | - | - | C | - | - | F | 67.1 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2025 A.M. with Project | 4W | F | - | - | F | - | - | C | - | - | C | - | - | F | 92.1 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. without Project | 4W | F | - | - | F | - | - | E | - | - | D | - | - | F | 165.7 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2035 A.M. with Project | 4W | F | - | - | F | - | - | E | - | - | D | - | - | F | 200.9 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. without Project | 4W | F | - | - | F | - | - | E | - | - | D | - | - | F | 1196.2 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. with Project | 4W | F | - | - | F | - | - | F | - | - | F | - | - | F | 1371.0 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2045 A.M. with Project Mitigated | S | B | C | - | B | C | B | D | D | D | D | D | D | C | 33.7 | N/A |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Year 2023 P.M. Existing | 4W | D | - | - | C | - | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | C | 21.9 | No |
|  |  | Year 2023 P.M. with Project | 4W | D | - | - | C | - | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | C | 23.5 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. without Project | 4W | E | - | - | C | - | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | D | 26.9 | No |
|  |  | Year 2025 P.M. with Project | 4W | F | - | - | C | - | - | B | - | - | B | - | - | D | 34.0 | No |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. without Project | 4W | F | - | - | D | - | - | C | - | - | B | - | - | F | 166.5 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2035 P.M. with Project | 4W | F | - | - | E | - | - | C | - | - | B | - | - | F | 208.5 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. without Project | 4W | F | - | - | F | - | - | D | - | - | C | - | - | F | 515.3 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. with Project | 4W | F | - | - | F | - | - | D | - | - | C | - | - | F | 582.5 | Yes |
|  |  | Year 2045 P.M. with Project Mitigated | S | A | B | - | B | B | A | - | E | D | - | E | D | C | 25.7 | N/A |
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## TABLE 7a: Street Segment Level of Service for AM Peak Hour

|  |  |  |  | Year 2023 <br> Existing A.M. <br> Volumes <br> (Figure 2) | Year 2023 <br> A.M. Plus <br> Project <br> Traffic <br> (Figure 5A) | Year 2025 <br> A.M. <br> Without <br> Project <br> Traffic <br> (Figure 6A) | Year 2025 <br> A.M. Plus <br> Project <br> Traffic <br> (Figure 7A) | Year 2035 <br> A.M. <br> Without <br> Project <br> Traffic <br> (Figure 8A) | Year 2035 <br> A.M. Plus <br> Project <br> Traffic <br> (Figure 9A) | Year 2045 <br> A.M. <br> Without <br> Project <br> Traffic <br> (Figure 8A) | Year 2045 <br> A.M. Plus <br> Project <br> Traffic <br> (Figure 9A) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Street Segment | Limits | Existing <br> \# of Laneage | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) |
| 1 | Hwy 65 | Cedar Ave/ <br> Tulare Rd | 2 | E | E | E | E | E | E | F | F |
| 2 | Hwy 65 | Tulare Rd/ <br> Hermosa St | 4 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 3 | Hwy 65 | Hermosa St/ Lindmore St | 4 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 4 | Hwy 65 | Lindmore St/ Marigold St | 4 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 5 | Hwy 65 | Marigold St/ Ave 208 | 4 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
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## TABLE 7a: Street Segment Level of Service for AM Peak Hour (cont.)

|  |  |  |  | Year 2023 <br> Existing A.M. <br> Volumes <br> (Figure 2) | Year 2023 <br> A.M. Plus <br> Project <br> Traffic <br> (Figure 5A) | Year 2025 <br> A.M. <br> Without <br> Project Traffic <br> (Figure 6A) | Year 2025 <br> A.M. Plus Project Traffic <br> (Figure 7A) | Year 2035 <br> A.M. <br> Without <br> Project <br> Traffic <br> (Figure 8A) | Year 2035 <br> A.M. Plus <br> Project <br> Traffic <br> (Figure 9A) | Year 2045 A.M. <br> Without Project Traffic (Figure 8A) | Year 2045 <br> A.M. Plus <br> Project <br> Traffic <br> (Figure 9A) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Street Segment | Limits | Existing \# of Laneage | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) |
| 6 | Hwy 65 | Cedar Ave/ <br> N Spruce Ave | 2 | E | E | E | E | E | E | F | F |
| 7 | Hwy 65 | N Spruce Ave/ Hwy 137 | 2 | D | D | D | D | E | E | E | E |
| 8 | Hwy 137 | Hwy 65/ <br> Road 188 | 2 | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D |
| 9 | Hwy 137 | Road 188/ <br> Road 180 | 2 | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C |
| 10 | N Spruce Ave | Hwy 65/ Acacia Ave | 2 | D | D | D | D | D | D | E | E |
| 11 | N Spruce Ave | Acacia Ave/ Sycamore Ave | 2 | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D |
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TABLE 7b: Street Segment Level of Service for PM Peak Hour

|  |  |  |  | Year 2023 <br> Existing P.M. <br> Volumes <br> (Figure 2) | Year 2023 <br> P.M. Plus <br> Project <br> Traffic <br> (Figure 5B) | Year 2025 <br> P.M. <br> Without <br> Project <br> Traffic <br> (Figure 6B) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } 2025 \\ \text { P.M. Plus } \\ \text { Project } \\ \text { Traffic } \\ \text { (Figure 7B) } \end{gathered}$ | Year 2035 <br> P.M. <br> Without <br> Project <br> Traffic <br> (Figure 8B) | Year 2035 <br> P.M. Plus <br> Project <br> Traffic <br> (Figure 9B) | Year 2045 <br> P.M. <br> Without <br> Project <br> Traffic <br> (Figure 8B) | Year 2045 <br> P.M. Plus <br> Project <br> Traffic <br> (Figure 9B) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Street Segment | Limits | Existing <br> \# of Laneage | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) |
| 1 | Hwy 65 | Cedar Ave/ <br> Tulare Rd | 2 | E | E | E | E | F | F | F | F |
| 2 | Hwy 65 | Tulare Rd/ <br> Hermosa St | 4 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 3 | Hwy 65 | Hermosa St/ <br> Lindmore St | 4 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 4 | Hwy 65 | Lindmore St/ Marigold St | 4 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 5 | Hwy 65 | Marigold St/ Ave 208 | 4 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
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TABLE 7b: Street Segment Level of Service for PM Peak Hour (cont.)

|  |  |  |  | Year 2023 <br> Existing P.M. <br> Volumes <br> (Figure 2) | Year 2023 <br> P.M. Plus Project Traffic (Figure 5B) | Year 2025 P.M. <br> Without Project Traffic (Figure 6B) | Year 2025 <br> P.M. Plus <br> Project <br> Traffic <br> (Figure 7B) | Year 2035 P.M. <br> Without Project Traffic (Figure 8B) | Year 2035 <br> P.M. Plus Project Traffic (Figure 9B) | Year 2045 P.M. <br> Without Project Traffic (Figure 8B) | Year 2045 <br> P.M. Plus <br> Project <br> Traffic <br> (Figure 9B) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Street Segment | Limits | Existing \# of Laneage | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) | Level of Service (LOS) |
| 6 | Hwy 65 | Cedar Ave/ <br> N Spruce Ave | 2 | E | E | E | E | E | E | F | F |
| 7 | Hwy 65 | N Spruce Ave/ Hwy 137 | 2 | D | D | D | D | E | E | E | E |
| 8 | Hwy 137 | Hwy 65/ <br> Road 188 | 2 | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D |
| 9 | Hwy 137 | Road 188/ <br> Road 180 | 2 | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C |
| 10 | N Spruce Ave | Hwy 65/ <br> Acacia Ave | 2 | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D |
| 11 | N Spruce Ave | Acacia Ave/ Sycamore Ave | 2 | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D |

## C. Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

Non-signalized intersections within a Project's vicinity are typically analyzed for satisfaction of the Peak Hour Volume Warrant as described in Section 9 of the Caltrans Traffic Manual and the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices. A brief explanation of the intersection warrant analysis is provided as follows:

The Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) prescribes "tests" which are conducted to determine the need for installation of a traffic signal. These "tests" are referred to as "warrants". The MUTCD list minimum signal "warrants", which have been adopted by the California Department of Transportation and most California agencies, including the City of Lindsay and the Country of Tulare. These "warrants" consist of evaluation of various criteria that have been determined as critical for the installation of a signal. The warrant criterion has been derived empirically.

In actual practice, justification for signal installation is usually based on satisfaction of a number of warrants as well as poor Levels of Service for multiple movements. In keeping within the scope of this traffic study, non-signalized intersections were evaluated for signalization, including expansion of the intersection, based solely on satisfaction of said Peak Hour Signal Warrant and a poor level of service.

As shown in Table 8 herein, the intersection of State Route 65 and Cedar Avenue, by the Year 2025, with the addition of Project-generated traffic, satisfies the Peak Hour Warrant. In addition, the intersection of State Route 65 and W. Tulare Road satisfies the Peak Hour Warrant under existing traffic volumes, without the addition of Project-generated traffic.
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Table 8: Peak Hour Warrant Analysis ${ }^{1}$

|  |  | Year 2023 Volumes |  | Year 2025 Volumes |  | Year 2035 Volumes |  | Year 2045 Volumes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Existing <br> Volumes (Figures 2 \& 3) | Existing <br> Volumes Plus Project <br> (Figure 5) | Opening Day <br> Volumes <br> (Figure 6) | Opening Day <br> Volumes Plus Project (Figure 7) | Future Volumes (Figures 8) | Future <br> Volumes <br> Plus Project <br> (Figures 9) | Future <br> Volumes <br> (Figures 10) | Future <br> Volumes Plus Project (Figures 11) |
| No. | Existing NonSignalized Intersection | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied | Peak Hour Warrant Satisfied | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied |
| 1) | Hwy 65 \& Cedar Ave AM | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
|  | Hwy 65 \& Cedar Ave PM | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2) | Hwy 65 \& W Tulare Rd AM | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | Hwy 65 \& W Tulare Rd PM | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3) | Hwy 65 \& W Lindmore St AM | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | Hwy 65 \& W Lindmore St PM | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |

1) Table shown as summary only. Peak Warrant calculations included in Appendix " $C$ " herein.
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Table 8: Peak Hour Warrant Analysis (cont.) ${ }^{1}$

|  |  | Year 2023 Volumes |  | Year 2025 Volumes |  | Year 2035 Volumes |  | Year 2045 Volumes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Existing <br> Volumes <br>  <br> 3) | Existing <br> Volumes <br> Plus Project <br> (Figure 5) | Opening Day <br> Volumes <br> (Figure 6) | Opening Day <br> Volumes Plus Project (Figure 7) | Future Volumes (Figures 8) | Future <br> Volumes Plus Project (Figures 9) | Future <br> Volumes <br> (Figures 10) | Future <br> Volumes Plus Project (Figures 11) |
| No. | Existing NonSignalized Intersection | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied | Peak Hour Warrant Satisfied | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied |
| 4) | Hwy 65 \& Marigold St AM | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | Hwy 65 \& Marigold St PM | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5) | Hwy 65 \& Ave 208 AM | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | Hwy 65 \& Ave 208 PM | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6) | Hwy 137 \& Road 188 AM | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | Hwy 137 \& Road 188 PM | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |

1) Table shown as summary only. Peak Warrant calculations included in Appendix " $C$ " herein.
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Table 8: Peak Hour Warrant Analysis (cont.) ${ }^{1}$

|  |  | Year 2023 Volumes |  | Year 2025 Volumes |  | Year 2035 Volumes |  | Year 2045 Volumes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Existing <br> Volumes (Figures 2 \& 3) | Existing <br> Volumes <br> Plus Project <br> (Figure 5) | Opening Day <br> Volumes <br> (Figure 6) | Opening Day <br> Volumes Plus Project (Figure 7) | Future <br> Volumes <br> (Figures 8) | Future <br> Volumes Plus Project (Figures 9) | Future <br> Volumes <br> (Figures 10) | Future Volumes Plus Project (Figures 11) |
| No. | Existing NonSignalized Intersection | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied | Peak Hour Warrant Satisfied | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied | Peak Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied | Peak Hour Warrant Satisfied |
| 7) | Hwy 137 \& Road 180 AM | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | Hwy 137 \& Road 180 PM | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8) | N Spruce Ave \& Acacia Ave AM | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | N Spruce Ave \& Acacia Ave PM | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9) | N Spruce Ave \& Sycamore Ave AM | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  | N Spruce Ave \& Sycamore Ave PM | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

1) Table shown as summary only. Peak Warrant calculations included in Appendix " $C$ " herein.

## V. PROJECT VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED

## A. Background

The California Legislature, through Senate Bill 746, Senate Bill 32, and Executive Order, have required the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to consider the effects of a project on the surrounding transportation system, with Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as an appropriate measure of impact. The specific goal is reduction of greenhouse gas emission by reducing reliance on individual vehicles, improving mass transit, and reduction in trip length via denser infill development.

Senate Bill 32 requires the State of California to reduce greenhouse gas emission to 40 percent below 1990 levels by Year 2030; and Executive Order requires reduction of greenhouse gas emission to 90 percent below 1990 levels by Year 2050.

The calculation of VMT of any project, simply put, is the number of project-generated trips multiplied by the travel length of each trip. Obviously, there is no completely precise method for determining VMT for any project prior to development and occupancy; however, the best available data must be used for estimating both project-generated trips and trip length.

## B. Project Generated Trips for VMT Calculation

The phenomena of "Capture", "Pass-by" and "Diverted Link" trips have been previously discussed. However, trip reductions taken for these phenomena for the purpose of Level of Service (LOS) analysis are typically limited by agency standards. This ensures a conservative analysis of Level of Service (LOS) impact. For determination of VMT, this analysis has defaulted to rates obtained from driveway surveys. As indicated earlier, multiple field surveys of the adjacent highway commercial development as well as other similar facilities virtually all Projectgenerated trips are "pass-bys" trips do not contribute to VMT. Since all vehicles must eventually stop for fuel, it can be argued that any other fueling destination would not be a lesser distance traveled than the Project.

## VI. TRAFFIC MITIGATION

## A. Project's Obligation to Fund Mitigation

Mitigation is normally considered necessary if a particular intersection or street segment, under any existing or future scenario, (with or without the addition of Project-generated traffic), is anticipated to function at a less than Level of Service (LOS) "C". Generally, the objective of traffic mitigation is to restore the Level of Service to a "C" or better. However, the Project, only has an obligation to fund mitigation if the addition of its trip generation caused the Level of Service (LOS) of a facility to fall below " $C$ "; or degrade a pre-Project LOS that is already less than " $C$ " further.

In other words, if a facility presently functions at a LOS of " D ", and Project-generated traffic does not degrade the LOS further to an " $E$ ", then the project has no obligation to fund mitigation. However, in this same scenario, if Project trips degraded the LOS from a "D" to an "E", then the project would be obligated to mitigate to the pre-project LOS of "D".

## B. Project's Pro-Rata Share of Mitigation

In a scenario where degradation of a facility's LOS to less than " $C$ " is attributable to Projectgenerated traffic, the Project pro-rata share of mitigation necessary to restore a " C " LOS. If a facility's pre-project LOS was a " $D$ " or worse, mitigation is only required to restore the LOS to the pre-project condition. Again, if the LOS degradation is not attributable to the Project, the developer has no obligation to fund mitigation.

For mitigation improvements inside the Caltrans right of way, the equation is the ratio of Project traffic to the difference of future traffic and current existing traffic. Again, the total Year 2042 traffic includes Project or cumulative project trips. The equation is as follows:

$$
\text { Caltrans Pro - rata Share }=\frac{\text { Project Traffic }}{\text { Total Future Traffic - Current Existing Traffic }}
$$
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Table 9: Project Pro-Rata Share

|  |  | 2045 A.M. Peak Hour |  |  |  | 2045 P.M. Peak Hour |  |  |  | Weighted Average Project ProRata Share |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | Mitigation | Total <br> Traffic <br> Year 2022 | Total <br> Traffic <br> Year 2042 | Project Generated Traffic | Project Pro-Rata Share | Total <br> Traffic <br> Year 2022 | Total <br> Traffic <br> Year 2042 | Project Generated Traffic | Project Pro-Rata Share |  |
| Highway 65 and Cedar Ave | Install Traffic Signal | 1,959 | 2,760 | 419 | 52\% | 1,601 | 2,242 | 363 | 57\% | 54\% |
| Highway 65 and N Spruce Ave | Widened for Additional Lanes | 2,418 | 3,528 | 286 | 26\% | 2,474 | 3,639 | 234 | 20\% | 23\% |

## Notes:

1. Pro-rata Share for mitigation in Caltrans' right of way calculated using the Caltrans pro-rata share formula: (Project Traffic/(Future Traffic-Present Traffic))

## C. Proposed Mitigation

As discussed in detail earlier in this report, a poor operational Level of Service for multiple movements, and satisfaction of the Peak Hour Warrant were considered justification for installation of a traffic signal or upgrading an existing signalized intersection (to full expansion in accordance with all local standards).

In any present day or future year scenario, degradation of the LOS of a street segment to less than "C", whether or not attributable to Project-traffic, was considered justification for mitigation. However, as discussed, the Project may or may not be obligated to fund such mitigation.

It should be noted that in the analysis of an intersection, every through and turning movement is evaluated for its own Level of Service (LOS). However, the average estimated delay of all vehicles passing through the intersection is used to determine a composite, or average LOS. The composite level of service is used to determine if mitigation is required. In the following, the need for mitigation is discussed for every intersection and street segment within the scope of this study.
I. Intersections: As shown in Table 6, there are four intersections that are anticipated to degrade or currently function at an unsatisfactory LOS. In the following, each intersection within the scope of this study is discussed including the need for mitigation and Project obligation for funding such:
A. State Route 65 and W. Tulare Avenue: Under present day traffic volumes, this intersection has been shown to operate at a Level of Service (LOS) of "D". Again, the poor LOS is without the addition of Project-generation traffic.

Recommended Mitigation: Signalization of this intersection would theoretically improve its LOS to an " $A$ "; however, this intersection is less than a quarter mile from the intersection of Cedar Avenue. As discussed in the next item, a signal is also warranted at Cedar Avenue and SR 65. However, since mitigation was warranted under existing traffic volumes without the addition of Project-generated traffic, the Project should have no obligation to fund mitigation. Again, as mentioned in Section II herein, W. Tulare will be realigned to tie into Oak Avenue and its intersection with SR 65 will be removed.
B. Intersection of State Route 65 and Cedar Avenue: Under existing conditions, with a "no Project scenario", this intersection currently function at an LOS of " C ". The addition of Project-generated traffic further degrades the LOS to less than " C ".

Recommended Mitigation: Installation of a traffic signal at this intersection will improve the LOS to a " C " and better through the year 2045. Given the addition of Projectgenerated traffic degrades the LOS under present day and future volumes, this signal
should be installed by "Opening Day". As mentioned previously, roundabout project, Cedar Ave will be realigned as a part of the roundabout construction project and realignment of State Route 65. It is recommended that the intersection be re-evaluated in the future in order to determine new intersection control methods are appropriate for the new layout.
C. Intersection of State Route 65 and North Spruce Avenue: For Year 2035 analysis, with a "no Project scenario", this intersection currently function at an LOS of " C ". The addition of Project-generated traffic further degrades the LOS of "D".

Recommended Mitigation: Widening this intersection to include more lanes will improve the LOS to a " C " through the year 2045. For the western and eastern segments, the intersection should be widened to include three lanes in each direction, including dedicated left turn lane. For the northern segment, it should be widened to three lanes, with two lanes as dedicated left turn lanes. The southern segment can remain unchanged. Again, the addition of Project-generated traffic degrades the LOS under Year 2035 conditions only. Under present day and opening day conditions, the LOS does not degrade with the addition of the project.
D. North Spruce Avenue and Sycamore Avenue: Under present day traffic volumes, this intersection has been shown to operate at a Level of Service (LOS) of "F". The poor LOS is without the addition of Project-generation traffic.

Recommended Mitigation: Signalization of this intersection would theoretically improve its LOS to an "C"; Since mitigation was warranted under existing traffic volumes, and without the addition of Project-generated traffic, the Project should have no obligation to fund mitigation.
II. Street Segments: Street segment LOS for all analyzed traffic scenarios are shown in Table 7 a and 7 b . The addition of Project-generated traffic under any present day or future scenario did not degrade the level of service; therefore, no mitigation is warranted.

## VII. CONCLUSIONS \& RECOMMENDATIONS

The study has shown that with the addition of Project-generated traffic, a traffic signal is warranted at the intersection of Cedar Avenue and State Route 65. This signal is warranted by "opening day" of the Project and will result in a satisfactory LOS for this intersection through the year 2045.

It is noted that this study has been prepared in a conservative manner. Some of the conservative methodology is summarized in the following:

- Although the latest surveys for State Highway 65 indicate a decreasing trend in traffic volume, a positive growth factor of $1.9 \%$ was used to extrapolate future traffic scenarios.
- "Pass-by" rates used to determine final trip count were far less than that yielded by numerous surveys of similar highway commercial developments. Although pass-by trips will affect driveway and intersection LOS, they should not be added to the volume of surrounding streets, to include State Route 65 . Since the trip reduction for "pass-bys" was only 20 percent, the analysis of State 65 should certainly be considered conservative.

Finally, the calculations and "findings" of this report have shown that with implementation of recommended mitigation the impact of the Project and adjacent development will be "less-thansignificant".

Additionally, as mentioned previously, Caltrans and the County of Tulare have plans to re-align and reconstruct State Route 65, which will include the construction of a roundabout, located at the intersection of State Route 65 and Cedar Avenue, tentatively planned to commence in 2034. As a part of the roundabout project, Cedar Ave will be realigned to the East to connect with Oak Ave. It is recommended that the intersection of State Route 65 and Cedar Avenue be re-evaluated in the future to determine if the intersection's traffic control improvements are adequate.

## Appendix " A "

Exhibits and Figures





















## Intersections

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Ave 208 |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 0 | 16 |  | 20 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 8 | 612 | 24 | 0 | 20 | 476 | 12 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Ave 208 |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 0 | 16 |  | 20 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 8 | 689 | 24 | 0 | 23 | 541 | 14 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Ave 208 |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 0 | 17 |  | 21 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 8 | 636 | 25 | 0 | 21 | 495 | 12 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Ave 208 |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 0 | 17 |  | 21 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 8 | 713 | 25 | 0 | 24 | 560 | 14 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Ave 208 |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 0 | 20 |  | 25 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 10 | 771 | 30 | 0 | 25 | 600 | 15 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Ave 208 |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 0 | 20 |  | 25 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 10 | 848 | 30 | 0 | 28 | 665 | 17 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Ave 208 |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 0 | 24 |  | 30 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 12 | 930 | 36 | 0 | 30 | 724 | 18 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Ave 208 |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 0 | 24 |  | 30 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 12 | 1007 | 36 | 0 | 44 | 789 | 20 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Cedar Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | Cedar Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 660 |  |  |  | 880 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 346 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, Q ${ }_{95}$ (veh) | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 15.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Cedar Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | Cedar Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 139 | 660 |  |  |  | 954 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 134 |  | 72 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Cedar Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | Cedar Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 686 |  |  |  | 914 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 326 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 16.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Cedar Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | Cedar Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 139 | 686 |  |  |  | 988 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 134 |  | 72 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Cedar Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | Cedar Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 832 |  |  |  | 1109 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 233 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 20.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Cedar Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | Cedar Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 139 | 832 |  |  |  | 1183 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 134 |  | 72 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Cedar Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | Cedar Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 1003 |  |  |  | 1338 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 157 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 27.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Cedar Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | Cedar Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 139 | 1003 |  |  |  | 1412 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 134 |  | 72 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 158 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 234 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 138 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 1.14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, Q ${ }_{95}$ (veh) | 21.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 427.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Marigold St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 8 | 8 | 0 |  | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 460 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 344 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Marigold St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 9 | 8 | 0 |  | 8 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 548 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 422 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Marigold St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 8 | 8 | 0 |  | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 478 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 357 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Marigold St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 9 | 8 | 0 |  | 8 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 566 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 435 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



[^0]
## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Marigold St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 10 | 10 | 0 |  | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 580 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 433 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Marigold St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 11 | 10 | 0 |  | 10 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 668 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 511 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Marigold St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 12 | 12 | 0 |  | 12 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 699 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 523 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Marigold St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 13 | 12 | 0 |  | 12 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 787 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 601 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Lindmore St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | W Lindmore St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 12 | 8 |  | 0 | 12 | 32 | 0 | 4 | 644 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 584 | 4 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Lindmore St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | W Lindmore St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 12 | 8 |  | 0 | 12 | 37 | 0 | 4 | 743 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 668 | 4 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Lindmore St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | W Lindmore St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 12 | 8 |  | 0 | 12 | 33 | 0 | 4 | 669 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 607 | 4 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



Copyright © 2023 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Lindmore St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | W Lindmore St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 12 | 8 |  | 0 | 12 | 38 | 0 | 4 | 768 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 691 | 4 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



[^1]
## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Lindmore St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | W Lindmore St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 15 | 10 |  | 0 | 15 | 40 | 0 | 5 | 811 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 736 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Lindmore St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | W Lindmore St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 15 | 10 |  | 0 | 15 | 45 | 0 | 5 | 910 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 820 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



[^2]
## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Lindmore St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | W Lindmore St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 18 | 12 |  | 0 | 18 | 49 | 0 | 6 | 979 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 888 | 6 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Lindmore St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | W Lindmore St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 18 | 12 |  | 0 | 18 | 54 | 0 | 6 | 1078 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 972 | 6 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Tulare Rd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | W Tulare Rd |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  | T | R |  |  |  |  |  | L |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 108 | 875 |  |  |  | 960 | 55 |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  | 114 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage |  |  |  |  | ded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 123 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 |  | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 274 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22 |  | 254 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.74 |  | 0.51 |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.7 |  | 3.0 |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 28.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 464.0 |  | 33.7 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  | D |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 80.7 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |

HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Tulare Rd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | W Tulare Rd |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  | T | R |  |  |  |  |  | L |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 130 | 987 |  |  |  | 1098 | 55 |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  | 130 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage |  |  |  |  | ded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Tulare Rd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | W Tulare Rd |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  | T | R |  |  |  |  |  | L |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 112 | 909 |  |  |  | 997 | 57 |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |  | 118 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage |  |  |  |  | ded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 127 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 |  | 134 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 256 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 |  | 240 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.99 |  | 0.56 |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 2.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 |  | 3.6 |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 32.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 819.0 |  | 38.5 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  | E |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | 3.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 126.6 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |

HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Tulare Rd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | W Tulare Rd |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  | T | R |  |  |  |  |  | L |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 134 | 1021 |  |  |  | 1135 | 57 |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |  | 134 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage |  |  |  |  | ded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 152 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 |  | 152 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 202 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 194 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.34 |  | 0.79 |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 7.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.9 |  | 7.9 |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 71.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5768.5 |  | 82.5 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  | F |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | 8.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 654.9 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Tulare Rd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | W Tulare Rd |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  | T | R |  |  |  |  |  | L |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 136 | 1103 |  |  |  | 1210 | 69 |  |  |  |  |  | 18 |  | 144 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage |  |  |  |  | ded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Tulare Rd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | W Tulare Rd |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  | T | R |  |  |  |  |  | L |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 158 | 1215 |  |  |  | 1348 | 69 |  |  |  |  |  | 18 |  | 160 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage |  |  |  |  | ded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 180 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |  | 182 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 137 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 139 |
| v/c Ratio | 1.31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.31 |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 30.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30.4 |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 689.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 680.3 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 9.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Tulare Rd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | W Tulare Rd |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  | T | R |  |  |  |  |  | L |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 164 | 1330 |  |  |  | 1459 | 84 |  |  |  |  |  | 21 |  | 173 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage |  |  |  |  | ded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 186 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24 |  | 197 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 110 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 117 |
| v/c Ratio | 1.70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.69 |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 44.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 46.3 |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 1368.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1342.0 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Tulare Rd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | W Tulare Rd |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  | T | R |  |  |  |  |  | L |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 186 | 1442 |  |  |  | 1597 | 84 |  |  |  |  |  | 21 |  | 189 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage |  |  |  |  | ded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service




## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 180 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 180 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 156 | 0 |  | 0 | 148 | 0 |  | 12 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 180 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 180 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 199 | 0 |  | 0 | 189 | 0 |  | 12 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 16 |  |  |  | 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 1120 |  |  |  | 1336 |  |  |  |  | 516 |  |  |  | 583 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.00 |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  |  | 0.01 |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 8.2 |  |  |  | 7.7 |  |  |  |  | 12.2 |  |  |  | 11.2 |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | A |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |  | B |  |  |  | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | . 0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 12.2 |  |  |  | 11.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B |  |  |  | B |  |
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 180 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 180 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 162 | 0 |  | 0 | 154 | 0 |  | 12 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 16 |  |  |  | 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 1188 |  |  |  | 1385 |  |  |  |  | 583 |  |  |  | 644 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.00 |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  |  | 0.01 |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 8.0 |  |  |  | 7.6 |  |  |  |  | 11.3 |  |  |  | 10.6 |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | A |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |  | B |  |  |  | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | . 0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 11.3 |  |  |  | 10.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B |  |  |  | B |  |
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 180 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 180 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 205 | 0 |  | 0 | 195 | 0 |  | 12 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 180 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 180 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 197 | 0 |  | 0 | 186 | 0 |  | 15 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 180 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 180 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 240 | 0 |  | 0 | 227 | 0 |  | 15 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 180 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 180 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 237 | 0 |  | 0 | 225 | 0 |  | 18 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



[^9]
## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 180 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 180 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 280 | 0 |  | 0 | 268 | 0 |  | 18 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 188 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 188 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 12 | 224 | 4 |  | 0 | 332 | 20 |  | 0 | 8 | 0 |  | 16 | 4 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 188 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 188 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 12 | 271 | 4 |  | 0 | 377 | 23 |  | 0 | 8 | 0 |  | 19 | 4 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 14 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |  |  | 26 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 784 |  |  |  | 1242 |  |  |  |  | 302 |  |  |  | 296 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.02 |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  |  | 0.09 |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.1 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |  | 0.3 |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 9.7 |  |  |  | 7.9 |  |  |  |  | 17.3 |  |  |  | 18.3 |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | A |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 0.6 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 17.3 |  |  |  | 18.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  | C |  |
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 188 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 188 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 12 | 233 | 4 |  | 0 | 345 | 21 |  | 0 | 8 | 0 |  | 17 | 4 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 188 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 188 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 12 | 280 | 4 |  | 0 | 390 | 24 |  | 0 | 8 | 0 |  | 20 | 4 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 188 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 188 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 15 | 282 | 5 |  | 0 | 418 | 25 |  | 0 | 10 | 0 |  | 20 | 5 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 188 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 188 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 15 | 329 | 5 |  | 0 | 463 | 28 |  | 0 | 10 | 0 |  | 23 | 5 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 17 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |  |  | 32 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 672 |  |  |  | 1173 |  |  |  |  | 234 |  |  |  | 222 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.03 |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.05 |  |  |  | 0.14 |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.1 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.2 |  |  |  | 0.5 |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 10.5 |  |  |  | 8.1 |  |  |  |  | 21.2 |  |  |  | 23.9 |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 0.8 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 21.2 |  |  |  | 23.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  | C |  |
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 188 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 188 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 18 | 340 | 6 |  | 0 | 505 | 30 |  | 0 | 12 | 0 |  | 24 | 6 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 20 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 34 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 623 |  |  |  | 1160 |  |  |  |  | 211 |  |  |  | 196 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.03 |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.06 |  |  |  | 0.17 |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.1 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.2 |  |  |  | 0.6 |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 11.0 |  |  |  | 8.1 |  |  |  |  | 23.3 |  |  |  | 27.2 |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 1.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 23.3 |  |  |  | 27.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  | D |  |

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 188 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 188 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 18 | 387 | 6 |  | 0 | 550 | 33 |  | 0 | 12 | 0 |  | 27 | 6 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 20 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 38 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 575 |  |  |  | 1108 |  |  |  |  | 180 |  |  |  | 164 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.04 |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  | 0.23 |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.1 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.2 |  |  |  | 0.9 |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 11.5 |  |  |  | 8.2 |  |  |  |  | 26.6 |  |  |  | 33.4 |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 1.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 26.6 |  |  |  | 33.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  | D |  |

[^14]
## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

Site Information

| Intersection | N Spruce Ave/Acacia Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Acacia Ave |
| North/South Street | N Spruce Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



[^15]
## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | N Spruce Ave/Acacia Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Acacia Ave |
| North/South Street | N Spruce Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | N Spruce Ave/Acacia Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Acacia Ave |
| North/South Street | N Spruce Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | N Spruce Ave/Acacia Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Acacia Ave |
| North/South Street | N Spruce Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | N Spruce Ave/Acacia Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Acacia Ave |
| North/South Street | N Spruce Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | N Spruce Ave/Acacia Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Acacia Ave |
| North/South Street | N Spruce Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

Site Information

| Intersection | N Spruce Ave/Acacia Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Acacia Ave |
| North/South Street | N Spruce Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | N Spruce Ave/Acacia Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Acacia Ave |
| North/South Street | N Spruce Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



HCS7 All-Way Stop Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB | Intersection | N Spruce Ave/SycamoreAve |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting | Jurisdiction | County |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ | East/West Street | Sycamore Ave |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | N Spruce Ave |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | 0.92 |  |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |  |  |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volume and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume | 16 | 128 | 92 | 4 | 164 | 52 | 32 | 420 | 0 | 44 | 400 | 4 |
| \% Thrus in Shared Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 257 |  |  | 239 |  |  | 491 |  |  | 487 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |

Departure Headway and Service Time

| Initial Departure Headway, hd (s) | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial Degree of Utilization, x | 0.228 |  |  | 0.213 |  |  | 0.437 |  |  | 0.433 |  |  |
| Final Departure Headway, hd (s) | 8.26 |  |  | 8.42 |  |  | 7.52 |  |  | 7.53 |  |  |
| Final Degree of Utilization, $x$ | 0.589 |  |  | 0.559 |  |  | 1.027 |  |  | 1.018 |  |  |
| Move-Up Time, m (s) | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  |
| Service Time, ts (s) | 6.26 |  |  | 6.42 |  |  | 5.52 |  |  | 5.53 |  |  |

Capacity, Delay and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 257 |  | 239 |  | 491 |  | 487 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity | 436 |  | 428 |  | 478 |  | 478 |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, Q ${ }_{95}$ (veh) | 3.7 |  | 3.3 |  | 14.4 |  | 14.1 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 22.4 |  | 21.6 |  | 75.9 |  | 73.4 |  |  |
| Level of Service, LOS | C |  | C |  | F |  | F |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 22.4 |  | 21.6 |  | 75.9 |  | 73.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  | C |  | F |  | F |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 56.9 |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 All-Way Stop Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB | Intersection | N Spruce Ave/SycamoreAve |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting | Jurisdiction | County |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ | North/South Street | Sycamore Ave |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | Peak Hour Factor | N Spruce Ave |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | 0.92 |  |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |  |  |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volume and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume | 16 | 128 | 99 | 5 | 164 | 52 | 35 | 464 | 0 | 44 | 432 | 4 |
| \% Thrus in Shared Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 264 |  |  | 240 |  |  | 542 |  |  | 522 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |

Departure Headway and Service Time

| Initial Departure Headway, hd (s) | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial Degree of Utilization, x | 0.235 |  |  | 0.214 |  |  | 0.482 |  |  | 0.464 |  |  |  |
| Final Departure Headway, hd (s) | 8.24 |  |  | 8.44 |  |  | 7.53 |  |  | 7.53 |  |  |  |
| Final Degree of Utilization, $x$ | 0.604 |  |  | 0.563 |  |  | 1.134 |  |  | 1.091 |  |  |  |
| Move-Up Time, m (s) | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  |  |
| Service Time, ts (s) | 6.24 |  |  | 6.44 |  |  | 5.53 |  |  | 5.53 |  |  |  |

Capacity, Delay and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 264 |  | 240 |  | 542 |  | 522 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity | 437 |  | 427 |  | 478 |  | 478 |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 3.9 |  | 3.4 |  | 18.8 |  | 17.0 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 23.0 |  | 21.8 |  | 109.7 |  | 95.1 |  |  |
| Level of Service, LOS | C |  | C |  | F |  | F |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 23.0 |  | 21.8 |  | 109.7 |  | 95.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  | C |  | F |  | F |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 76.8 |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 All-Way Stop Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB | Intersection | N Spruce Ave/SycamoreAve |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting | Jurisdiction | County |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ | East/West Street | Sycamore Ave |
| Analysis Year | 2025 | Peak Hour Factor | N Spruce Ave |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |  | 0.92 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |  |  |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volume and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume | 17 | 133 | 96 | 4 | 170 | 54 | 33 | 436 | 0 | 46 | 416 | 4 |
| \% Thrus in Shared Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 267 |  |  | 248 |  |  | 510 |  |  | 507 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |

Departure Headway and Service Time


Capacity, Delay and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 267 |  | 248 |  | 510 |  | 507 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity | 434 |  | 426 |  | 474 |  | 474 |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, Q ${ }_{95}$ (veh) | 4.0 |  | 3.6 |  | 16.2 |  | 16.0 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 23.7 |  | 22.6 |  | 90.4 |  | 88.3 |  |  |
| Level of Service, LOS | C |  | C |  | F |  | F |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 23.7 |  | 22.6 |  | 90.4 |  | 88.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  | C |  | F |  | F |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 67.1 |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 All-Way Stop Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB | Intersection | N Spruce Ave/SycamoreAve |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting | $3 / 28 / 23$ | Earisdiction |
| Date Performed | 2025 | North/South Street | County |
| Analysis Year | 0.25 | Peak Hour Factor | N Spruce Ave |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | AM Peak Hour + Project | 0.92 |  |
| Time Analyzed | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |  |  |
| Project Description |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volume and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume | 17 | 133 | 103 | 5 | 170 | 54 | 36 | 480 | 0 | 46 | 448 | 4 |
| \% Thrus in Shared Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 275 |  |  | 249 |  |  | 561 |  |  | 541 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |

Departure Headway and Service Time

| Initial Departure Headway, hd (s) | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial Degree of Utilization, x | 0.244 |  |  | 0.221 |  |  | 0.499 |  |  | 0.481 |  |  |  |
| Final Departure Headway, hd (s) | 8.30 |  |  | 8.51 |  |  | 7.67 |  |  | 7.67 |  |  |  |
| Final Degree of Utilization, $x$ | 0.634 |  |  | 0.589 |  |  | 1.194 |  |  | 1.153 |  |  |  |
| Move-Up Time, m (s) | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  |  |
| Service Time, ts (s) | 6.30 |  |  | 6.51 |  |  | 5.67 |  |  | 5.67 |  |  |  |

Capacity, Delay and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 275 |  | 249 |  | 561 |  | 541 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity | 434 |  | 423 |  | 470 |  | 470 |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, Q ${ }_{95}$ (veh) | 4.3 |  | 3.7 |  | 21.3 |  | 19.4 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 24.6 |  | 23.0 |  | 132.1 |  | 116.9 |  |  |
| Level of Service, LOS | C |  | C |  | F |  | F |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 24.6 |  | 23.0 |  | 132.1 |  | 116.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  | C |  | F |  | F |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 92.1 |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 All-Way Stop Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB | Intersection | N Spruce Ave/SycamoreAve |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting | Jurisdiction | County |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ | East/West Street | Sycamore Ave |
| Analysis Year | 2035 | North/South Street | N Spruce Ave |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | 0.92 |  |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |  |  |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volume and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume | 20 | 161 | 116 | 5 | 207 | 66 | 40 | 529 | 0 | 55 | 504 | 5 |
| \% Thrus in Shared Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 323 |  |  | 302 |  |  | 618 |  |  | 613 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |

Departure Headway and Service Time

| Initial Departure Headway, hd (s) | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial Degree of Utilization, x | 0.287 |  |  | 0.269 |  |  | 0.550 |  |  | 0.545 |  |  |
| Final Departure Headway, hd (s) | 8.70 |  |  | 8.87 |  |  | 8.39 |  |  | 8.39 |  |  |
| Final Degree of Utilization, x | 0.780 |  |  | 0.745 |  |  | 1.442 |  |  | 1.429 |  |  |
| Move-Up Time, m (s) | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  |
| Service Time, ts (s) | 6.70 |  |  | 6.87 |  |  | 6.39 |  |  | 6.39 |  |  |

Capacity, Delay and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 323 |  | 302 |  | 618 |  | 613 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity | 414 |  | 406 |  | 429 |  | 429 |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, Q ${ }_{95}$ (veh) | 6.7 |  | 6.0 |  | 31.1 |  | 30.5 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 36.4 |  | 33.6 |  | 234.7 |  | 229.4 |  |  |
| Level of Service, LOS | E |  | D |  | F |  | F |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 36.4 |  | 33.6 |  | 234.7 |  | 229.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  | D |  | F |  | F |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 165.7 |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 All-Way Stop Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB | Intersection | N Spruce Ave/SycamoreAve |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting | Jurisdiction | County |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ | East/West Street | Sycamore Ave |
| Analysis Year | 2035 | Peak Hour Factor | N Spruce Ave |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | 0.92 |  |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |  |  |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volume and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume | 20 | 161 | 123 | 6 | 207 | 66 | 43 | 573 | 0 | 55 | 536 | 5 |
| \% Thrus in Shared Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 330 |  |  | 303 |  |  | 670 |  |  | 648 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |

Departure Headway and Service Time


Capacity, Delay and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 330 |  | 303 |  | 670 |  | 648 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity | 413 |  | 404 |  | 426 |  | 426 |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, Q ${ }_{95}$ (veh) | 7.1 |  | 6.1 |  | 37.2 |  | 34.8 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 38.5 |  | 34.4 |  | 290.8 |  | 268.9 |  |  |
| Level of Service, LOS | E |  | D |  | F |  | F |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 38.5 |  | 34.4 |  | 290.8 |  | 268.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  | D |  | F |  | F |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 200.9 |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 All-Way Stop Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB | Intersection | N Spruce Ave/SycamoreAve |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting | Jurisdiction | County |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ | East/West Street | Sycamore Ave |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | N Spruce Ave |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 | 0.92 |  |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |  |  |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volume and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume | 24 | 195 | 140 | 6 | 249 | 79 | 49 | 636 | 0 | 57 | 608 | 6 |
| \% Thrus in Shared Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 390 |  |  | 363 |  |  | 745 |  |  | 729 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |

Departure Headway and Service Time


Capacity, Delay and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 390 |  | 363 |  | 745 |  | 729 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity | 389 |  | 381 |  | 378 |  | 378 |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, Q ${ }_{95}$ (veh) | 24.5 |  | 19.4 |  | 189.3 |  | 181.8 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 144.0 |  | 105.0 |  | 1779.7 |  | 1706.6 |  |  |
| Level of Service, LOS | F |  | F |  | F |  | F |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 144.0 |  | 105.0 |  | 1779.7 |  | 1706.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  | F |  | F |  | F |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 1196.2 |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 All-Way Stop Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB | Intersection | N Spruce Ave/SycamoreAve |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting | Jurisdiction | County |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ | East/West Street | Sycamore Ave |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | Peak Hour Factor | N Spruce Ave |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |  | 0.92 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |  |  |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volume and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume | 24 | 195 | 147 | 7 | 249 | 79 | 52 | 682 | 0 | 67 | 640 | 6 |
| \% Thrus in Shared Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 398 |  |  | 364 |  |  | 798 |  |  | 775 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |

Departure Headway and Service Time

| Initial Departure Headway, hd (s) | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial Degree of Utilization, x | 0.354 |  |  | 0.324 |  |  | 0.709 |  |  | 0.689 |  |  |
| Final Departure Headway, hd (s) | 9.26 |  |  | 9.46 |  |  | 9.50 |  |  | 9.50 |  |  |
| Final Degree of Utilization, x | 1.024 |  |  | 0.957 |  |  | 2.106 |  |  | 2.046 |  |  |
| Move-Up Time, m (s) | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  |
| Service Time, ts (s) | 7.26 |  |  | 7.46 |  |  | 7.50 |  |  | 7.50 |  |  |

Capacity, Delay and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 398 |  | 364 |  | 798 |  | 775 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity | 389 |  | 380 |  | 379 |  | 379 |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 26.8 |  | 19.6 |  | 215.1 |  | 203.8 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 165.9 |  | 107.2 |  | 2021.7 |  | 1913.6 |  |  |
| Level of Service, LOS | F |  | F |  | F |  | F |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 165.9 |  | 107.2 |  | 2021.7 |  | 1913.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  | F |  | F |  | F |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 1371.0 |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Ave 208 |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 4 | 20 |  | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 864 | 10 | 0 | 20 | 768 | 8 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Ave 208 |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 4 | 20 |  | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 933 | 10 | 0 | 22 | 834 | 8 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Ave 208 |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 4 | 21 |  | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 898 | 10 | 0 | 21 | 798 | 8 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \\| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Ave 208 |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 4 | 21 |  | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 967 | 10 | 0 | 23 | 864 | 8 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Ave 208 |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 5 | 25 |  | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1089 | 13 | 0 | 25 | 968 | 10 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Ave 208 |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 5 | 25 |  | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1158 | 13 | 0 | 27 | 1034 | 10 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \\| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Ave 208 |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 6 | 30 |  | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1313 | 15 | 0 | 30 | 1167 | 12 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Ave 208 |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 6 | 30 |  | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1382 | 15 | 0 | 32 | 1233 | 12 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Cedar Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | Cedar Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 636 |  |  |  | 600 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 558 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 11.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Cedar Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | Cedar Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 121 | 636 |  |  |  | 656 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 130 |  | 56 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 138 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 211 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 507 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 89 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.36 |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 65.8 |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 14.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2564.7 |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 256 | 4.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | F |  |

HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Cedar Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | Cedar Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 661 |  |  |  | 623 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 537 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 11.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Cedar Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | Cedar Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 121 | 661 |  |  |  | 679 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 130 |  | 56 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 138 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 211 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 488 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 82 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.58 |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 69.4 |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 15.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2970.2 |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2970 | 0.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | F |  |

HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Cedar Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | Cedar Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 801 |  |  |  | 756 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 428 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 13.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Cedar Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | Cedar Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 121 | 801 |  |  |  | 812 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 130 |  | 56 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 138 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 211 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 389 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 48 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.42 |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, Q ${ }_{95}$ (veh) | 1.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 85.5 |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 19.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6341.0 |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 2.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 634 | 1.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | F |  |

HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Cedar Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | Cedar Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 967 |  |  |  | 912 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 327 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 16.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Cedar Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | Cedar Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 121 | 967 |  |  |  | 968 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 130 |  | 56 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Marigold St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 28 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 792 | 36 | 0 | 4 | 1008 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Marigold St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 28 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 869 | 36 | 0 | 4 | 1084 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Marigold St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 29 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 823 | 37 | 0 | 4 | 1047 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Marigold St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 29 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 900 | 37 | 0 | 4 | 1123 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Marigold St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 35 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 998 | 45 | 0 | 5 | 1270 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Marigold St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 35 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1075 | 45 | 0 | 5 | 1346 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Marigold St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 43 | 6 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1204 | 55 | 0 | 6 | 1532 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/Marigold St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Marigold St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 43 | 6 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1281 | 55 | 0 | 6 | 1608 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description |
| Demand Information |
| Approach Movement |
| Demand $(v)$, veh/h |

Intersection Information

| LAV Consulting | Analysis Date | Mar 28, 2023 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BMB | Time Period | PM Peak Hour + <br> Project |
| County | Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Hwy 65 | Pis |  |

Hwy 65/W Hermosa St

| Duration, h | 0.250 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Area Type | Other |
| :--- | :--- |
| PHF | 0.88 |

Analysis Period 1> 7:00
File Name Hwy 65 and W Hermosa St 2023 PM+Proj.xus

| EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L | T | R | L | T | R |
| 44 | 115 | 61 | 184 | 75 | 116 |


| NB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L | T | R |
| 39 | 764 | 138 |


| SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L | T | R |
| 116 | 796 | 40 |

Signal Information

| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 7 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, $s$ | 8.8 | 19.2 | 19.3 | 29.7 | 8.5 | 67.3 | 14.3 | 73.0 |
| Change Period, $(Y+R c)$, s | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Headway $(M A H)$, s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time $(g s)$, s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Green Extension Time $(g e), s$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Green Ratio ( g/C ) | 0.17 | 0.13 |  | 0.13 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.04 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.09 | 0.57 | 0.57 |
| Capacity ( c ), veh/h | 302 | 227 |  | 230 | 407 | 345 | 68 | 1907 | 849 | 155 | 2079 | 925 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.159 | 0.844 |  | 0.868 | 0.200 | 0.366 | 0.619 | 0.435 | 0.177 | 0.815 | 0.416 | 0.047 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 52.9 | 236.7 |  | 246.6 | 85.3 | 137.4 | 57.7 | 268.2 | 92.2 | 169 | 249 | 21.5 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 2.1 | 9.5 |  | 9.9 | 3.4 | 5.5 | 2.3 | 10.7 | 3.7 | 6.8 | 10.0 | 0.9 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile) | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 42.8 | 51.2 |  | 51.4 | 38.7 | 40.2 | 56.9 | 17.4 | 14.8 | 53.9 | 14.3 | 11.2 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 0.1 | 3.3 |  | 3.9 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 3.4 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 3.9 | 0.6 | 0.1 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 42.9 | 54.5 |  | 55.2 | 38.8 | 40.4 | 60.2 | 18.1 | 15.2 | 57.9 | 14.9 | 11.2 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | D | D |  | E | D | D | E | B | B | E | B | B |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 52.2 |  | D | 47.4 |  | D | 19.5 |  | B | 20.0 |  | B |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS |  |  |  | . 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.46 | B | 2.46 | B | 2.09 | B | 1.89 | B |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 0.88 | A | 1.16 | A | 1.33 | A | 1.34 | A |
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Lindmore St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | W Lindmore St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 20 | 16 |  | 8 | 4 | 16 | 0 | 40 | 828 | 8 | 0 | 24 | 684 | 4 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Lindmore St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | W Lindmore St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 20 | 16 |  | 8 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 40 | 913 | 8 | 0 | 27 | 767 | 4 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Lindmore St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | W Lindmore St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 21 | 17 |  | 8 | 4 | 17 | 0 | 42 | 860 | 8 | 0 | 25 | 711 | 4 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Lindmore St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | W Lindmore St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 21 | 17 |  | 8 | 4 | 19 | 0 | 42 | 945 | 8 | 0 | 28 | 794 | 4 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Lindmore St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | W Lindmore St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 25 | 20 |  | 10 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 50 | 1043 | 10 | 0 | 30 | 862 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Lindmore St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | W Lindmore St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 25 | 20 |  | 10 | 5 | 22 | 0 | 50 | 1128 | 10 | 0 | 33 | 945 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Lindmore St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | W Lindmore St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 30 | 24 |  | 12 | 6 | 24 | 0 | 61 | 1259 | 12 | 0 | 36 | 1040 | 6 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Lindmore St |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | W Lindmore St |
| North/South Street | Hwy 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  | R |  | LT |  | R |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 30 | 24 |  | 12 | 6 | 26 | 0 | 61 | 1344 | 12 | 0 | 61 | 1344 | 12 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 7.66 | 6.66 | 7.06 |  | 4.26 |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 3.58 | 4.08 | 3.38 |  | 2.28 |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Tulare Rd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | W Tulare Rd |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  | L |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 117 | 1135 |  |  |  | 1046 | 46 |  |  |  |  |  | 19 |  | 96 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage |  |  |  |  | ded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22 |  | 109 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 240 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |  | 215 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.39 |  | 0.51 |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.6 |  | 2.9 |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 38.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3473.1 |  | 38.7 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  | E |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | 3.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 606.1 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |

HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Tulare Rd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | W Tulare Rd |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  | L |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 133 | 1249 |  |  |  | 1162 | 46 |  |  |  |  |  | 19 |  | 108 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage |  |  |  |  | ded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Tulare Rd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | W Tulare Rd |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  | L |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 122 | 1179 |  |  |  | 1087 | 48 |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |  | 100 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage |  |  |  |  | ded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Tulare Rd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | W Tulare Rd |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  | L |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 138 | 1293 |  |  |  | 1203 | 48 |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |  | 112 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage |  |  |  |  | ded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Tulare Rd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | W Tulare Rd |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  | L |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 147 | 1430 |  |  |  | 1318 | 58 |  |  |  |  |  | 24 |  | 121 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage |  |  |  |  | ded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 167 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27 |  | 138 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 147 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 139 |
| v/c Ratio | 1.14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.99 |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 21.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.0 |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 409.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 234.9 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 8.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Tulare Rd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | W Tulare Rd |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  | L |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 163 | 1544 |  |  |  | 1434 | 58 |  |  |  |  |  | 24 |  | 133 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage |  |  |  |  | ded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 185 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27 |  | 151 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 116 |
| v/c Ratio | 1.54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.30 |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 39.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26.3 |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 1091.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 694.4 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Tulare Rd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | W Tulare Rd |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  | L |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 178 | 1725 |  |  |  | 1590 | 70 |  |  |  |  |  | 29 |  | 146 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage |  |  |  |  | ded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 65/W Tulare Rd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 65 |
| North/South Street | W Tulare Rd |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  | L |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 194 | 1839 |  |  |  | 1706 | 70 |  |  |  |  |  | 29 |  | 158 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage |  |  |  |  | ded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.48 |  | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.57 |  | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service




## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 180 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 180 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 176 | 12 |  | 0 | 196 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 1107 |  |  |  | 1351 |  |  |  |  | 578 |  |  |  | 587 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.00 |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.01 |  |  |  | 0.01 |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 8.3 |  |  |  | 7.7 |  |  |  |  | 11.3 |  |  |  | 11.2 |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | A |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |  | B |  |  |  | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 11.3 |  |  |  | 11.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B |  |  |  | B |  |
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 180 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 180 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 206 | 12 |  | 0 | 233 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 1040 |  |  |  | 1312 |  |  |  |  | 526 |  |  |  | 533 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.00 |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.01 |  |  |  | 0.01 |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 8.5 |  |  |  | 7.7 |  |  |  |  | 11.9 |  |  |  | 11.8 |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | A |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |  | B |  |  |  | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 11.9 |  |  |  | 11.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B |  |  |  | B |  |
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 180 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 180 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 183 | 12 |  | 0 | 204 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 180 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 180 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 213 | 12 |  | 0 | 241 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 180 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 180 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 222 | 15 |  | 0 | 247 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 180 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 180 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 252 | 15 |  | 0 | 284 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 180 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 180 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 268 | 18 |  | 0 | 298 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 180 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 180 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 298 | 18 |  | 0 | 335 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 188 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 188 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 8 | 296 | 8 |  | 0 | 388 | 28 |  | 4 | 12 | 0 |  | 16 | 8 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 188 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 188 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 8 | 329 | 8 |  | 0 | 428 | 31 |  | 4 | 12 | 0 |  | 18 | 8 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 188 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 188 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 8 | 308 | 8 |  | 0 | 403 | 29 |  | 4 | 12 | 0 |  | 17 | 8 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 188 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 188 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 8 | 341 | 8 |  | 0 | 443 | 32 |  | 4 | 12 | 0 |  | 19 | 8 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 9 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 18 |  |  |  | 31 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 690 |  |  |  | 1157 |  |  |  |  | 239 |  |  |  | 234 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.01 |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  | 0.13 |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.2 |  |  |  | 0.4 |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 10.3 |  |  |  | 8.1 |  |  |  |  | 21.3 |  |  |  | 22.7 |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 0.4 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 21.3 |  |  |  | 22.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  | C |  |

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 188 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 188 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 10 | 373 | 10 |  | 0 | 489 | 35 |  | 5 | 15 | 0 |  | 20 | 10 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 188 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 188 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 10 | 406 | 10 |  | 0 | 529 | 38 |  | 5 | 15 | 0 |  | 22 | 10 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 11 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 23 |  |  |  | 36 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 590 |  |  |  | 1084 |  |  |  |  | 181 |  |  |  | 173 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.02 |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.13 |  |  |  | 0.21 |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.1 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.4 |  |  |  | 0.8 |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 11.2 |  |  |  | 8.3 |  |  |  |  | 27.8 |  |  |  | 31.3 |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 0.5 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 27.8 |  |  |  | 31.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  | D |  |
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 188 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 188 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 12 | 450 | 12 |  | 0 | 590 | 43 |  | 6 | 18 | 0 |  | 24 | 12 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hwy 137/Road 188 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Hwy 137 |
| North/South Street | Road 188 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 12 | 483 | 12 |  | 0 | 630 | 46 |  | 6 | 18 | 0 |  | 25 | 12 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  | 6.48 |  |  |  | 4.13 |  |  |  | 7.24 | 6.64 | 6.34 |  | 7.18 | 6.53 | 6.28 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.43 |  | 3.57 | 4.03 | 3.37 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 14 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 27 |  |  |  | 42 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 490 |  |  |  | 1004 |  |  |  |  | 129 |  |  |  | 119 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.03 |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.21 |  |  |  | 0.35 |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.1 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.8 |  |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 12.6 |  |  |  | 8.6 |  |  |  |  | 40.3 |  |  |  | 51.6 |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |  | E |  |  |  | F |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 0.8 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 40.3 |  |  |  | 51.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | E |  |  |  | F |  |

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | N Spruce Ave/Acacia Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Acacia Ave |
| North/South Street | N Spruce Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | N Spruce Ave/Acacia Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Acacia Ave |
| North/South Street | N Spruce Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | N Spruce Ave/Acacia Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Acacia Ave |
| North/South Street | N Spruce Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | N Spruce Ave/Acacia Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Acacia Ave |
| North/South Street | N Spruce Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | N Spruce Ave/Acacia Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Acacia Ave |
| North/South Street | N Spruce Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | N Spruce Ave/Acacia Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Acacia Ave |
| North/South Street | N Spruce Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | N Spruce Ave/Acacia Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Acacia Ave |
| North/South Street | N Spruce Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |

## Site Information

| Intersection | N Spruce Ave/Acacia Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| East/West Street | Acacia Ave |
| North/South Street | N Spruce Ave |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



HCS7 All-Way Stop Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB | Intersection | N Spruce Ave/SycamoreAve |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting | $3 / 28 / 23$ | Earisdiction |
| Date Performed | 2023 | North/South Street | County |
| Analysis Year | 1.00 | Peak Hour Factor | N Spruce Ave |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | PM Peak Hour | 0.92 |  |
| Time Analyzed | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |  |  |
| Project Description |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volume and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume | 0 | 152 | 56 | 0 | 60 | 8 | 72 | 408 | 0 | 12 | 296 | 12 |
| \% Thrus in Shared Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 226 |  |  | 74 |  |  | 522 |  |  | 348 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |

Departure Headway and Service Time

| Initial Departure Headway, hd (s) | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial Degree of Utilization, x | 0.201 |  |  | 0.066 |  |  | 0.464 |  |  | 0.309 |  |  |
| Final Departure Headway, hd (s) | 6.36 |  |  | 6.92 |  |  | 5.59 |  |  | 5.81 |  |  |
| Final Degree of Utilization, x | 0.400 |  |  | 0.142 |  |  | 0.809 |  |  | 0.562 |  |  |
| Move-Up Time, m (s) | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  |
| Service Time, ts (s) | 4.36 |  |  | 4.92 |  |  | 3.59 |  |  | 3.81 |  |  |

Capacity, Delay and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 226 |  | 74 |  | 522 |  | 348 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity | 566 |  | 520 |  | 645 |  | 619 |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 2.0 |  | 0.5 |  | 10.8 |  | 3.7 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 13.6 |  | 11.1 |  | 30.9 |  | 16.2 |  |  |
| Level of Service, LOS | B |  | B |  | D |  | C |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 13.6 |  | 11.1 |  | 30.9 |  | 16.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  | B |  | D |  | C |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 21.9 |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 All-Way Stop Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB | Intersection | N Spruce Ave/SycamoreAve |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting | Jurisdiction | County |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ | East/West Street | Sycamore Ave |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | Peak Hour Factor | N Spruce Ave |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |  | 0.96 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |  |  |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volume and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume | 0 | 152 | 62 | 0 | 60 | 8 | 77 | 435 | 0 | 12 | 325 | 12 |
| \% Thrus in Shared Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 223 |  |  | 71 |  |  | 533 |  |  | 364 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |

Departure Headway and Service Time


Capacity, Delay and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 223 |  | 71 |  | 533 |  | 364 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity | 561 |  | 514 |  | 643 |  | 618 |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 2.0 |  | 0.5 |  | 12.0 |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 13.6 |  | 11.1 |  | 33.8 |  | 17.0 |  |  |
| Level of Service, LOS | B |  | B |  | D |  | C |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 13.6 |  | 11.1 |  | 33.8 |  | 17.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  | B |  | D |  | C |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 23.5 |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 All-Way Stop Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB | Intersection | N Spruce Ave/SycamoreAve |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting | Jurisdiction | County |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ | East/West Street | Sycamore Ave |
| Analysis Year | 2025 | Peak Hour Factor | N Spruce Ave |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |  | 0.92 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volume and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume | 0 | 158 | 58 | 0 | 62 | 8 | 75 | 424 | 0 | 12 | 308 | 12 |
| \% Thrus in Shared Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 235 |  |  | 76 |  |  | 542 |  |  | 361 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |

Departure Headway and Service Time


Capacity, Delay and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 235 |  | 76 |  | 542 |  | 361 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity | 549 |  | 501 |  | 629 |  | 602 |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 2.2 |  | 0.5 |  | 14.1 |  | 4.3 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 14.4 |  | 11.5 |  | 40.4 |  | 17.8 |  |  |
| Level of Service, LOS | B |  | B |  | E |  | C |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 14.4 |  | 11.5 |  | 40.4 |  | 17.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  | B |  | E |  | C |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 26.9 |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 All-Way Stop Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB | Intersection | N Spruce Ave/SycamoreAve |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting | Jurisdiction | County |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ | East/West Street | Sycamore Ave |
| Analysis Year | 2025 | Peak Hour Factor | N Spruce Ave |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |  | 0.94 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |  |  |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volume and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume | 0 | 158 | 64 | 0 | 62 | 8 | 80 | 451 | 0 | 12 | 337 | 12 |
| \% Thrus in Shared Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 236 |  |  | 74 |  |  | 565 |  |  | 384 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |

Departure Headway and Service Time


Capacity, Delay and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 236 |  | 74 |  | 565 |  | 384 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity | 538 |  | 487 |  | 621 |  | 593 |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 2.3 |  | 0.5 |  | 18.3 |  | 5.2 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 14.9 |  | 11.7 |  | 54.5 |  | 20.0 |  |  |
| Level of Service, LOS | B |  | B |  | F |  | C |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 14.9 |  | 11.7 |  | 54.5 |  | 20.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  | B |  | F |  | C |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 34.0 |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 All-Way Stop Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB | Intersection | N Spruce Ave/SycamoreAve |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting | Jurisdiction | County |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ | East/West Street | Sycamore Ave |
| Analysis Year | 2035 | Peak Hour Factor | N Spruce Ave |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |  | 0.92 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volume and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume | 0 | 192 | 71 | 0 | 76 | 10 | 91 | 514 | 0 | 15 | 373 | 15 |
| \% Thrus in Shared Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 286 |  |  | 93 |  |  | 658 |  |  | 438 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |

Departure Headway and Service Time

| Initial Departure Headway, hd (s) | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial Degree of Utilization, x | 0.254 |  |  | 0.083 |  |  | 0.585 |  |  | 0.389 |  |  |
| Final Departure Headway, hd (s) | 7.06 |  |  | 7.95 |  |  | 6.36 |  |  | 6.50 |  |  |
| Final Degree of Utilization, x | 0.561 |  |  | 0.206 |  |  | 1.162 |  |  | 0.791 |  |  |
| Move-Up Time, m (s) | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  |
| Service Time, ts (s) | 5.06 |  |  | 5.95 |  |  | 4.36 |  |  | 4.50 |  |  |

Capacity, Delay and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 286 |  | 93 |  | 658 |  | 438 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity | 510 |  | 453 |  | 566 |  | 554 |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 3.7 |  | 0.8 |  | 61.9 |  | 9.7 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 19.0 |  | 13.0 |  | 341.6 |  | 32.6 |  |  |
| Level of Service, LOS | C |  | B |  | F |  | D |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 19.0 |  | 13.0 |  | 341.6 |  | 32.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  | B |  | F |  | D |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 166.5 |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 All-Way Stop Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB | Intersection | N Spruce Ave/SycamoreAve |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting | Jurisdiction | County |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ | East/West Street | Sycamore Ave |
| Analysis Year | 2035 | Peak Hour Factor | N Spruce Ave |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |  | 0.94 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |  |  |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volume and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume | 0 | 192 | 77 | 0 | 76 | 10 | 96 | 544 | 0 | 15 | 402 | 15 |
| \% Thrus in Shared Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 286 |  |  | 91 |  |  | 681 |  |  | 460 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |

Departure Headway and Service Time


Capacity, Delay and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 286 |  | 91 |  | 681 |  | 460 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity | 507 |  | 448 |  | 561 |  | 553 |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 3.8 |  | 0.8 |  | 73.9 |  | 11.8 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 19.2 |  | 13.1 |  | 429.0 |  | 38.6 |  |  |
| Level of Service, LOS | C |  | B |  | F |  | E |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 19.2 |  | 13.1 |  | 429.0 |  | 38.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  | B |  | F |  | E |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 208.5 |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 All-Way Stop Control Report

## General Information

| Analyst | BMB | Intersection | N Spruce Ave/SycamoreAve |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting | Jurisdiction | County |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 23$ | East/West Street | Sycamore Ave |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | Peak Hour Factor | N Spruce Ave |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |  | 0.92 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| Project Description | TIS for Lindsay Gas Station C-Store |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volume and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume | 0 | 231 | 85 | 0 | 91 | 12 | 109 | 617 | 0 | 18 | 450 | 18 |
| \% Thrus in Shared Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 343 |  |  | 112 |  |  | 789 |  |  | 528 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |

Departure Headway and Service Time

| Initial Departure Headway, hd (s) | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial Degree of Utilization, x | 0.305 |  |  | 0.100 |  |  | 0.701 |  |  | 0.470 |  |  |  |
| Final Departure Headway, hd (s) | 7.56 |  |  | 8.81 |  |  | 7.11 |  |  | 7.06 |  |  |  |
| Final Degree of Utilization, $x$ | 0.722 |  |  | 0.274 |  |  | 1.558 |  |  | 1.036 |  |  |  |
| Move-Up Time, m (s) | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  |  |
| Service Time, ts (s) | 5.56 |  |  | 6.81 |  |  | 5.11 |  |  | 5.06 |  |  |  |

Capacity, Delay and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 343 |  | 112 |  | 789 |  | 528 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity | 476 |  | 409 |  | 506 |  | 510 |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 7.0 |  | 1.1 |  | 149.3 |  | 33.2 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 29.4 |  | 15.1 |  | 1034.2 |  | 162.2 |  |  |
| Level of Service, LOS | D |  | C |  | F |  | F |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) |  | 29.4 |  | 15.1 |  | 1034.2 |  | 162.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  | C |  | F |  | F |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 515.3 |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |



## Street Segments

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/N Spruce Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |


| Highway class C | Class 1 |  | Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shoulder width | 6.0 | ft | \% Trucks and buses | 6 | \% |
| Lane width | 12.0 | ft | \% Trucks crawling | 0.0 | \% |
| Segment length | 0.0 | mi | Truck crawl speed | 0.0 | mi/hr |
| Terrain type | Level |  | \% Recreational vehicles | 4 | \% |
| Grade: Length | - | mi | \% No-passing zones | 20 | \% |
| Up/down | - | \% | Access point density | 8 | /mi |
| Analysis directi | ion volume, | 1114 | veh/h |  |  |
| Opposing directi | ion volume, | - 660 | veh/h |  |  |

Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 1211 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 717 |  | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (n | te-4) BPTSFd | 80.7 | \% |  |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 13.1 |  |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 88.9 | \% |  |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.71 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 37.4 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 88.9 | E |  |

Level of service, LOSd (from above)
E

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1210.9
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.79
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/N Spruce Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |


| Highway class C | Class 1 |  | Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shoulder width | 6.0 | ft | \% Trucks and buses | 6 | \% |
| Lane width | 12.0 | ft | \% Trucks crawling | 0.0 | \% |
| Segment length | 0.0 | mi | Truck crawl speed | 0.0 | mi/hr |
| Terrain type | Level |  | \% Recreational vehicles | 4 | \% |
| Grade: Length | - | mi | \% No-passing zones | 20 | \% |
| Up/down | - | \% | Access point density | 8 | /mi |
| Analysis directi | ion volume, | 1261 | veh/h |  |  |
| Opposing directi | ion volume, | 799 | veh/h |  |  |

Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.81 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | 35.2 |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 91.3 | E. |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1370.7
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.85
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/N Spruce Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |


| Highway class C | Class 1 |  | Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shoulder width | 6.0 | ft | \% Trucks and buses | 6 | \% |
| Lane width | 12.0 | ft | \% Trucks crawling | 0.0 | \% |
| Segment length | 0.0 | mi | Truck crawl speed | 0.0 | mi/hr |
| Terrain type | Level |  | \% Recreational vehicles | 4 | \% |
| Grade: Length | - | mi | \% No-passing zones | 20 | \% |
| Up/down | - | \% | Access point density | 8 | /mi |
| Analysis directi | ion volume, | 1157 | veh/h |  |  |
| Opposing directi | ion volume, | - 686 | veh/h |  |  |

Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.74 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 36.9 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 89.9 | E |  |

Level of service, LOSd (from above)
E

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1257.6
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.81
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/N Spruce Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |


| Highway class C | Class 1 |  | Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shoulder width | 6.0 | ft | \% Trucks and buses | 6 | \% |
| Lane width | 12.0 | ft | \% Trucks crawling | 0.0 | \% |
| Segment length | 0.0 | mi | Truck crawl speed | 0.0 | mi/hr |
| Terrain type | Level |  | \% Recreational vehicles | 4 | \% |
| Grade: Length | - | mi | \% No-passing zones | 20 | \% |
| Up/down | - | \% | Access point density | 8 | /mi |
| Analysis directi | ion volume, | 1304 | veh/h |  |  |
| Opposing directi | ion volume, | - 825 | veh/h |  |  |

Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing | ( 0 ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 141 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 897 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 34.6 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 65.3 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.83 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1417.4
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.87
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/N Spruce Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |


| Highway class Class | 1 |  | Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shoulder width | 6.0 | ft | \% Trucks and buses | 6 | \% |
| Lane width | 12.0 | ft | \% Trucks crawling | 0.0 | \% |
| Segment length | 0.0 | mi | Truck crawl speed | 0.0 | mi/hr |
| Terrain type | Level |  | \% Recreational vehicles | 4 | \% |
| Grade: Length | - | mi | \% No-passing zones | 20 | \% |
| Up/down | - | \% | Access point density | 8 | /mi |
| Analysis direction vol | lume, | 1433 | veh/h |  |  |
| Opposing direction vol | lume, | 832 | veh/h |  |  |

Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 155 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 904 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 33.4 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 63.1 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1557.6
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.91
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/N Spruce Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.0 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.0 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 168 |  | 1055 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 31.3 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 59.0 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 1685 | pc/h | 1055 |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 90.4 | $\%$ |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 8.0 |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 95.3 | $\%$ |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.99 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | $31.3 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 95.3 | E |  |

Level of service, LOSd (from above)
E

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1684.8
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.95
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/N Spruce Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.0 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.0 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 184 |  | 1090 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 29.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 56.2 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 1841 | pc/h | 1090 |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 92.2 | $\%$ |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 8.3 |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 97.4 | $\%$ |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | $F$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 1.08 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 29.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 97.4 | F |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1841.3
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 5.00
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/N Spruce Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 200 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 1241 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 27.4 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 51.7 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 2001 | pc/h | 1241 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 94.4 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 8.0 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 99.3 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | $F$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 1.18 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | 27.4 |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 99.3 | F |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) |  |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 2001.1
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 5.04
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/Tulare Rd |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 957 | pc/h | 1068 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 77.7 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 13.3 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 84.0 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.56 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 36.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 84.0 | E |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 956.5
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.67
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highway S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/Tulare Rd |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 1037 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 1214 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 35.1 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 66.2 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.61 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 35.1 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 86.1 | $E$ |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1037.0
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.71
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/Tulare Rd |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 993 | pc/h | 1110 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 79.1 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 12.6 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd | 85.0 | $\%$ |  |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.58 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 993.5
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.69
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highway S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/Tulare Rd |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 1074 | pc/h | 1255 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 82.3 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 10.3 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd | 87.0 | $\%$ |  |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.63 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl -
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1073.9
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.73
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/Tulare Rd |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 120 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 1347 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 32.7 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 61.8 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 1205 | pc/h | 1347 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 85.7 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 8.2 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 89.6 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.71 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 32.7 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 89.6 | E |

Level of service, LOSd (from above)
E

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1205.4
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.78
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highway S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/Tulare Rd |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |


| Highway class Class | 1 |  | Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shoulder width | 6.0 | ft | \% Trucks and buses | 6 | \% |
| Lane width | 12.0 | ft | \% Trucks crawling | 0.0 | \% |
| Segment length | 0.0 | mi | Truck crawl speed | 0.0 | mi/hr |
| Terrain type | Level |  | \% Recreational vehicles | 4 | \% |
| Grade: Length | - | mi | \% No-passing zones | 20 | \% |
| Up / down | - | \% | Access point density | 8 | /mi |
| Analysis direction vol | lume, | 1183 | veh/h |  |  |
| Opposing direction vo | lume, | 1373 | veh/h |  |  |


$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 1286 | pc/h | 1492 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 87.9 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 7.1 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 91.2 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.76 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | 31.0 |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 91.2 | E. |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1285.9
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.82
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/Tulare Rd |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |


| Highway class Class | 1 |  | Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.87 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shoulder width | 6.0 | ft | \% Trucks and buses | 6 | \% |
| Lane width | 12.0 | ft | \% Trucks crawling | 0.0 | \% |
| Segment length | 0.0 | mi | Truck crawl speed | 0.0 | mi/hr |
| Terrain type | Level |  | \% Recreational vehicles | 4 | \% |
| Grade: Length | - | mi | \% No-passing zones | 20 | \% |
| Up/down | - | \% | Access point density | 8 | /mi |
| Analysis direction vol | lume, | 1336 | veh/h |  |  |
| Opposing direction vol | lume, | 1494 | veh/h |  |  |

Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 153 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 1717 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 27.3 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 51.5 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 1536 | pc/h | 1717 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 91.7 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 5.5 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 94.3 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | $F$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.90 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | $\mathrm{mi}^{27.3}$ |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 94.3 | F |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) |  |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1535.6
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.88
Bicycle LOS E
```

Notes:

1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00 , as level terrain
is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) $>=1,700 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$, terminate analysis-the LOS is F .
3. For the analysis direction only and for $v>200$ veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
specific downgrade.

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highway S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/Tulare Rd |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 1535 | pc/h | 1770 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 91.7 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 5.8 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 94.4 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | $F$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.90 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 26.9 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 94.4 |  |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) | F |  |

Level of service, LOSd (from above)
$\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1534.8
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.91
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```


## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 851 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 600 | Terrain Type |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 960 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 685 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 884 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 623 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 993 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 708 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1072 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 741 | Terrain Type |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% |  |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | - |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1181 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 826 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^38]
## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |
| Direction 1 Geometric Data |  |  |  |


| Direction 1 | 1293 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 912 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |  |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1407 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 997 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 648 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 344 | Terrain Type |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |  |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 747 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 422 | Terrain Type |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% |  |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | - |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 673 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 357 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^43]
## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 772 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 435 | Terrain Type |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 816 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 433 | Terrain Type |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 915 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts $/ \mathrm{mi}$ | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 511 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |
| Direction 1 Geometric Data |  |  |  |


| Direction 1 | 985 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 523 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1084 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 601 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 480 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 508 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 568 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 578 | Terrain Type |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^50]
## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 499 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 528 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 587 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 598 | Terrain Type |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 605 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 637 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^53]
## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 693 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 710 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^54]
## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |
| Direction 1 Geometric Data |  |  |  |


| Direction 1 | 729 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 772 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^55]
## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 817 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts $/ \mathrm{mi}$ | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 853 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^56]HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | N Spruce Ave/Hwy 137 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 677 | pc/h | 676 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 63.4 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 21.1 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 74.0 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.40 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 677.2
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.49
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highway S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | N Spruce Ave/Hwy 137 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.44 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | $-\quad$ mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 40.6 | mi |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 76.5 | D |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 755.4
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.55
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | N Spruce Ave/Hwy 137 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.41 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 41.4 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 74.4 | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 704.3
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.51
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highway S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | N Spruce Ave/Hwy 137 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |


| Highway class C | Class 1 |  | Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shoulder width | 6.0 | ft | \% Trucks and buses | 6 | \% |
| Lane width | 12.0 | ft | \% Trucks crawling | 0.0 | \% |
| Segment length | 0.0 | mi | Truck crawl speed | 0.0 | mi/hr |
| Terrain type | Level |  | \% Recreational vehicles | 4 | \% |
| Grade: Length | - | mi | \% No-passing zones | 20 | \% |
| Up/down | - | \% | Access point density | 8 | /mi |
| Analysis directi | ion volume, | 719 | veh/h |  |  |
| Opposing directi | ion volume, | - 732 | veh/h |  |  |

Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 |  |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.9 |  |  |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 786 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 40.2 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 75.9 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.46 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | 40.2 |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 77.8 | D |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) |  |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 781.5
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.57
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | N Spruce Ave/Hwy 137 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |


| Highway class C | Class 1 |  | Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shoulder width | 6.0 | ft | \% Trucks and buses | 6 | \% |
| Lane width | 12.0 | ft | \% Trucks crawling | 0.0 | \% |
| Segment length | 0.0 | mi | Truck crawl speed | 0.0 | mi/hr |
| Terrain type | Level |  | \% Recreational vehicles | 4 | \% |
| Grade: Length | - | mi | \% No-passing zones | 20 | \% |
| Up/down | - | \% | Access point density | 8 | /mi |
| Analysis directi | ion volume, | 785 | veh/h |  |  |
| Opposing directi | ion volume, | -784 | veh/h |  |  |

Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 853 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 852 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS | -3) fLS | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) |  | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 39.3 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 74.2 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 853 | pc/h | 852 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 71.7 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 16.7 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd | 80.1 | $\%$ |  |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.50 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 39.3 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 80.1 | E |  |

Level of service, LOSd (from above)
E

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 853.3
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.61
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highway S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | N Spruce Ave/Hwy 137 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 932 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 945 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS | -3) fLS | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) |  | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 38.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 71.6 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.55 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, | Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | $38.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 82.7 | E |  |

Level of service, LOSd (from above)
E

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 931.5
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.65
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | N Spruce Ave/Hwy 137 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 1028 | pc/h | 1028 |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 79.0 | $\%$ |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 13.0 |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd | 85.5 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.60 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 36.6 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 85.5 | E |

Level of service, LOSd (from above)
E

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1028.3
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.70
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highway S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | N Spruce Ave/Hwy 137 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 110 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 1121 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 35.3 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 66.5 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 1107 | pc/h | 1121 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 82.0 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 11.4 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 87.7 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.65 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl -
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1106.5
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.74
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```


## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1015 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane $(\mathrm{vOL}), \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width $(\mathrm{We}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 801 | Lerrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |  |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1153 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts $/ \mathrm{mi}$ | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane $(\mathrm{vOL}), \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width $(\mathrm{We}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 907 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^58]
## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1054 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane $(\mathrm{vOL}), \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width $(\mathrm{We}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 832 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1192 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane $(\mathrm{vOL}), \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width $(\mathrm{We}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 938 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |
| Direction 1 Geometric Data |  |  |  |


| Direction 1 | 1279 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane $(\mathrm{vOL}), \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width $(\mathrm{We}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1009 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.8 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^61]
## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1417 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts $/ \mathrm{mi}$ | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane $(\mathrm{vOL}), \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width $(\mathrm{We}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1115 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^62]
## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |
| Direction 1 Geometric Data |  |  |  |


| Direction 1 | 1543 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane $(\mathrm{vOL}), \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width $(\mathrm{We}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1217 | Terrain Type |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | Level |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^63]
## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1681 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts $/ \mathrm{mi}$ | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane $(\mathrm{vOL}), \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width $(\mathrm{We}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1323 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.8 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^64]HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | 3/28/2023 |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Road 188 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for | mercia Development |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.3 |  | 1.1 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.982 |  | 0.994 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 390 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 44.4 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 83.8 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.23 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 382.6
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.20
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Hwy $65 /$ Road 188 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.3 |  | 1.1 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.982 |  | 0.994 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 443 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.7 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 43.7 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 82.4 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.26 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 43.7 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 58.0 | D |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 434.8
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.27
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | 3/28/2023 |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Road 188 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for | mercia Development |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.3 |  | 1.1 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.982 |  | 0.994 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 405 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.7 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 44.2 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 83.3 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.23 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 44.2 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 55.2 | D |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 397.8
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.22
Bicycle LOS
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Hwy $65 /$ Road 188 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.26 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | $-\quad$ mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | $-\quad 43.4$ | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 59.7 | mi |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 450.0
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.29
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | 3/28/2023 |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Road 188 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for | mercia Development |



| Direction An | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.2 |  | 1.1 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | $V \quad 0.988$ |  | 0.994 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 487 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3 | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) f | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 42.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 80.2 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.28 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 42.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 61.1 | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 481.5
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.32
Bicycle LOS
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Hwy $65 /$ Road 188 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.31 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 41.9 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 64.9 | D |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 533.7
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.37
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| ___-_Directional Two-Lane Highw |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Hwy $65 /$ Road 188 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.34 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 40.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 67.8 |  |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 581.5
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.42
Bicycle LOS
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Hwy $65 /$ Road 188 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.994 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 638 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 992 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 60.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 58.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.6 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 44.8 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 77.2 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.37 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl -
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 633.7
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.46
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Road $188 /$ Road 180 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 | 1.1 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 0.994 | 0.994 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 162 | pc/h | 262 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 18.8 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 35.1 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 32.2 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | C |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.09 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 160.9
Effective width of outside lane, We 28.68
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 2.53
Bicycle LOS C
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Road 188/Road 180 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 | 1.1 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 0.994 | 0.994 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 207 | pc/h | 314 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 25.3 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 36.4 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 39.8 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | C |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.12 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 47.6 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 39.8 |  |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) | C |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 205.4
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 3.89
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Road $188 /$ Road 180 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | C |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.10 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 48.2 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 33.7 |  |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) | C |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 167.4
Effective width of outside lane, We 28.14
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 2.70
Bicycle LOS C
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Road 188/Road 180 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | C |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.12 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 47.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 40.2 |  |

Level of service, LOSd (from above) C

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 212.0
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 3.90
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Road $188 /$ Road 180 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.4 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.971 |  | 0.977 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 208 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 336 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 1.3 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 47.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 89.6 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 | 1.1 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 0.994 | 0.994 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 203 | pc/h | 330 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 24.5 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 35.5 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 38.0 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | C |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.12 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 47.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 38.0 | C |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 202.2
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 3.88
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Road 188/Road 180 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.3 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.971 |  | 0.982 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 254 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 386 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 1.2 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 46.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 88.3 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 | 1.1 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 0.994 | 0.994 |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 248 | pc/h | 382 |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 29.4 | $\%$ |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 35.3 |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 43.3 | $\%$ |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | C |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.15 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 246.7
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 3.98
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Road $188 /$ Road 180 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 | 1.1 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 0.994 | 0.994 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 246 | pc/h | 398 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 30.0 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 34.0 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 43.0 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | C |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.14 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | 46.7 |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 43.0 |  |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) | C |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 244.6
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 3.98
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Road 188/Road 180 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 0.994 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 293 | pc/h | 447 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 35.7 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 30.5 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 47.8 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | C |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.17 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 46.1 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 47.8 |  |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) | C |  |

Level of service, LOSd (from above) C
Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 291.3
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.06
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Acacia Ave/Sycamore Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction An | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.2 |  | 1.3 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.9 |  | 0.982 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.0 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 497 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 456 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) f | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 1.1 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 44.5 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 84.0 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.29 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 491.3
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.33
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Acacia Ave/Sycamore Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.32 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 43.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 67.8 | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 542.4
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.38
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Acacia Ave/Sycamore Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.30 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | 44.3 |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 67.3 | D |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) |  |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 509.8
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.35
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Acacia Ave/Sycamore Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Ana | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 |  |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.9 |  |  |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 564 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3 | -3) fLS | 0.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 1.0 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 43.6 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 82.3 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.33 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | -m | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | 43.6 | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 68.9 | D |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) |  |  |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 560.9
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.40
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Acacia Ave/Sycamore Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 618 | pc/h | 564 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 58.8 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 24.4 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 71.6 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.36 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | $-\quad$ mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 42.9 | mi |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 71.6 |  |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 618.5
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.45
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Acacia Ave/Sycamore Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.39 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | $-\quad$ mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 42.2 | mi |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 73.3 | D |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl -
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 669.6
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.49
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Acacia Ave/Sycamore Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.44 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | 41.2 | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 76.5 | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 746.7
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.54
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Acacia Ave/Sycamore Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.47 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | $-\quad$ mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | 40.5 |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 78.5 | D |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) |  |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 797.8
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.58
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | 3/28/2023 |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Acacia Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for | mercia Development |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.34 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 575.0
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.41
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Acacia Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.38 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis $\qquad$

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | $-\quad \mathrm{mi}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 43.2 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 72.7 |  |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 638.0
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.46
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | 3/28/2023 |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Acacia Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for | mercia Development |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.35 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 43.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 71.0 | D |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) |  |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 597.8
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.43
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Acacia Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 661 | pc/h | 491 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 60.4 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 23.5 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 73.9 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.39 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 660.9
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.48
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highwa |
| :--- | :---: |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Acacia Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.43 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 722.8
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.53
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Acacia Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.46 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 41.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 78.4 | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl -
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 787.0
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.57
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | 3/28/2023 |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Acacia Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for | mercia Development |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.1 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.000 |  | 0.994 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 875 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS | -3) fLS | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) |  | 0.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.7 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 40.5 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 76.5 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.51 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 40.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 80.7 |  |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) | E |  |

Level of service, LOSd (from above)
E

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 875.0
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.62
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Acacia Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.1 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.000 |  | 0.994 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 938 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 698 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS | -3) fLS | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) |  | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.6 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 39.7 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 74.9 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.55 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 938.0
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.66
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/N Spruce Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |


| Highway class C | Class 1 |  | Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shoulder width | 6.0 | ft | \% Trucks and buses | 6 | \% |
| Lane width | 12.0 | ft | \% Trucks crawling | 0.0 | \% |
| Segment length | 0.0 | mi | Truck crawl speed | 0.0 | mi/hr |
| Terrain type | Level |  | \% Recreational vehicles | 4 | \% |
| Grade: Length | - | mi | \% No-passing zones | 20 | \% |
| Up/down | - | \% | Access point density | 8 | /mi |
| Analysis directi | ion volume, | 1129 | veh/h |  |  |
| Opposing directi | ion volume, | - 636 | veh/h |  |  |

Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.72 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1227.2
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.79
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| ___-_Directional Two-Lane Highway S |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/N Spruce Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year |  |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |


| Highway class C | Class 1 |  | Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shoulder width | 6.0 | ft | \% Trucks and buses | 6 | \% |
| Lane width | 12.0 | ft | \% Trucks crawling | 0.0 | \% |
| Segment length | 0.0 | mi | Truck crawl speed | 0.0 | mi/hr |
| Terrain type | Level |  | \% Recreational vehicles | 4 | \% |
| Grade: Length | - | mi | \% No-passing zones | 20 | \% |
| Up/down | - | \% | Access point density | 8 | /mi |
| Analysis directi | ion volume, | 1242 | veh/h |  |  |
| Opposing directi | ion volume, | 757 | veh/h |  |  |

Average Travel Speed

| Direction An | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.1 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.0 |  | 0.994 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.0 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 135 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 828 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) f | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 35.6 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 67.2 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.79 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | $35.6 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 90.9 | E |

Level of service, LOSd (from above)
E

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1350.0
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.84
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/N Spruce Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |


| Highway class C | Class 1 |  | Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shoulder width | 6.0 | ft | \% Trucks and buses | 6 | \% |
| Lane width | 12.0 | ft | \% Trucks crawling | 0.0 | \% |
| Segment length | 0.0 | mi | Truck crawl speed | 0.0 | mi/hr |
| Terrain type | Level |  | \% Recreational vehicles | 4 | \% |
| Grade: Length | - | mi | \% No-passing zones | 20 | \% |
| Up/down | - | \% | Access point density | 8 | /mi |
| Analysis directi | ion volume, | 1173 | veh/h |  |  |
| Opposing directi | ion volume, | 661 | veh/h |  |  |

Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing | ( 0 ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 1275 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 718 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | te-4) BPTSFd | 82.1 | \% |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 12.1 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 89.8 | \% |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.75 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 36.9 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 89.8 | E |  |

Level of service, LOSd (from above)
E

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1275.0
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.81
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highway S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/N Spruce Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year |  |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |


| Highway class C | Class 1 |  | Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shoulder width | 6.0 | ft | \% Trucks and buses | 6 | \% |
| Lane width | 12.0 | ft | \% Trucks crawling | 0.0 | \% |
| Segment length | 0.0 | mi | Truck crawl speed | 0.0 | mi/hr |
| Terrain type | Level |  | \% Recreational vehicles | 4 | \% |
| Grade: Length | - | mi | \% No-passing zones | 20 | \% |
| Up/down | - | \% | Access point density | 8 | /mi |
| Analysis directi | ion volume, | 1286 | veh/h |  |  |
| Opposing directi | ion volume, | 782 | veh/h |  |  |

Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing | ( 0 ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.1 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.000 |  | 0.994 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 139 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 855 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 35.1 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 66.1 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.82 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 35.1 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 91.8 | E |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1397.8
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.86
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/N Spruce Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |


| Highway class C | Class 1 |  | Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shoulder width | 6.0 | ft | \% Trucks and buses | 6 | \% |
| Lane width | 12.0 | ft | \% Trucks crawling | 0.0 | \% |
| Segment length | 0.0 | mi | Truck crawl speed | 0.0 | mi/hr |
| Terrain type | Level |  | \% Recreational vehicles | 4 | \% |
| Grade: Length | - | mi | \% No-passing zones | 20 | \% |
| Up/down | - | \% | Access point density | 8 | /mi |
| Analysis directi | ion volume, | 1423 | veh/h |  |  |
| Opposing directi | ion volume, | 801 | veh/h |  |  |

Average Travel Speed

| Direction An | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.0 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.0 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 154 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 871 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) f | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 33.8 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 63.7 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.91 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 33.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 93.5 | E |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1546.7
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.91
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highway S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/N Spruce Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 167 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 1002 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 31.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 60.0 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | $1670 \quad$ pc/h | 1002 | pc/h |  |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 90.0 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 8.2 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 95.1 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.98 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 31.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 95.1 |  |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) | E |  |

Level of service, LOSd (from above)
E

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl -
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1669.6
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.95
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/N Spruce Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 186 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 1051 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 29.9 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 56.4 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 1865 | pc/h | 1051 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 92.2 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 8.5 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 97.6 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | $F$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 1.10 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | $9.9 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | F |  |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) |  |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1865.2
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 5.01
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/N Spruce Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 198 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 1183 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 27.9 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 52.7 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 1988 | pc/h | 1183 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 94.2 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 8.2 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 99.3 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | $F$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 1.17 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | 27.9 |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 99.3 | F |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) |  |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1988.0
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 5.04
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/Tulare Rd |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.9 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.0 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 656 |  | 1339 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 37.1 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 69.9 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 652 | pc/h | 1339 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 69.0 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 10.8 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 72.5 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.38 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | $-\quad$ mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | $-\quad \mathrm{mi}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 37.1 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 72.5 | E |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl -
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 652.2
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.47
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highway S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/Tulare Rd |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



| Direction Ana | Analysis (d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.994 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 717 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 35.3 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 66.6 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.42 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl -
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 713.0
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.52
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/Tulare Rd |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 677 | pc/h | 1414 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 70.6 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 10.4 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 74.0 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.40 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | $36.3 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 74.0 | E |  |


| Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective |  |  |
| length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde | - | mi |
| Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective |  |  |
| length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld | - | mi |
| Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane on average speed, fpl | - |  |
| Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl | - |  |
| Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl | 0.0 | \% |

Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 677.2
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.49
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highway S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/Tulare Rd |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.994 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 742 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 1555 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 34.7 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 65.5 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 738 | pc/h | 1555 |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 74.2 | $\%$ |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 9.9 |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 77.4 | $\%$ |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.43 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 738.0
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.54
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/Tulare Rd |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.9 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.0 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 827 |  | 1714 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 32.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 61.9 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 822 | pc/h | 1714 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 77.5 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 9.4 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 80.5 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | $F$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.48 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 32.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 80.5 |  |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) | F |  |

Level of service, LOSd (from above)
F

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 821.7
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.59
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highway S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/Tulare Rd |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 883 | pc/h | 1877 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 79.4 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 9.3 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 82.4 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | $F$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.52 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 31.1 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 82.4 |  |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) | F |  |

Level of service, LOSd (from above)
F

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 882.6
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.63
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/Tulare Rd |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 104 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 2187 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 27.4 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 51.8 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 1048 | pc/h | 2187 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 83.8 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 9.2 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 86.8 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | $F$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.62 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | $\mathrm{mi}^{27.4}$ |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 86.8 |  |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) | F |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1048.3
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.71
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highway S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | Cedar Ave/Tulare Rd |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 1052 | pc/h | 2210 |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 83.9 | $\%$ |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 9.2 |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd | 86.9 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | $F$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.62 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 27.2 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 86.9 | F |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) |  |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 1052.2
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.72
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```


## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 850 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 712 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 960 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 685 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 883 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 740 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 974 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts $/ \mathrm{mi}$ | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 826 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^68]
## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1071 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1162 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1162 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 983 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1293 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/n | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 912 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |  |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1383 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1168 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 876 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/n | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1012 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 961 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1088 | Terrain Type |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% |  |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | - |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 955 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts $/ \mathrm{mi}$ | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1127 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 910 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1051 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1103 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1275 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1188 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1351 | Terrain Type |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% |  |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | - |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1332 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/n | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1538 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1417 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1614 | Terrain Type |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 828 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/n | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 796 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 905 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 864 | Terrain Type |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 860 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 827 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |  |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 937 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts $/ \mathrm{mi}$ | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 895 | Terrain Type |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1043 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/n | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1003 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^85]
## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1119 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts $/ \mathrm{mi}$ | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1071 | Terrain Type |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% |  |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | - |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^86]
## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1259 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/n | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1209 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^87]
## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1336 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts $/ \mathrm{mi}$ | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.5 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fm) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |
| Direction 1 Bicycle LOS | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |  |
| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vol),veh/h | 0 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1277 | Terrain Type |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 2.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 54.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2090 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.5 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^88]HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | N Spruce Ave/Hwy 137 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.38 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis $\qquad$


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 642.4
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.47
Bicycle LOS
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highway S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | N Spruce Ave/Hwy 137 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.42 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 709.8
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.52
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | N Spruce Ave/Hwy 137 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 |  | 1.1 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.994 |  | 0.994 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 671 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 759 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 41.4 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 78.1 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.39 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | 41.4 | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 72.5 | D |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) |  |  |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 667.4
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.48
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highway S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | N Spruce Ave/Hwy 137 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.43 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | $-\quad$ mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | 40.3 mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 75.6 | D |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) |  |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 734.8
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.53
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | N Spruce Ave/Hwy 137 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.48 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 39.1 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 78.4 |  |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) | E |  |

Level of service, LOSd (from above)
E

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 809.8
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.58
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highway S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | N Spruce Ave/Hwy 137 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 1.000 |  | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 877 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 992 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS | -3) fLS | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) |  | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 38.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 71.8 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.52 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, | Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 38.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 81.0 | E |  |

Level of service, LOSd (from above)
E

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 877.2
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.62
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | N Spruce Ave/Hwy 137 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 977 | pc/h | 1104 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 78.6 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 12.8 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 84.6 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.57 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 36.4 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 84.6 | E |

Level of service, LOSd (from above)
$\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 977.2
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.68
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highway S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 65 |
| From/To | N Spruce Ave/Hwy 137 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.49 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis


Level of service, LOSd (from above)
E

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 839.1
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.60
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```


## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1092 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLw) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width $(\mathrm{We}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 844 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^89]
## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1208 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts $/ \mathrm{mi}$ | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/n | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane $(\mathrm{vOL}), \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width $(\mathrm{We}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 952 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1135 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLw) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane $(\mathrm{vOL}), \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width $(\mathrm{We}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 877 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1249 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane $(\mathrm{vOL}), \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width $(\mathrm{We}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 985 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1376 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLw) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width $(\mathrm{We}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1064 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1492 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1172 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1660 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLw) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume (Wv), ft | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width $(\mathrm{We}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1283 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^95]
## Project Information

| Analyst | BMB | Date | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | LAV Consulting | Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Jurisdiction | County | Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Project Description | TIS for Commercial <br> Development | Units | U.S. Customary |

## Direction 1 Geometric Data

| Direction 1 | 1776 | Terrain Type | Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 1 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 1 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 1 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane $(\mathrm{vOL}), \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width $(\mathrm{We}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

## Direction 2 Geometric Data

| Direction 2 | 1391 | Terrain Type |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Access Point Density, pts/mi | 1.0 |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 55.0 | Left-Side Lateral Clearance (LCR), ft | 6 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Total Lateral Clearance (TLC), ft | 12 |
| Median Type | Divided | 54.8 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  |  |  |

## Direction 2 Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driver Population SAF | 1.000 | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 |
| Driver Population CAF | 1.000 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Demand and Capacity

| Volume(V) veh/h | 0 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 0 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 0.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2096 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.00 |  |

## Direction 2 Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 54.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Lateral Clearance Adj. (fLLC) | 0.0 | Density (D ), pc/mi/ln | 0.0 |
| Median Type Adjustment (fM) | 0.0 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Access Point Density Adjustment (fA) | 0.3 |  |  |

## Direction 2 Bicycle LOS

| Flow Rate in Outside Lane (vOL),veh/h | 0 | Effective Speed Factor (St) | 4.62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effective Width of Volume $(\mathrm{Wv}), \mathrm{ft}$ | 36 | Bicyle LOS Score (BLOS) | 0.00 |
| Average Effective Width (We), ft | 42 | Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) | A |

[^96]HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | 3/28/2023 |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Road 188 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for | mercia Development |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction An | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.9 |  | 0.988 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.0 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 458 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 498 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) f | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 1.0 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 44.6 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 84.1 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.27 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 44.6 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 62.3 | D |

Level of service, LOSd (from above)
D

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 452.2
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.29
Bicycle LOS
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Road 188 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.49 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 41.1 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 79.2 | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 825.0
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.59
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | 3/28/2023 |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Road 188 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for | mercia Development |



| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.2 |  | 1.1 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.988 |  | 0.994 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 474 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 44.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 83.1 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.28 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | $-\quad$ mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | 44.0 mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 61.3 | D |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) |  |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 468.5
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.31
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Road 188 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.2 |  | 1.1 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.988 |  | 0.994 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 523 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 618 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 43.4 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 81.9 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.30 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | -m | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 43.4 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 64.8 | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 516.3
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.35
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highw |
| :--- | :---: |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Hwy $65 /$ Road 188 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.34 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | -m | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 42.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 68.3 | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 569.6
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.40
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Road 188 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 |  | 1.1 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.994 |  | 0.994 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 620 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.6 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 42.1 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 79.5 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 616 | pc/h | 695 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 60.5 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 21.5 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 70.6 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.36 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 42.1 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 70.6 |  |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 616.3
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.44
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | 3/28/2023 |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Road 188 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for | mercia Development |



$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.40 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 688.0
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.50
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Road 188 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.43 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 44.9 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 75.7 | D |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 734.8
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.53
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Road $188 /$ Road 180 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.4 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.971 |  | 0.977 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 219 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 347 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 1.3 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 47.3 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 89.3 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 | 1.1 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 0.994 | 0.994 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 214 | pc/h | 341 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 26.4 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 35.9 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 40.2 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | C |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.13 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 47.3 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 40.2 |  |

Level of service, LOSd (from above) C

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 213.0
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 3.91
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Road 188/Road 180 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.4 |  | 1.3 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.977 |  | 0.982 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 259 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 382 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 1.2 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 46.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 88.3 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 | 1.1 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 0.994 | 0.994 |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 255 | pc/h | 377 |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 30.3 | $\%$ |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 35.6 |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 44.7 | $\%$ |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | C |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.15 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 253.3
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 3.99
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Road $188 /$ Road 180 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.3 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.971 |  | 0.982 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 228 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 356 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 1.3 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 47.2 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 89.1 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 | 1.1 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 0.994 | 0.994 |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 223 | pc/h | 352 |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 26.9 | $\%$ |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 36.1 |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 40.9 | $\%$ |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | C |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.13 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 221.7
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 3.93
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Road 188/Road 180 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.4 |  | 1.3 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.977 |  | 0.982 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 268 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 395 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 1.2 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 46.6 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 88.0 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 | 1.1 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 0.994 | 0.994 |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 264 | pc/h | 390 |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 31.8 | $\%$ |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 34.6 |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd | 45.8 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | C |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.15 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | $-\quad$ mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 46.6 | mi |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 45.8 |  |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) | C |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 262.0
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.01
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Road $188 /$ Road 180 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.4 |  | 1.3 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.977 |  | 0.982 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 275 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 435 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 1.1 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 46.3 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 87.4 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | C |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.16 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | 46.3 |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 44.6 |  |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) | C |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 268.5
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.02
Bicycle LOS
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Road 188/Road 180 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.4 |  | 1.2 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.977 |  | 0.988 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 316 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 469 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 1.1 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 45.8 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 86.5 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 0.994 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 311 | pc/h | 463 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 36.4 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 29.3 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 48.2 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | C |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.18 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

Level of service, LOSd (from above) C

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 308.7
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.09
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Road $188 /$ Road 180 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | C |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.19 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 45.4 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 49.2 |  |

Level of service, LOSd (from above) C

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 323.9
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.12
Bicycle LOS
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | Hwy 137 |
| From/To | Road 188/Road 180 |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.3 |  | 1.2 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.982 |  | 0.988 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 363 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 546 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.9 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 45.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 85.0 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 0.994 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 359 | pc/h | 539 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 42.3 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 26.6 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 52.9 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | C |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.21 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | $-\quad$ mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 45.0 | mi |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 52.9 | C |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) |  |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 356.4
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.18
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Acacia Ave/Sycamore Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.988 |  | 0.988 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 528 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 485 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 1.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 44.1 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 83.2 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.31 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | -m | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 44.1 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 66.9 | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 521.7
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.36
Bicycle LOS
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Acacia Ave/Sycamore Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.33 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 556.5
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.39
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Acacia Ave/Sycamore Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.32 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 43.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 67.8 | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 542.4
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.38
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Acacia Ave/Sycamore Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 577 | pc/h | 541 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 56.8 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 26.0 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 70.2 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.34 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | $43.3 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 70.2 | D |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 577.2
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.41
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Acacia Ave/Sycamore Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 |  | 1.1 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.994 |  | 0.994 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 662 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 42.4 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 80.0 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 658 | pc/h | 604 |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 60.5 | $\%$ |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 22.7 |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 72.3 | $\%$ |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.39 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis $\qquad$


Level of service, LOSd (from above) D
Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 657.6
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.48
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Acacia Ave/Sycamore Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 696 | pc/h | 648 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 63.5 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 21.0 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 74.4 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.41 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 695.7
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.51
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Acacia Ave/Sycamore Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.46 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | $-\quad$ mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | $-\quad 40.6$ | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 78.3 |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 789.1
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.57
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Acacia Ave/Sycamore Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |


| Highway class C | Class 1 |  | Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shoulder width | 6.0 | ft | \% Trucks and buses | 6 | \% |
| Lane width | 12.0 | ft | \% Trucks crawling | 0.0 | \% |
| Segment length | 0.0 | mi | Truck crawl speed | 0.0 | mi/hr |
| Terrain type | Level |  | \% Recreational vehicles | 4 | \% |
| Grade: Length | - | mi | \% No-passing zones | 20 | \% |
| Up/down | - | \% | Access point density | 8 | /mi |
| Analysis directi | ion volume, | 748 | veh/h |  |  |
| Opposing directi | ion volume, | - 710 | veh/h |  |  |

Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 |  | 1.1 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.994 |  | 0.994 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 818 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 40.1 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 75.7 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.48 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 | mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 40.1 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 78.5 | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 813.0
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.59
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | 3/28/2023 |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Acacia Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for | mercia Development |


| Highway class C | Class 1 |  | Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shoulder width | 6.0 | ft | \% Trucks and buses | 6 | \% |
| Lane width | 12.0 | ft | \% Trucks crawling | 0.0 | \% |
| Segment length | 0.0 | mi | Truck crawl speed | 0.0 | mi/hr |
| Terrain type | Level |  | \% Recreational vehicles | 4 | \% |
| Grade: Length | - | mi | \% No-passing zones | 20 | \% |
| Up/down | - | \% | Access point density | 8 | /mi |
| Analysis directi | ion volume, | 407 | veh/h |  |  |
| Opposing directi | ion volume, | - 440 | veh/h |  |  |

Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.3 |  | 1.2 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.982 |  | 0.988 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 451 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 1.0 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 44.7 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 84.4 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.26 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 442.4
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.28
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Acacia Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.988 |  | 0.988 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 490 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 538 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.9 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 44.1 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 83.2 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.28 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, | Lu | - | mi |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 44.1 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 63.8 | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 483.7
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.32
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | 3/28/2023 |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Acacia Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for | mercia Development |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.988 |  | 0.988 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 465 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 1.0 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 44.5 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 84.0 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.27 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis


Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 459.8
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.30
Bicycle LOS
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Acacia Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2025 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis(d) |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.988 |  | 0.988 |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 507 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 557 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.9 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 43.9 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 82.8 | \% |  |

$\qquad$

| Direction | Analysis(d) | Opposing (o) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adjustment factor, fHV | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Grade adjustment factor, (note-1) fg | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 501 | pc/h | 550 | pc/h |
| Base percent time-spent-following, (note-4) | BPTSFd | 51.6 | $\%$ |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 27.2 |  |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd |  | 64.6 | $\%$ |  |

Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.29 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | $-\quad$ mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | $-\quad 43.9$ | mi |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 64.6 |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 501.1
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.34
Bicycle LOS
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highwa |
| :--- | :---: |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Acacia Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

| Direction Anal | Analysis |  | Opposing (o) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCE for trucks, ET | 1.1 |  |  |  |
| PCE for RVs, ER | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| Heavy-vehicle adj. factor, (note-5) fHV | 0.9 |  |  |  |
| Grade adj. factor, (note-1) fg | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| Directional flow rate, (note-2) vi | 560 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
| Free-Flow Speed from Field Measurement: |  |  |  |  |
| Field measured speed, (note-3) S FM |  | - | mi/h |  |
| Observed total demand, (note-3) V |  | - | veh/h |  |
| Estimated Free-Flow Speed: |  |  |  |  |
| Base free-flow speed, (note-3) BFFS |  | 55.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for lane and shoulder width, (note-3) | -3) fLS | 0.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adj. for access point density, (note-3) fA | fA | 2.0 | mi/h |  |
| Free-flow speed, FFSd |  | 53.0 | mi/h |  |
| Adjustment for no-passing zones, fnp |  | 0.8 | mi/h |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd |  | 43.2 | mi/h |  |
| Percent Free Flow Speed, PFFS |  | 81.5 | \% |  |

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.33 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 43.2 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 67.2 | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 556.5
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.39
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Acacia Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2035 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.35 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | -m | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 42.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 69.2 | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 597.8
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.43
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

|  | Directional Two-Lane Highwa |
| :--- | :---: |
| Analyst | BMB |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Acacia Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.40 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Directional capacity | 1700 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | - | mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | - | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 41.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 73.4 | D |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 672.8
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.49
Bicycle LOS D
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```

HCS7: Two-Lane Highways Release 7.7

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ Directional Two-Lane Highway Segment Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst | BMB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | LAV Consulting |
| Date Performed | $3 / 28 / 2023$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak Hour + Project |
| Highway | N Spruce Ave |
| From/To | Hwy 65/Acacia Ave |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |
| Description TIS for Commercia Development |  |



Average Travel Speed

$\qquad$


Level of Service and Other Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Level of service, LOS | D |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume to capacity ratio, v/c | 0.42 |  |
| Peak 15-min vehicle-miles of travel, VMT15 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak-hour vehicle-miles of travel, VMT60 | 0 | veh-mi |
| Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 | 0.0 | veh-h |
| Capacity from ATS, CdATS | 1700 | veh/h |
| Capacity from PTSF, CdPTSF | 1700 | veh/h |
| Directional Capacity | 1700 | veh/h |

Passing Lane Analysis

| Total length of analysis segment, Lt | 0.0 mi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length of two-lane highway upstream of the passing lane, Lu | $-\quad$ mi |  |
| Length of passing lane including tapers, Lpl | mi |  |
| Average travel speed, ATSd (from above) | 40.9 | mi |
| Percent time-spent-following, PTSFd (from above) | 74.9 | D |
| Level of service, LOSd (from above) |  |  |

Average Travel Speed with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective
length of passing lane for average travel speed, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective
length of the passing lane for average travel speed, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on average speed, fpl
Average travel speed including passing lane, ATSpl
Percent free flow speed including passing lane, PFFSpl 0.0 \%
Percent Time-Spent-Following with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Downstream length of two-lane highway within effective length
of passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Lde - mi
Length of two-lane highway downstream of effective length of the passing lane for percent time-spent-following, Ld - mi
Adj. factor for the effect of passing lane
on percent time-spent-following, fpl
Percent time-spent-following including passing lane, PTSFpl - \%
_____Level of Service and Other Performance Measures with Passing Lane $\qquad$
Level of service including passing lane, LOSpl E
Peak 15-min total travel time, TT15 - veh-h

```
Posted speed limit, Sp 55
Percent of segment with occupied on-highway parking 0
Pavement rating, P 3
Flow rate in outside lane, vOL 714.1
Effective width of outside lane, We 24.00
Effective speed factor, St 4.79
Bicycle LOS Score, BLOS 4.52
Bicycle LOS E
Notes:
1. Note that the adjustment factor for level terrain is 1.00, as level terrain
    is one of the base conditions. For the purpose of grade adjustment, specific
    dewngrade segments are treated as level terrain.
2. If vi (vd or vo ) >= 1,700 pc/h, terminate analysis-the LOS is F.
3. For the analysis direction only and for v>200 veh/h.
4. For the analysis direction only.
5. Use alternative Exhibit 15-14 if some trucks operate at crawl speeds on a
    specific downgrade.
```


## Appendix "C" Additional Documents

## California Department of Transportation

DISTRICT 6 OFFICE<br>1352 WEST OLIVE AVENUE |P.O. BOX 12616 |FRESNO, CA 93778-2616<br>(559) 840-6066 | FAX (559) 488-4195 | TTY 711<br>www.dot.ca.gov

June 15, 2023
TUL-65-30.30
TRAVEL CENTER (5)
CEDAR AVENUE, LINDSAY, CA
GTS \#: $\underline{36146}$

## SENT VIA EMAIL: brent@lavpinnacle.com

Mr. Brent Barenberg
LAV // Pinnacle
Consulting \& Engineering Services
12418 Rosedale Highway, Suite B
Bakersfield, CA 93312

Dear Mr. Barenberg:
Caltrans has completed review the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) dated April 20, 2023, for a Travel Center which proposes a convenience store, 2 quick serve restaurants (QSR) with drive-thru, a gas fueling canopy with 8 pumps ( 16 dispensers), and a diesel fueling area with 6 pumps ( 12 dispensers) (Project). The Project site is located on northeast corner of the State Route (SR) 65 intersection with Cedar Avenue in the City of Lindsay, Tulare County.

Caltrans provides the following comments consistent with the State's smart mobility goals that support a vibrant economy and sustainable communities:

1. On page 13, of the TIS, the last paragraph states "Caltrans' policy sets a limit ...pass-by and captured to 25 percent." The Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies states that a reduction of more than $15 \%$ for "pass-by" as well as $5 \%$ for "internal capture" trips shall be justified and must be discussed in the TIS. Please provide examples and discussion in the TIS, of similar development sites, as a part of the justification for a reduction of more than $15 \%$.
2. Table 2, on page 14 , under the calculated trips generation, indicates reduction for "pass-by" trips was computed at 20\% which exceeds the limits for "pass-by" trips set by Caltrans in the Traffic Impact Study Guide (This is also stated at the top of page 41). Please provide examples/discussion of similar development sites, as justification for a reduction of more than $15 \%$.
3. Please correct, page 15, second paragraph under "Trip Simulation", where it states, "Based on information provided by Kern Council of Government ...". This project is in Tulare County and should be changed to "Tulare County Council of Government...".
4. Please correct, page 32, second paragraph, where it states "...including the City of Bakersfield and the County of Kern." This project is in Tulare County and should indicate "...including the City of Lindsay and the County of Tulare."
5. Please verify and correct, Table 9: Project Pro-Rata Share, on page 38. The year of the Pro-Rata Share is listed as year 2042, however the analysis year (future life cycle of the project) in the report is shown as year 2045.
6. Caltrans does not disagree with the calculated Pro-Rata Share in the Table 9 . However, Caltrans has partnered with the County of Tulare to design and construct the re-alignment of SR 65, which is west of the current existing SR 65 alignment and is tentatively scheduled to start construction in 2034.
7. As a point of information, the new SR 65 re-alignment project will include the construction of a Roundabout at the SR 65 and Cedar Avenue intersection. As part of the SR 65 re-alignment project, Cedar Avenue would be terminated north of SR 65 and realigned to the East to connect with the new alignment of Oak Avenue. The existing W. Tulare Road will be closed or re-aligned when the roundabout is constructed. For further information, it is recommended to contact Caltrans Project Manager, Mohamad Annan at (559) 270-4448 or mohamad.annan@dot.ca.gov
8. Caltrans anticipates that the recommended signalization of the SR 65 / Cedar Avenue intersection may need to be re-evaluated in the future. Caltrans Traffic Operations Directive 13-02 requires the analysis of any new intersection control, to evaluate the most effective traffic control strategies (whether signal, multi-stop or yield or roundabout control) for an intersection within the State's right-of-way.
9. Regarding the site plan for the proposed development, Layout A-1, on page 43:
a) It is we request that structures (above-ground or underground) like underground storage fuel tanks or monument signage be installed outside of the footprint of the future roundabout at the Cedar Avenue intersection. The Project developer understands that any improvements, upon, over, and across said real property within the roundabout footprint shall be removed at Project developer's expense, when construction of the roundabout starts.
b) It is requests that all truck traffic to enter/exit the Project site via the Cedar Avenue driveway which should be designed for truck traffic movements. Therefore, it is recommended that the SR 65 / Cedar intersection be re-evaluated by the TIS for truck turning movements.
c) Please be advised that the westbound to northbound right turn lane shall be designed to meet the Caltrans standards specified in the Highway Design Manual (HDM Index 405.3).
d) A 6-foot bike lane shall also be installed between the thru-lane and the right-turn lane as required by the Caltrans HDM Index 403.6.(1). Additional safety measures must be considered, during the design phase, to facilitate safe operations for motoring public, especially at the proposed access point (driveway) on SR 65.
10. On page 45, Figure 2: 2023 traffic volume/count, please verify there is no turning volumes (in/out to/from SR 65) at Cedar Avenue during peak hours. This is the same for all future year analysis (without project scenario).
11. Please provide the traffic signal warrant sheets (calculations) for the unsignalized intersections listed in Table 8.
12. For Appendix B, regarding printouts/outputs for the LOS calculations:
a) For the signalized analysis, the peak hour factor (PHF) is set at 1.0. Please verify that the PHF calculation is correct.
b) For the multi-lane highway analysis, the access point density is set at zero. Please verify that the correct value for access density is being used.
13. Caltrans requires the Project to construct highway frontage improvements along SR 65 including but not limited to roadway pavement improvements, curb, gutter, sidewalks, streetlights and drainage facilities.
14. Caltrans requires a minimum of a 6 -foot sidewalk (10-foot preferred), measured from the back of the curb.
15. Dust control measures shall be implemented on the site in a manner to prevent dust from entering the State right-of-way.
16. No water from the proposed project shall flow into the State right-of-way without approval from the District Hydraulic Engineer.
17. Caltrans recommends the Project install sidewalks and streetlights at the SR 65 and Cedar Avenue intersection and along Cedar Avenue for pedestrian security and safe operations of the intersection.
18. All proposed landscaping plans shall meet current standards as determined by the District Landscape Architect. Proposed landscaping adjacent to driveways needs to be low growing, less than two feet in height, due to sight distance concerns. All features of landscaping shall be evaluated for type, location and site visibility conflicts during the encroachment review process. All permits for landscaping in conventional highway right-of-way must be accompanied by a "District" approved maintenance agreement obligating a local agency or the permittee to maintaining the
landscaping. Said maintenance agreement must accompany and be approved prior to issuance of the landscape permit. Proposed landscape projects in access control rights-of-way require an exception process, and approval is subject to the Headquarters Departmental approval process.
19. The sidewalk, streetlights and any landscaping shall be maintained per a "District 6" approved maintenance agreement.
20. As a point of information, any work completed in the State's right-of-way will require a Caltrans encroachment permit. An encroachment permit must be obtained for all proposed activities for placement of encroachments within, under or over the State highway rights-of-way. Activity and work planned in the State right-of-way shall be performed to State standards and specifications, at no cost to the State. Engineering plans, calculations, specifications, and reports (documents) shall be stamped and signed by a licensed Engineer or Architect. Engineering documents for encroachment permit activity and work in the State right-of-way may be submitted using English Units. The Permit Department and the Environmental Planning Branch will review and approve the activity and work in the State right-of-way before an encroachment permit is issued. The Streets and Highways Code Section 670 provides Caltrans discretionary approval authority for projects that encroach on the State Highway System. Encroachment permits will be issued in accordance with Streets and Highway Codes, Section 671.5, "Time Limitations." Encroachment permits do not run with the land. A change of ownership requires a new permit application. Only the legal property owner or his/her authorized agent can pursue obtaining an encroachment permit.
21. Prior to an encroachment permit application submittal, the project proponent is required to schedule a "Pre-Submittal" meeting with District 6 Encroachment Permit Office. To schedule this meeting, please call the Caltrans Encroachment Permit Office - District 6: 1352 W. Olive, Fresno, CA 93778, at (559) 383-5047 or (559) 383-5235.
22. Please review the encroachment permit application - required document checklist at: https://forms.dot.ca.gov/v2Forms/servlet/FormRenderer?frmid=TR0402\&distpath=MAOT O\&brapath=PERM.
23. Please also review the encroachment permit application - processing checklist at: https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/traffic-operations/documents/encroachment-permits/tr-0416-applicable-review-processchecklist.pdf.
24. Any advertising signs within the immediate area outside the State right-of-way need to be cleared through the Caltrans Division of Traffic Operations, Office of Outdoor Advertising. The project proponent must construct and maintain the advertising signs without access to the State Routes. Please contact the Outdoor Advertising Program, P.O. Box 942874, MS-36, Sacramento, CA 94274-001, by email at ODA@dot.ca.gov or at

Mr. Brent Barenberg - TIS
June 15, 2023
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(916) 654-6473 for additional information or to obtain a sign permit application. Additional information on Caltrans Outdoor Advertising Permit requirement may also be found on the Internet at http://dot.ca.gov/programs/traffic-operations/oda.

If you have any other questions, please call David Deel, Associate Transportation Planner at (559) 981-1041.

Sincerely,
Lorena Mendibles
Ms. Lorena Mendibles, Branch Chief, Transportation Planning - South

# LAV//PINNACLE <br> Consulting \& Engineering Services <br> Planning - Engineering - Surveying - Project Management 

Ms. Lorena Medibles, Branch Chief<br>August 14, 2023<br>Transportation Planning, - South<br>California Department of Transportation - District 6 Office<br>1352 West Olive Avenue, P.O. Box 12616<br>Fresno, California 93778-2316<br>\section*{RE: Travel Center TUL-6.5-30.30, Cedar Avenue, Lindsay - Response to Traffic Impact Study Review - Caltrans Letter of 6-15-23}

Dear Ms. Mendibles:
This letter is in response to your letter of June 15, 2023, to Mr. Brent Barenberg, LAV/Pinnacle Engineering, in which you provided a review and comments for the referenced traffic impact study (TIS). Thank you for your prompt review of the TIS.

In addition to review of the TIS, your letter of June 15th included numerous Caltrans design, construction, and landscaping requirements. This letter and the attached revised TIS can only address comments related to the TIS. Compliance with Caltrans' site design, landscaping, erosion, dust control, and drainage criteria can only be demonstrated with submission of improvement plans. However, the full range of improvements can only be determined once the TIS is approved. With this submittal, we are seeking approval of the TIS from your office.

In the following, I have reiterated each comment from your letter of June $15^{\text {th }}$, and provided our responses:

Comment 1: On page 13, of the TIS, the last paragraph states "Caltrans' policy sets a limit ...pass-by and captured to 25 percent." The Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies states that a reduction of more than $15 \%$ for "pass-by" as well as $5 \%$ for "intemal capture" trips shall be justified and must be disc ussed in the TIS. Please provide examples and disc ussion in the TIS, of similar development sites, as a part of the justification fora reduction of more than $15 \%$.

Response to Comment No. 1: Given comments no. 1 and 2 are of a similar nature, we have provided a combined response to both comments: Please see our response that follows Comment No. 2.

Comment 2: Table 2, on page 14, under the calculated trips generation, indicates reduction for "pass-by" tripswascomputed at 20\%which exceedsthe limitsfor "passby" trips set by C a ltrans in the Traffic Impa ct Study Guide (This is also sta ted at the top of page 41). Please provide examples/discussion of similar development sites, as justific ation for a reduction of more than $15 \%$.

Response to Comment No. 1 and 2: Our office has specialized in the development of truck stops, gas stations with convenience markets and quick serve restaurants. These sites also often include specialty retail stores. As in the referenced project, these facilities are typically located along major arterials, thoroughfares, expressways, and freeways. The Project itself is located at the intersection of State Route (SR) 65. South of the Project, much of SR 65 is classified as an expressway, but it downgrades to a rural two-lane highway in the vicinity of Lindsay. Nevertheless, SR 65 carries a significant amount of traffic bound for central valley locations.

Having been involved in so many similar projects, including preparation of traffic impact studies (TIS), we have performed numerous driveway surveys of like projects. These surveys have been performed at all hours to include peak and non-peak periods. As in the case of every project, we perform a driveway survey at the nearest similar facility. As discussed in page 8 of the Project TIS, without exception, these surveys all indicated well over 90 percent of trips to these facilities are "side trips", being part of the principal trip to a destination other than the project. If the project was "sited" along a major thoroughfare, our surveys revealed over 90 percent of trips were "passbys". If the project was at or near a freeway interchange, our surveys revealed the majority of trips were "diverted link" trips. In either scenario, again without exception, less than 2 percent of trips to these projects were primary trips, being mostly employees.

As I am sure you are aware, current editions of the ITE Manual do not include data or case studies for "pass-by" and "capture". However, past editions provided numerous studies for similar projects and resulting rates ranging from $58 \%$ to $90 \%$, and $15 \%$ to $38 \%$ for "pass-by" and "capture", respectively.

Given our own research, as well as that by other reputable sources, we have no doubt that the 20 percent used in this study for the combined effects of "pass-by" and "capture", is extremely conservative.

Comment 3: Please correct, page 15, second paragraph under "Trip Simulation", where it states, "Based on information provided by Kem Counc il of Govemment ...". This project is in Tulare County and should be changed to "Tulare County Council of Govemment..."

Response to Comment No. 3: The information in the report was in fact provided by the Kern Council of Governments (KernCOG). Said information only relates to average trip length. KernCOG maintains a traffic simulation model for Kern County, and we have not found an agency in Tulare County providing same. Since central Lindsay is about 1.5 miles from the Project, and the majority of the trips are "pass-bys", using 4 miles for an average trip assimilation length is considered conservative. Actual average trip lengths for gas or convenience items are likely less than the 4 miles used in the study.

Comment 4: Please correct, page 32, second paragraph, where it states "...including the City of Bakersfield and the County of Kem." This project is in Tulare

# LAV//PINNACLE <br> Consulting \& Engineering Services <br> Planning - Engineering - Surveying - Project Management 

County and should indicate "...including the City of Lindsay and the County of Tulare."

Response to Comment No. 4: The correction has been made in the revised copy, attached and dated August 14, 2023.

Comment 5: Please verify and correct, Table 9: Project Pro-Rata Share, on page 38. The yea rof the Pro-Rata Share is listed as year 2042, howeverthe a na lysis year (future life cycle of the project) in the report is shown as year 2045.

Response to Comment No. 5: The correction has been made in the revised copy, attached, and dated August 14, 2023.

Comment 6: Caltrans does not disagree with the calculated Pro-Rata Share in the Table 9. However, Caltrans has partnered with the County of Tulare to design and construct the re-alignment of SR 65, which is west of the current existing SR 65 a lignment and istentatively scheduled to start construction in 2034.

Response to Comment No. 6: Comment noted.
Comment 7: Asa point of information, the new SR 65 re-a lignment project will include the construction of a Roundabout at the SR 65 and Cedar Avenue intersection. As part of the SR 65 re-alignment project, Cedar Avenue would be temminated north of SR 65 and realigned to the East to connect with the new alignment of Oak Avenue. The existing W. Tulare Road will be closed or re-aligned when the roundabout is constructed. For further information, it is recommended to contact Caltrans Project Manager, Mohamad Annan at (559) 270-4448 or mohamad.annan@dot.ca.gov

Response to Comment No. 7: As recommended I spoke with Mr. Annan, who participated in our conference call months ago, and he has seen the site plan for the Project. Mr. Annan indicated that the Project Report for the SR 65 realignment would be completed in about 6 weeks, at which time a more "final" drawing of the realignment will be available. However, Mr. Annan did not indicate any substantial changes that would affect the Project. In our discussion, I indicated the Project's current site layout is compatible with Caltrans' realignment of SR 65, including the roundabout.

Your comment indicated that Cedar Avenue would be closed north of SR 65 and realigned to tie into Oak Avenue. Since it will be tying into Oak Avenue, I have assumed that a short segment of Cedar Avenue will still connect to SR 65, rather than its complete removal. Either way will be compatible with the Project. We are also in agreement with the realignment of W. Tulare Road such that it does not intersect with SR 65. Certainly realignment of W. Tulare Road as a first order of work would simplify construction and traffic control for the SR 65 project.

As you know, the TIS recommends a traffic signal at the intersection of Cedar Avenue and SR 65. This signal will simply be removed and salvaged when the SR 65 realignment project commences work on the roundabout in 2034.

Comment 8: Caltra ns antic ipa tes that the recommended signa liza tion of the SR 65 / Cedar Avenue intersection may need to be re-evaluated in the future. Caltrans Traffic Operations Direc tive 13-02 requires the a nalysis of a ny new intersection c ontrol, to evaluate the most effective traffic control strategies (whether signal, multi-stop or yield or roundabout control) for an intersection within the State's right-of-way.

Response to Comment No. 8: We do not disagree that the proposed traffic signal at the intersection SR 65 and Cedar may need reevaluation in the future. Please be aware that the TIS for the Project, in addition to a signal analysis of Cedar Avenue and SR 65, evaluated the intersection for a two-way stop and a multi-stop, both with additional dedicated turn lanes; however, the "finding" was that a traffic signal was the only mitigation resulting in a satisfactory Level of Service. As I discussed in my response to Comments 1 and 2, the TIS calculations are overly conservative given Caltrans' limitations on "pass-by" and "capture" rates. We are happy to reanalyze the intersection of Cedar Avenue and SR 65 using realistic values for "pass-by" and "capture." I should also mention that the TIS used growth factors of 1.9 percent, compounded annually to estimate future traffic. Even though the last few years of data indicate decreasing traffic, lesser or negative growth factors have been rejected by Caltrans and local agencies in past studies.

Decreasing traffic is largely attributed to California’s decreasing population, and the continued post-pandemic trend in working remotely. Please let me know if we should reanalyze the intersection of Cedar Avenue and SR 65 using "pass-by" and "capture" rates consistent with our driveway surveys and other data.

Comment 9: Regarding the site plan for the proposed development, Layout A-1, on page 43:
a) It is we request that structures (above-ground or underground) like underground storage fuel tanks or monument signage be installed outside of the footprint of the future roundabout at the Cedar Avenue intersection. The Project developer understands that any improvements, upon, over, and across said real property within the roundabout footprint shall be removed at Project developer's expense, when construction of the rounda bout starts.

Response to Comment No. 9a: Comment noted. Please understand that following this recommendation can only be demonstrated with submission of improvement plans. At this time, we are only seeking approval of the TIS; but the current site plan has located underground tanks and structures outside of the future footprint of said roundabout.
b) It is requests that a ll truck traffic to enter/ exit the Project site via the CedarAvenue driveway which should be designed for truck traffic movements. Therefore, it is recommended that the SR 65 / Cedarintersection be re-evaluated by the TISfortruck tuming movements.

Response to Comment No. 9b: The intersection of Cedar Avenue and SR 65 has been reanalyzed routing all anticipated project-related truck traffic through the intersection. Calculations have been attached herewith and are included in the attached revised TIS. The analysis has indicated that the intersection will operate at a satisfactory Level of Service with proposed mitigation in place.
c)Please be advised that the westbound to northbound right tum lane shall be designed to meet the Caltrans standards specified in the Highway Design Manual (HDM Index 405.3).

Response to Comment No. 9c: Comment noted; however, given the presence of W. Tulare Road, the length of a west bound right-turn lane is limited. Once W. Tulare Road is realigned and does not intersect with SR 65, the right turn lane could be lengthened.
d) A 6-foot bike lane shall also be installed between the thru-lane and the right-tum lane as required by the Caltrans HDM Index 403.6.(1). Additional safety measures must be considered, during the design phase, to facilitate safe operations for motoring public, especially at the proposed access point (driveway) on SR 65.

Response to Comment No. 9d: We request that Caltrans reconsider the requirement for a striped 6-foot bike lane for the following reasons: 1) There is currently no bike lane striping on either side of the Project, nor anywhere in its vicinity. 2) There is not a planned bike route along SR 65 or any other side street. 3) Five hundred feet of striped bike lane with no connectivity at either end would obviously not be utilized by bicyclists and would only confuse motorists.

Comment 10: On page 45, Figure 2: 2023 traffic volume/count, please verify there is no tuming volumes (in/out to/from SR 65) at Cedar Avenue during peak hours. This is the same for all future year a nalysis (without project scena rio).

Response to Comment No. 10: The volumes indicated in the original report reflect our actual counts. However, we have reanalyzed the intersection, adding a small volume of traffic, including turning movements. The Level of Service calculations under this scenario did not yield different results.

Comment 11: Please provide the traffic signal warrant sheets (calculations) for the unsigna lized intersections listed in Table 8.

Response to Comment No. 11: Warrant sheets are included in Appendix "C" of the original TIS. Additional copies are attached herewith.

Comment 12: For Appendix B, regarding printouts/ outputs for the LOS calculations:
a) For the signa lized a na lysis, the peak hour factor (PHF) is set at 1.0.

Plea se verify that the PHF calculation is correct.
Response to Comment No. 12a: A calculation of the PHF was prepared and yielded a value of 0.88 . The intersection has been recalculated; however, the Level of Service did not change. The overall average delay did increase from 38.3 to 38.9 seconds.
b) For the multi-lane highway analysis, the access point density is set at zero. Please verify that the correct value for access density is being used.

Response to Comment No. 12b: The muli-lane access point densities have been adjusted, ranging from 1.0 to 2.0 where appropriate, but the Level of Service results did not change.

Comment 13: Caltrans requires the Project to construct highway frontage improvements along SR 65 including but not limited to roadway pavement improvements, curb, gutter, sidewalks, streetlights a nd dra ina ge facilities.

Response to Comment No. 13: The current site plan shows said required improvements. These improvements will also be verified by Caltrans when plans are submitted as part of the encroachment permit process.

Comment 14: Caltrans requires a minimum of a 6-foot sidewalk (10-foot preferred), measured from the back of the curb.

Response to Comment No. 14: The current site plan shows a sidewalk width of 6-feet.

Comment No. 15: Dust control measures shall be implemented on the site in a manner to prevent dust from entering the State right-of-way.

Response to Comment No. 15: The Grading Plan, yet unsubmitted, includes both erosion control and dust control measures. Fugitive dust will not leave the Project site.

Comment 16: No water from the proposed project shall flow into the State right-ofway without approval from the District Hydra ulic Engineer.

Response to Comment No. 16: The Grading Plan, yet unsubmitted, includes erosion control measures. The site is not large enough to "trigger" a Storm Water Pollution Control Plan (SWPPP), yet a comprehensive plan of appropriate BMPs for erosion control is included. This plan is as comprehensive as any SWPPP.
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Comment 17: Caltrans recommends the Project install sidewalks and streetlights at the SR 65 and Cedar Avenue intersection and along Cedar Avenue for pedestrian security and safe operations of the intersection.

Response to Comment No. 17: The Grading Plan, yet unsubmitted, includes sidewalks and street lights. These improvements will be verified by Caltrans during the encroachment permit process.

Comment 18: All proposed landscaping plans shall meet current standards as determined by the District Landscape Architect. Proposed landscaping adjacent to driveways needsto be low growing, less than two feet in height, due to sight dista nce concems. All features of landscaping shall be evaluated for type, location and site visibility conflicts during the encroachment review process. All permits for landscaping in conventional highway right-of-way must be accompanied by a "District" approved maintenance agreement obligating a local agency or the permittee to maintaining the landscaping. Said maintenance agreement must accompany and be approved prior to issuance of the landscape pemit. Proposed la ndsc a pe projectsin accesscontrol rights-of-way require an exception process, and a pproval is subject to the Headquarters Departmental a pproval process.

Response to Comment No. 18: Comment noted. We also are especially concerned with maintaining safe site distance at all intersections and project entrances.

Comment 19: The sidewalk, streetlights a nd a ny land sc a ping shall be ma inta ined per a "District 6" approved maintenance agreement.

Response to Comment No. 19: Comment noted.
Comment 20: As a point of information, any work completed in the State's right-ofway will require a Caltrans encroachment permit. An encroachment permit must be obta ined for all proposed a ctivities for placement of enc roachments within, under or over the State highway rights-of-way. Activity and work planned in the State right-ofway shall be performed to State standardsand specific ations, at no cost to the State. Engineering plans, calculations, specifications, and reports (documents) shall be stamped and signed by a licensed Engineer orArchitect. Engineering documents for encroachment permit activity and work in the State right-of-way may be submitted using English Units. The Permit Department and the Environmental Planning Branch will review and approve the activity and work in the State right-of-way before an encroachment permit is issued. The Streets a nd HighwaysCode Section 670 provides Caltrans discretionary approval authority for projects that encroach on the State Highwa y System. Enc roa chment permits will be issued in a ccord ance with Streets a nd Highway Codes, Section 671.5, "Time Limitations." Encroachment permits do not run with the land. A change of ownership requires a new permit application. Only the
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legal property owner or his/her authorized agent can pursue obtaining an encroachment pemit.

Response to Comment No. 20: Comment noted. The Owner's intent is to pursue the encroachment as soon as possible. Engineered plans must be comprehensive and include all requirements of an approved TIS.

Comment 21: Prior to an encroachment permit application submittal, the project proponent is required to schedule a "Pre-Submittal" meeting with District 6 Encroachment Permit Office. To schedule this meeting, please call the Caltrans Encroachment Permit Office - District 6: 1352 W. Olive, Fresno, CA 93778, at (559) 3835047 or (559) 383-5235.

Response to Comment No. 21: Comment noted.
Comment 22. Please review the encroachment permit a pplic ation - required document checklist at:
https:// forms.dot.ca.gov/v2Forms/ servlet/ FormRenderer? frmid =TR0402\&d istpath=M AOTO\&brapath=PERM.

Response to Comment No. 22: Comment noted.
Comment 23: Please a lso review the encroachment permit application - processing checklist at: https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/trafficoperations/doc uments/encroa c hment-permits/tr-0416-a pplic able-review-processchec klist.pdf.

Response to Comment No. 23: Comment noted.
Comment 24: Any a dvertising signs within the immed iate a rea outside the Sta te right-of-way need to be cleared through the Caltrans Division of Traffic Operations, Office of Outdoor Advertising. The project proponent must construct and mainta in the advertising signs without access to the State Routes. Please contact the Outdoor Advertising Program, P.O. Box 942874, MS-36, Sa cramento, CA 94274-001, by email at ODA@dot.ca.gov orat
(916)654-6473 for additional information or to obtain a sign pemit application. Additional information on Caltra ns Outdoor Advertising Permit requirement may also be found on the Intemet athttp://dot.ca.gov/programs/traffic-operations/oda.

Response to Comment No. 24: Comment noted.

## LAV//PINNACLE

Consulting \& Engineering Services
Planning - Engineering - Surveying - Project Management
Thank you again for your review and comments. Again, all comments related to the TIS have been addressed with this letter, the revised TIS, and attachments. Please let me know if you need any further information. We hereby request approval of the attached TIS, dated August 14, 2023.

Sincerely,

Matt VoVilla, P.E.

Attachments

| From: | Deel, David@DOT |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Brent Barenberg |
| Cc: | Scott Quintana; Alyssa Allen; Mendibles, Lorena@DOT |
| Subject: | RE: TIS Lindsay Gas Station Route 65 [21-992] |
| Date: | Friday, July 14, 2023 1:38:47 PM |

Brent,
Got a quick reply and both questions a re YES.
Q1 =Yes, granted a section of the study was devoted to justifying the reasoning
Q2 $=$ Yes, Given the findings of the surveys, would Caltrans find the 20\% reduction to be acceptable for the basis of our study?

Respectfully,
DAVID DEEL| CALIRANSD6| Offic e: 559.981.1041

From: Brent Barenberg [brent@lavpinnacle.com](mailto:brent@lavpinnacle.com)
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2023 9:04 AM
To: Deel, David@DOT [david.deel@dot.ca.gov](mailto:david.deel@dot.ca.gov)
Cc: Scott Quintana [scott@lavpinnacle.com](mailto:scott@lavpinnacle.com); Alyssa Allen [alyssa@lavpinnacle.com](mailto:alyssa@lavpinnacle.com)
Subject: RE: TIS Lindsay Gas Station Route 65 [21-992]

## EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

Hello David,

I am addressing the comment letter you provided for the Lindsay Traffic Study. I had a question regarding comments $1 \& 2$.

Both comments regard justifying a pass-by percentage of $20 \%$. Based on how the comments are written, it seems that the $20 \%$ reduction could be considered acceptable, granted a section of the study was devoted to justifying the reasoning. Am I correct in this assessment?

In regard to pass-by, we determined a $20 \%$ reduction is conservative based on a driveway survey done at a travel center near the Project site. Additionally, several driveway surveys of travel centers in the region were looked at as a basis of comparison. For the Lindsay driveway survey, it was found that $100 \%$ of trips are pass-by trips. In all other surveys, the pass-by percentage was a minimum of $30 \%$ of surveyed trips, with several surveys exceeding $90 \%$ pass-by. Several such surveys, including the Lindsay survey, have been attached to this email. Given the findings of the surveys, would Caltrans find the $20 \%$ reduction to be acceptable for the basis of our study?

Thank you for your help. Please let me know if you have any questions or need any additional information.

Brent Barenberg
LAV // Pinnacle

From: Deel, David@DOT [david.deel@dot.ca.gov](mailto:david.deel@dot.ca.gov)
Sent: Thursday, June 15, 2023 4:08 PM
To: Brent Barenberg [brent@lavpinnacle.com](mailto:brent@lavpinnacle.com)
Cc: logananthonycouch@gmail.com; Scott Quintana [scott@lavpinnacle.com](mailto:scott@lavpinnacle.com); Alyssa Allen [alyssa@lavpinnacle.com](mailto:alyssa@lavpinnacle.com); Matt Vovilla [matt@lavpinnacle.com](mailto:matt@lavpinnacle.com); Mendibles, Lorena@DOT
[lorena.mendibles@dot.ca.gov](mailto:lorena.mendibles@dot.ca.gov)
Subject: RE: TIS Lindsay Gas Station Route 65 [21-992]

Brent,

C altrans comment letter is attached for the TIS review for the proposed Travel Center on SR 65 in Lindsay.

If you have further questions, please contact me.

Respectfully,
DAVID DEEL| Associate Transportation Planner| Desk \& Mobile: 559.981.1041
Pla nning, Local Programs \& Environmental Analysis Division
C ALTRANS - District 6
1352 W. Olive Avenue (P.O. Box 12616)
Fresno, CA 93778-2616

## For real-time highway conditions: http://quickmap.dotca.gov/

From: Brent Barenberg [brent@lavpinnacle.com](mailto:brent@lavpinnacle.com)
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2023 3:58 PM
To: Deel, David@DOT [david.deel@dot.ca.gov](mailto:david.deel@dot.ca.gov)
Cc: logananthonycouch@gmail.com; Scott Quintana [scott@lavpinnacle.com](mailto:scott@lavpinnacle.com); Alyssa Allen [alyssa@lavpinnacle.com](mailto:alyssa@lavpinnacle.com); Matt Vovilla [matt@lavpinnacle.com](mailto:matt@lavpinnacle.com)
Subject: TIS Lindsay Gas Station Route 65 [21-992]

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.
Hello David,

Please find in the link below the Traffic Impact Study for the proposed Gas Station/C-Store located on Route 65 in Lindsay.

## $\underline{\text { https://lavpinnacle.sharefile.com/d-s84d0dce2e5754568828c523bdc5c1640 }}$

Please let me know if you have any questions or need any additional information.

Brent Barenberg
LAV // Pinnacle
Consulting \& Engineering Services
12418 Rosedale Highway, Suite B
Bakersfield, CA 93312
brent@lavpinnacle.com
Office: (661) 869-0184

| From: | Deel, David@DOT |
| :---: | :---: |
| To: | Brent Barenberg |
| Cc: | Scott Quintana; "Matt Vovilla"; "Nashwan Obad"; najimoh09@gmail.com; "Kari Rivera"; Ly, Duc Ken K@DOT; Lee, Albert M@DOT; Mendibles, Lorena@DOT; Olson, Eric@DOT; Annan, Mohamad@DOT; Navarro, Michael@DOT; logananthonycouch@gmail.com |
| Subject: | RE: TIS Scope for Lindsay Route 65 and Route 198/245 [21-992] |
| Date: | Wednesday, January 04, 2023 10:54:31 AM |
| Attachments: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { image001.png } \\ & \text { image002.png } \end{aligned}$ |

Brent,
The following is what the Traffic study a nd a nalysis should include:

1. Existing condition (current year 2023 in this case)
2. Opening day condition \{with project and without project; approximately year 2025 in this case \}.
3. Future condition with cumulative traffic in the in area, approximate year 2045 \{with project and without project $\}$
4. If viable, include the near term or mid-term analysis (10 years afterthe opening day, approximately year 2035 in this case).

Also, the following wasemailed to Logan Couch on 12/20/22:
From: Deel, David@DOT
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2022 1:22 PM
To: logananthonycouch@gmail.com; Mendibles, Lorena@DOT lorena.mendibles@dot.ca.gov
Cc: 'Scott Quintana' scott@lavpinnacle.com; 'Matt Vovilla' matt@pinnaclex2.com; 'Nashwan Obad' nashwanobad@gmail.com; najimoh09@gmail.com; 'Kari Rivera' krivera@cmconstructionservices.com; Ly, Duc Ken K@DOT duc.ken.ly@dot.ca.gov; Lee, Albert M@DOT albert.lee@dot.ca.gov; Olson, Eric@DOT eric.olson@dot.ca.gov; Annan, Mohamad@DOT mohamad.annan@dot.ca.gov; Navarro, Michael@DOT michael.navarro@dot.ca.gov
Subject: RE: TUL-65-30.30 Lindsay update - Lindsay Route 65 and Route 198/245 Operational Improvements Project

Logan,
See my responses below in bold that corespond to the imbedded map from the Caltrans website forthe Lindsay Route 65 and Route 198/245 Operational Improvements Project (https://dot.ca.gov/caltrans-near-me/district-6/district-6-projects/ 06-43080):

- Anticipated construction date for the large 2 lane roundabout south of our site. (Location \#3 and the Roundabouts at Cedar Avenue and Hermosa Street do not have an estimated construction date, at this time.)
- Anticipated construction date for the smaller roundabout to the east of our site. (Location \#1 and the Roundabout at Oak Avenue has an approximate construction start date in Mid-2027.)
- Confirm our development will not need to provide LOS analysis for the 'post roundabout' condition. Our TIS will only include the 'pre roundabout condition'. (Correct, no LOS analysis for Post-Roundabout, analysis is only for PreRoundabout)
- Advise on SCE easement for new power poles on the south side of our site, adjacent to HWY 65 ROW, pre and post roundabout conditions. (Please contact Caltrans Project Manager, Mohamad Annan at (559) 270-4448 ormohamad.annan@dotca.gov)


## [

If you have furtherquestions, please contact me.
Respectfully,
DAVID DEFL|Associate Transportation Planner| Desk \& Mobile: 559.981.1041
Planning, Local Programs \& Environmental Analysis Division
Local Development Review (LDR) - Tulare \& Kem
Regional Planning - Tulare
FTA 5311 Transit - Tulare
CALTRANS - District 6
1352 W. Olive Avenue (P.O. Box 12616)
Fresno, CA 93778-2616

## For real-time highway conditions: http://quickmap.dotca.gov/

## 2

From: Brent Barenberg [brent@lavpinnacle.com](mailto:brent@lavpinnacle.com)
Sent: Wednesday, December 21, 2022 11:33 AM
To: Deel, David@DOT [david.deel@dot.ca.gov](mailto:david.deel@dot.ca.gov)

Cc: Scott Quintana [scott@lavpinnacle.com](mailto:scott@lavpinnacle.com); 'Matt Vovilla' [matt@pinnaclex2.com](mailto:matt@pinnaclex2.com); 'Nashwan Obad'
[nashwanobad@gmail.com](mailto:nashwanobad@gmail.com); najimoh09@gmail.com; 'Kari Rivera' [krivera@cmconstructionservices.com](mailto:krivera@cmconstructionservices.com); Ly, Duc Ken K@DOT [duc.ken.ly@dot.ca.gov](mailto:duc.ken.ly@dot.ca.gov); Lee, Albert M@DOT [albert.lee@dot.ca.gov](mailto:albert.lee@dot.ca.gov); Mendibles, Lorena@DOT [lorena.mendibles@dot.ca.gov](mailto:lorena.mendibles@dot.ca.gov); Olson, Eric@DOT [eric.olson@dot.ca.gov](mailto:eric.olson@dot.ca.gov); Annan, Mohamad@DOT [mohamad.annan@dot.ca.gov](mailto:mohamad.annan@dot.ca.gov); Navarro, Michael@DOT [michael.navarro@dot.ca.gov](mailto:michael.navarro@dot.ca.gov); logananthonycouch@gmail.com Subject: TIS Scope for Lindsay Route 65 and Route 198/245 [21-992]

## EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe

Hello David,

Thank you for your help with clarifying the scope of this Project. Based on the previous correspondence, the following is, as we understand it, a summary of the scope for the Traffic Impact Study:

The Traffic Impact Study will determine the potential impact of the Project on local traffic. Impact will be determined through Level of Service (LOS) calculations and Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) calculations. Calculations will be performed for current conditions (2023), opening day conditions ( $\sim 2025$ ), and future conditions ( $\sim 2043$ ). The analysis for all conditions will be performed based on current improvements only. The construction of the roundabout by Caltrans will not be a factor in any analysis.

Please let us know if this is an accurate summary of the scope, or if you have any clarifications.

Brent Barenberg
LAV // Pinnacle
Consulting \& Engineering Services
12418 Rosedale Highway, Suite B
Bakersfield, CA 93312
brent@lavpinnacle.com
Office: (661) 869-0184

Table 8: Peak Hour Warrant Analysis

|  |  | Year 2023 Volumes |  |  |  |  |  | Year 2025 Volumes |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Existing Volumes (Figures 2 \& 3) |  |  | Existing Volumes Plus Project (Figure 5) |  |  | Opening Day Volumes (Figure 6) |  |  | Opening Day Volumes Plus Project (Figure 7) |  |  |
| No. | Existing Non-Signalized Intersection | Highest Minor Approach Volume (vph) | Total Major Approach Volume (vph) | Peak <br> Hour Warrant Satisfied | Highest <br> Minor <br> Approach <br> Volume <br> (vph) | Total Major <br> Approach Volume (vph) | Peak <br> Hour Warrant Satisfied | Highest <br> Minor <br> Approach <br> Volume <br> (vph) | Total Major <br> Approach Volume (vph) | Peak <br> Hour Warrant Satisfied | Highest Minor Approach Volume (vph) | Total Major Approach Volume (vph) | Peak <br> Hour Warrant Satisfied |
| 1) | Hwy 65 \& Cedar Ave AM | 0 | 1,520 | No | 206 | 1,753 | Yes | 0 | 1,600 | No | 206 | 1,813 | Yes |
|  | Hwy 65 \& Cedar Ave PM | 0 | 1,236 | No | 186 | 1,413 | Yes | 0 | 1,284 | No | 186 | 1,461 | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2) | Hwy 65 \& W Tulare Rd AM | 128 | 1,998 | Yes | 144 | 2,270 | Yes | 133 | 2,075 | Yes | 149 | 2,347 | Yes |
|  | Hwy 65 \& W Tulare Rd PM | 115 | 2,344 | Yes | 127 | 2,590 | Yes | 120 | 2,436 | Yes | 132 | 2,682 | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3) | Hwy 65 \& W Lindmore St AM | 44 | 1,248 | No | 49 | 1,432 | No | 45 | 1,296 | No | 50 | 1,480 | No |
|  | Hwy 65 \& W Lindmore St PM | 36 | 1,588 | No | 36 | 1,759 | No | 38 | 1,650 | No | 38 | 1,821 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4) | Hwy 65 \& Marigold St AM | 16 | 824 | No | 18 | 990 | No | 16 | 856 | No | 18 | 1,022 | No |
|  | Hwy 65 \& Marigold St PM | 40 | 1,839 | No | 41 | 1,992 | No | 41 | 1,911 | No | 42 | 2,064 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5) | Hwy 65 \& Ave 208 AM | 36 | 1,152 | No | 38 | 1,099 | No | 38 | 1,197 | No | 40 | 1,344 | No |
|  | Hwy 65 \& Ave 208 PM | 24 | 1,670 | No | 24 | 1,807 | No | 25 | 1,735 | No | 25 | 1,892 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6) | Hwy 137 \& Road 188 <br> AM | 20 | 592 | No | 23 | 687 | No | 21 | 615 | No | 24 | 710 | No |
|  | Hwy 137 \& Road 188 PM | 24 | 728 | No | 26 | 804 | No | 25 | 756 | No | 27 | 832 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7) | Hwy 137 \& Road 180 AM | 12 | 304 | No | 12 | 388 | No | 12 | 316 | No | 12 | 400 | No |
|  | Hwy 137 \& Road 180 PM | 0 | 384 | No | 0 | 451 | No | 0 | 399 | No | 0 | 466 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8) | N Spruce Ave \& Acacia Ave AM | 10 | 941 | No | 11 | 1,045 | No | 10 | 978 | No | 11 | 1,082 | No |
|  | N Spruce Ave \& Acacia Ave PM | 19 | 847 | No | 21 | 926 | No | 20 | 881 | No | 22 | 959 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9) | N Spruce Ave \& Sycamore Ave AM | 236 | 900 | No | 243 | 979 | No | 246 | 935 | Yes | 253 | 1,014 | Yes |
|  | N Spruce Ave \& Sycamore Ave PM | 208 | 728 | No | 214 | 784 | No | 216 | 831 | No | 222 | 892 | No |

Table 8: Peak Hour Warrant Analysis

|  |  | Year 2035 Volumes |  |  |  |  |  | Year 2045 Volumes |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Future Volumes (Figures 8) |  |  | Future Volumes Plus Project (Figures 9) |  |  | Future Volumes (Figures 10) |  |  | Future Volumes Plus Project <br> (Figures 11) |  |  |
| No. | Existing Non-Signalized Intersection | Highest <br> Minor <br> Approach Volume (vph) | Total Major Approach Volume (vph) | Peak <br> Hour Warrant Satisfied | Highest <br> Minor Approach Volume (vph) | Total <br> Major Approach Volume (vph) | Peak <br> Hour <br> Warrant <br> Satisfied | Highest Minor Approach Volume (vph) | Total Major <br> Approach Volume (vph) | Peak <br> Hour Warrant Satisfied | Highest Minor Approach Volume (vph) | Total <br> Major Approach Volume (vph) | Peak <br> Hour Warrant Satisfied |
| 1) | Hwy 65 \& Cedar Ave AM | 0 | 1,941 | No | 206 | 2,154 | Yes | 0 | 2,341 | No | 206 | 2,415 | Yes |
|  | Hwy 65 \& Cedar Ave PM | 0 | 1,557 | No | 186 | 1,734 | Yes | 0 | 1,879 | No | 186 | 2,056 | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2) | Hwy 65 \& W Tulare Rd AM | 162 | 2,518 | Yes | 178 | 2,790 | Yes | 194 | 3,037 | Yes | 210 | 3,309 | Yes |
|  | Hwy 65 \& W Tulare Rd PM | 145 | 2,953 | Yes | 157 | 3,199 | Yes | 175 | 3,563 | Yes | 187 | 3,809 | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3) | Hwy 65 \& W Lindmore St AM | 55 | 1,557 | No | 60 | 1,741 | No | 67 | 1,897 | No | 72 | 2,081 | No |
|  | Hwy 65 \& W Lindmore St PM | 45 | 2,020 | No | 45 | 2,171 | No | 54 | 2,414 | No | 54 | 2,585 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4) | Hwy 65 \& Marigold St AM | 20 | 1,038 | No | 22 | 1,204 | No | 24 | 1,252 | No | 26 | 1,418 | No |
|  | Hwy 65 \& Marigold St PM | 50 | 2,318 | No | 51 | 2,471 | No | 61 | 2,797 | No | 62 | 2,944 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5) | Hwy 65 \& Ave 208 AM | 45 | 1,451 | No | 47 | 1,234 | No | 54 | 1,750 | No | 56 | 1,908 | No |
|  | Hwy 65 \& Ave 208 PM | 30 | 2,105 | No | 30 | 2,242 | No | 36 | 2,537 | No | 36 | 2,674 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6) | Hwy 137 \& Road 188 AM | 25 | 745 | No | 28 | 830 | No | 30 | 899 | No | 33 | 994 | No |
|  | Hwy 137 \& Road 188 PM | 30 | 917 | No | 32 | 993 | No | 36 | 1,107 | No | 38 | 1,183 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7) | Hwy 137 \& Road 180 AM | 15 | 383 | No | 15 | 467 | No | 18 | 462 | No | 18 | 548 | No |
|  | Hwy 137 \& Road 180 PM | 0 | 484 | No | 0 | 551 | No | 0 | 584 | No | 0 | 651 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8) | N Spruce Ave \& Acacia Ave AM | 12 | 1,185 | No | 13 | 1,292 | No | 16 | 1,431 | No | 17 | 1,535 | No |
|  | N Spruce Ave \& Acacia Ave PM | 24 | 1,068 | No | 26 | 1,146 | No | 29 | 1,289 | No | 31 | 1,367 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9) | N Spruce Ave \& Sycamore Ave AM | 297 | 1,133 | Yes | 304 | 1,212 | Yes | 359 | 1,368 | Yes | 366 | 1,447 | Yes |
|  | N Spruce Ave \& Sycamore Ave PM | 263 | 1,008 | Yes | 269 | 1,072 | Yes | 316 | 1,212 | Yes | 322 | 1,263 | Yes |

Pass-By and Diverted Link Study
Location: $\qquad$ Date: $3 \mid 01$


Pass-By and Diverted Link Study
Location: N\&S TRAVEL CENTER (WWY 65 \& AVE 128)
Date: $3 / 16$

| No. | Purpose of your trip | Trip Origin | Trip Destination | Route In |  | Route Out |  | Time PM | Trip Type |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Street | Direction | Street | Direction |  | Primary | Pass-By | Diverted Link |
| 1) | GAS |  |  | 128 | EAST | 65 | N | 6:10 |  |  |  |
| 2) | GAS/FOOD |  |  | 128 | EAST | 65 | N | 6.14 |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3) | BEER |  |  | 128 | EAST | 65 | N | $6: 18$ |  |  |  |
| 4) | BFEN |  |  | 128 | EAST | 65 | 5 | 6: 25 |  |  |  |
| 5) | FOOD/REER |  |  | 123 | EASS | 65 | 5 | $6: 32$ |  |  |  |
| 6) | GAS/BEER |  |  | 128 | WFST | 65 | N | 6.35 |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 7) | GAS/SNACKS |  |  | 123 | EAST | 65 | $N$ | $6: 42$ |  |  |  |
| 8) | BEER |  |  | 123 | EAST | 65 | 5 | $6: 50$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 9) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

6:15-8:00am


$$
6: 15-8: 00 \mathrm{am}
$$



$$
6: 15-8: 00 a \mathrm{am}
$$

| Pass-By and Diverted Link Study for Gas Station/C-Store at Comanche Drive \& Hwy 58: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Date: } 9 / 25 \\ \hline \text { Pass-Bys } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Purpose of your trip: | Trip Origin: | Trip Destination: | Edison | Comanche | Hwy. 58 | Time: | Yes | No |
| 49) | Basiness | Boren | Portland |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $7: 53$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 50) | Work | Bakersfield | Arvin |  | $\checkmark$ |  | $7: 54$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 51) | Work | Bakersfield | Arvin |  | $\checkmark$ |  | $7: 57$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 52) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 53) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 56) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 57) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 58) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 59) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

4:00-5:30pm



| Driveway Survey for Stockdale Hwy \& I5: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Date: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Arrival |  | Primary Route Departure |  | Survey By: |  | CF |
| No. | Purpose of your trip: | Trip Origin: | Trip Destination: | 15 | Stockdale Hwy | 15 | Stockdale Hwy | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Pass- } \\ \text { Bys } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Diverted Link | Time: |
| 1) | Home | Lost Hills | Bakersfield | S |  |  | E | X |  | 4:06 |
| 2) | Visit Family | San Jose | Ventura | S |  | S |  |  | X | 4:10 |
| 3) | Vacation | Bakersfield | San Diego |  | W | S |  | X |  | 4:13 |
| 4) | Home | Oregon | Los Angeles | S |  | S |  |  | X | 4:17 |
| 5) | Home | Taft | Bakersfield |  | E |  | E | X |  | 4:29 |
| 6) | Vacation | Los Angeles | San Francisco | S |  | N |  |  | X | 4:32 |
| 7) | Home | Atascadero | Bakerfield | S |  |  | E | X |  | 4:35 |
| 8) | Moving | San Diego | Eugene, OR | N |  | N |  |  | X | 4:41 |
| 9) | Home | Los Angeles | Sacramento | N |  | N |  |  | X | 4:47 |
| 10) | Work | Bakersfield | Paramount Farms |  | W | N |  | X |  | 4:53 |
| 11) | Home | Los Angeles | Bakersfield | N |  |  | E | X |  | 4:57 |


| Driveway Survey for Stockdale Hwy \& I5: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Date: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Arrival |  | Primary Route Departure |  | Survey By: |  | CF |
| No. | Purpose of your trip: | Trip Origin: | Trip Destination: | 15 | Stockdale Hwy | 15 | Stockdale Hwy | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pass- } \\ & \text { Bys } \end{aligned}$ | Diverted Link | Time: |
| 1) | Moving | San Diego | Oregon | N |  |  |  |  | X | 10:28 |
| 2) | Dog Show | San Francisco | Palm Springs | S |  |  |  |  | X | 10:30 |
| 3) | Vacation | Oakland | Palm Springs | S |  |  |  |  | X | 10:35 |
| 4) | Take Daughter Home | Los Angeles | San Jose | N |  |  |  |  | X | 10:35 |
| 5) | Visit Sister | Lahaba | Yuba | N |  |  |  |  | X | 10:38 |
| 6) | Deliver Furniture | Bakersfield | Oregon |  | E | N |  | X |  | 10:43 |
| 7) | Visiting Friends | Bakersfield | San Francisco |  | E | N |  | X |  | 10:54 |
| 8) | Work | Lebec | Bakersfield |  | E | N |  | X |  | 10:54 |
| 9) | Vacation | Santa Rosa | Texas | N |  | S |  |  | X | 10:55 |
| 10) | Work | McFarland | Avenall | S |  | N |  |  | X | 11:00 |
| 11) | Vacation | Prescott AZ | Napa | S |  | N |  |  | X | 11:01 |
| 12) | Vacation | Los Angeles | San Francisco | S |  | N |  |  | X | 11:03 |


| Driveway Survey for Stockdale Hwy \& 15: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Date: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Arrival | Primary Route Departure |  | Survey By: |  | CF |
| No. | Purpose of your trip: | Trip Origin: | Trip Destination: | 15 | Stockdale Hwy | 15 | Stockdale Hwy | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Pass- } \\ \text { Bys } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Diverted Link | Time: |
| 13) | Golf | Sacramento | Palm Springs | N |  | S |  |  | X | 11:09 |
| 14) | Vacation | Los Angeles | San Francisco | S |  | N |  |  | X | 11:11 |
| 15) | Visit Friends | San Jose | Los Angeles | N |  | S |  |  | X | 11:12 |
| 16) | Business | Los Angeles | San Francisco | S |  | N |  |  | X | 11:14 |
| 17) | Church Revival | Los Angeles | San Francisco | S |  | N |  |  | X | 11:20 |
| 18) | Vacation | Carson | Eureka | S |  | N |  |  | X | 11:20 |
| 19) | Moving | Paso Robles | Burbank | N |  | S |  |  | X | 11:26 |
| 20) | Visit Friends | Los Angeles | Livermore | S |  | N |  |  | X | 11:30 |
| 21) | Work | Chino | Redding | S |  | N |  |  | X | 11:36 |
| 22) | Universal Studios | San Francisco | Universal Studios | N |  | S |  |  | X | 11:36 |
| 23) | Visit Friends | Los Angeles | Sacramento | S |  | N |  |  | X | 11:38 |
| 24) | Visit Friends | Burbank | San Francisco | S |  | N |  |  | X | 11:43 |


| Driveway Survey for Stockdale Hwy \& I5: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Date: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Prim | Arrival | Primary Route Departure |  | Survey By: |  | CF |
| No. | Purpose of your trip: | Trip Origin: | Trip Destination: | 15 | Stockdale Hwy | 15 | Stockdale Hwy | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Pass- } \\ \text { Bys } \end{array}$ | Diverted <br> Link | Time: |
| 25) | Moving | Las Vegas | San Francisco | S |  | N |  |  | X | 11:52 |
| 26) | Take child to school | Los Angeles | San Francisco | S |  | N |  |  | x | 11:53 |
| 27) | Take family home | Firebough | Los Angeles | N |  | S |  |  | x | 11:53 |
| 28) | Work | Oakland | San Diego | N |  | S |  |  | X | 11:54 |
| 29) | Disneyland | San Bruno | Anaheim | N |  | S |  |  | X | 11:55 |
| 30) | Visit Friends | Fresno | Los Angeles | N |  | S |  |  | x | 11:55 |
| 31) | Moving | Phoenix | Menlo Park | S |  | N |  |  | X | 11:56 |
| 32) | Business | Los Angeles | San Jose | S |  | N |  |  | X | 12:03 |
| 33) | Vacation | Ensenada | San Francisco | S |  | N |  |  | X | 12:03 |
| 34) | Work | Buttonwillow | Bakersfield |  | E |  | w | X |  | 12:04 |
| 35) | Vacation | San Ramon | San Francisco | S |  | N |  |  | x | 12:05 |
| 36) | College Tour | Los Angeles | Davis | S |  | N |  |  | X | 12:10 |


| Driveway Survey for Stockdale Hwy \& I5: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Date: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Prim | Arrival | Primary Route Departure |  | Survey By: |  | CF |
| No. | Purpose of your trip: | Trip Origin: | Trip Destination: | 15 | Stockdale Hwy | 15 | Stockdale Hwy | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Pass- } \\ \text { Bys } \end{array}$ | Diverted Link | Time: |
| 37) | Business | Bakersfield | Maricopa |  | W |  | E | X |  | 12:13 |
| 38) | Vacation | San Francisco | Los Angeles | N |  | S |  |  | X | 12:14 |
| 39) | Work | Lindsey | Long Beach | N |  | S |  |  | X | 12:17 |
| 40) | Visiting Family | Los Angeles | Sacramento | S |  | N |  |  | X | 12:18 |
| 41) | Visiting Family | Bakersfield | San Francisco |  | W | N |  | X |  | 12:20 |
| 42) | Work | Los Angeles | San Francisco | S |  | N |  |  | X | 12:21 |
| 43) | Vacation | Bakersfield | Napa |  | W | N |  | X |  | 12:21 |
| 44) | Work | Buttonwillow | Bakersfield |  | E |  | W | X |  | 12:22 |
| 45) | Work | Bakersfield | Paso Robles |  | W | N |  | X |  | 12:24 |
| 46) | Visit Family | Los Angeles | Oakland | S |  | N |  |  | X | 12:25 |
| 47) | Visit Family | Bakersfield | Pismo Beach |  | E |  | w | X |  | 12:29 |
| 48) | Visit Family | Los Angeles | San Francisco | S |  | N |  |  | X | 12:30 |
| 49) | Vacation | Burbank | San Jose | S |  | N |  |  | X | 12:30 |


| Driveway Survey for Stockdale Hwy \& I5: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Date: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Arrival |  | Primary Route Departure |  | Survey By: |  | CF |
| No. | Purpose of your trip: | Trip Origin: | Trip Destination: | 15 | Stockdale Hwy | 15 | Stockdale Hwy | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Pass- } \\ \text { Bys } \end{array}$ | Diverted <br> Link | Time: |
| 1) | Vacation | Ventura | Dublin | S |  | N |  |  | X | 4:20 |
| 2) | Work | Bakersfield | Sacramento |  | W | N |  | x |  | 4:24 |
| 3) | Work | Mississippi | Eureka | S |  | N |  |  | x | 4:25 |
| 4) | Go back to School | San Francisco | San Diego | N |  | S |  |  | X | 4:26 |
| 5) | Work | Los Angeles | Sacramento | S |  | N |  |  | X | 4:41 |
| 6) | Work | Concord | Burbank | N |  | S |  |  | x | 4:42 |
| 7) | Work | Bakersfield | Mckitrick |  | W |  | E | X |  | 4:46 |
| 8) | Work | Paso Robles | Bakersfield | N |  |  | E | X |  | 4:47 |
| 9) | Work | Orange County | Cupertino | S |  | N |  |  | X | 4:53 |
| 10) | Visit Friends | Sacramento | Los Angeles | N |  | S |  |  | X | 4:54 |
| 11) | Work | Bakersfield | Lost Hills |  | W |  | E | x |  | 4:59 |
| 12) | Work | BelRidge | Bakersfield |  | E |  | w | X |  | 4:59 |


| Driveway Survey for Stockdale Hwy \& I5: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Date: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Arrival |  | Primary Route Departure |  | Survey By: |  | CF |
| No. | Purpose of your trip: | Trip Origin: | Trip Destination: | 15 | Stockdale Hwy | 15 | Stockdale Hwy | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Pass- } \\ \text { Bys } \end{array}$ | Diverted Link | Time: |
| 13) | Work | Oxnard | Salinas | N |  | S |  |  | X | 5:00 |
| 14) | Work | Long Beach | San Jose | S |  | N |  |  | X | 5:01 |
| 15) | Visit Family | Seaside | Oakland | S |  | N |  |  | x | 5:10 |
| 16) | Funeral | Stockton | Bakersfield | N |  |  | E | X |  | 5:23 |
| 17) | Work | Santabarbara | San Francisco | S |  | N |  |  | X | 5:24 |
| 18) | Work | San Jose | Los Angeles | N |  | S |  |  | X | 5:29 |
| 19) | Vacation | Mexico | Woodland | S |  | N |  |  | X | 5:30 |
| 20) | Vacation | Los Angeles | Stockton | S |  | N |  |  | X | 5:31 |
| 21) | Work | San Francisco | San Diego | N |  | S |  |  | x | 5:35 |
| 22) | Funeral | Los Angeles | Monteca | S |  | N |  |  | X | 5:36 |
| 23) | Work | San Francisco | Bakersfield | N |  |  | E | x |  | 5:39 |
| 24) | Work | Los Angeles | Paso Robles | S |  | N |  |  | X | 5:43 |


| Driveway Survey for Stockdale Hwy \& I5: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Date: 5/25/20 <br> Survey By:  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Primary Route Arrival |  | Primary Route Departure |  |  |  | CF |
| No. | Purpose of your trip: | Trip Origin: | Trip Destination: | 15 | Stockdale Hwy | 15 | Stockdale Hwy | $\begin{array}{\|c} \begin{array}{c} \text { Pass- } \\ \text { Bys } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Diverted Link | Time: |
| 25) | Vacation | Stockton | San Diego | N |  | S |  |  | x | 5:49 |
| 26) | Work | Los Angeles | San Francisco | S |  | N |  |  | x | 5:54 |
| 27) | Work | Bakersfield | Redwood City |  | w | N |  | x |  | 5:56 |
| 28) | Work | Tracy | Bakersfield | N |  |  | E | x |  | 5:58 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass-By | 29\% |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Diverted <br> Link | 71\% |  |  |

Page 8

Taft Highway \& 99 Travel Center Driveway Survey


Taft Highway \& 99 Travel Center Driveway Survey

| Pass-By and Diverted Link Study: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { Date: } \\ \hline \text { Pass-Bys } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Route In |  | Route Out |  | $\frac{\text { AM }}{\text { Time: }}$ |  |  |
| No. | Purpose of your trip: | Trip Origin: | Trip Destination: | 99 | 119 | 99 | 119 |  | Yes | No |
| 13) | work | Bakersfield | Taft | S |  |  | $\omega$ | 8:10 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 14) | vacation | Bakersfield | Yosemite |  | $E$ | N |  | 8:13 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 15) | work | Bakersfield | Bakersfield | S |  |  | $\omega$ | 8:14 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 16) | work | Bakersfield | Bakersfield |  | $E$ | 5 |  | 8:15 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 17) | work | Bakersfield | Taft | 5 |  |  | $\omega$ | 8:18 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 18) | work | Bakersfield | Bakersfield |  | $\omega$ |  | $\omega$ | 8:19 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 19) | work | Fresno | Bakersfield | S |  |  | $\omega$ | 8:23 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 20) | work | Bakersfield | Bakersfield |  | $E$ | $N$ |  | 8:28 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 21) | work | Bakersfield | Bakersfield | $s$ |  |  | $\omega$ | $8: 31$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 22) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Taft Highway \& 99 Travel Center Driveway Survey
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