## MEMORANDUM

TO: $\quad$ Barry Kurtz, City of Culver City Heba El-Guindy, City of Culver City<br>FROM: Sean Mohn<br>DATE: August 17, 2021<br>RE: $\quad$ Queuing Assessment for the Scenic Arts Project<br>Sony Pictures Studios<br>Culver City, California

Ref: J1762

At the request of Culver City (City) and the direction of Sony Pictures Studios, Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc. (GTC) prepared trip generation estimates, identified off-site traffic mitigation requirements, and prepared an assessment of the queuing conditions at the intersection of Overland Avenue \& Palm Court Way and the Overland Gate driveway for the Sony Pictures Studios Scenic Arts Project (Project) as part of the Comprehensive Plan conformance review process. This memorandum details the assessment findings and conclusions.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

As detailed in the preliminary plan review submittal to the City, the adaptive reuse of the existing Scenic Arts Building would require the construction of new office and support space and both the renovation and demolition of existing office and support space, resulting in a total of 39,079 square feet (sf) of net new development for the Project, including 25,757 sf of office space and 13,322 of support space.

## PROJECT TRIP GENERATION \& OFF-SITE TRAFFIC MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS

The trip generation estimates for the Project were estimated based on the empirically derived site generation peak hour rates for office and support land uses documented in Sony Pictures Studios Comprehensive Plan (Crain \& Associates, March 19, 1992) (EIR Traffic Study), as required by the Comprehensive Plan Development Agreement (DA). As summarized in Table 1, the Project would generate approximately 28 net new AM peak hour trips and approximately 24 net new PM peak hour trips.

The identification of off-site traffic mitigation requirements for the Project is based on the offsite mitigation trip thresholds identified in the EIR Traffic Study and the net increase in trips from the baseline count data identified in Sony Pictures Studios 1994 Annual Parking Survey and Trip Generation Monitoring Report (Crain \& Associates, 1994) (1994 Survey

Report), as calculated based on the most recent annual survey count data documented in Sony Pictures Studios Annual Trip Generation and Parking Survey Report Year 2021(GTC, March 2021) (2021 Survey Report) and the net new trip generation estimates for the Project, as required by the DA.

As summarized in Table 2, based on the 1994 Survey Report data, the 2021 Survey Report Data, and the trip generation estimates summarized in Table 1, the Project would result in a net decrease in trips from the baseline count. As such, no off-site traffic mitigation measures are required for the Project.

## INTERSECTON QUEUING ANALYSIS \& CONCLUSIONS

For the purposes of evaluating the effect of Project-related trips on the queuing conditions at the intersection of Overland Avenue \& Palm Court Way, specifically related to the southbound leftturn movement and northbound right-turn movement, GTC developed AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes for both Baseline Conditions and Baseline plus Project Conditions based on the peak hour traffic volume data documented in Sony Pictures Entertainment Resolution No 2014P007 Comprehensive Plan Conformance Review \#62 Monitoring Report (Crain \& Associates, April 23, 2018) (Monitoring Report), which was previously reviewed and approved by the City and utilizes the most recent intersection turning movement count data collected for the intersection of Overland Avenue \& Palm Court Way.

The AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes at the intersection of Overland Avenue \& Palm Court Way under Baseline Conditions are illustrated in Figure 1. The net new AM and PM peak hour Project trips summarized in Table 1 were then assigned to Overland Avenue \& Palm Court Way based on the Baseline Conditions trip distribution patterns, as illustrated in Figure 2. The resulting AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes under Baseline plus Project Conditions are illustrated in Figure 3.

In accordance with City requirements, the queueing evaluation for Overland Avenue \& Palm Court Way was conducted based on Highway Capacity Manual, 6th Edition (Transportation Research Board, 2016) (HCM) methodology and the utilization of Synchro software to identify the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue for the southbound left-turn movement and the northbound right-turn movement. As summarized in Table 3, the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue for the southbound left-turn movement is projected at 7.1 vehicles/lane during the AM peak hour under Baseline Conditions and 7.5 vehicles/lane during the AM peak under Baseline plus Project Conditions, resulting in a projected increase in queue of 0.4 vehicles/lane. As summarized in Table 3, the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue for the northbound right-turn movement ${ }^{1}$ is projected at 9.4 vehicles/lane during the AM peak hour under Baseline Conditions and 9.8 vehicles/lane during the AM peak under Baseline plus Project Conditions, resulting in a projected increase in queue of 0.4 vehicles/lane. The corresponding Synchro worksheets are provided in the Appendix.

Based on the intersection operating conditions documented in the Monitoring Report, which was prepared to assess the effectiveness of the improvements implemented at the Overland Gate and the intersection of Overland Avenue \& Palm Court Way after the construction and full

[^0]occupation of the Morita Building, and the results of the intersection queuing analysis detailed above, it is our professional opinion that the effect of the Project related trips on the southbound left-turn and northbound right-turn queuing conditions at the intersection of Overland Avenue \& Palm Court Way would be negligible and would not require the implementation of any additional improvements at the intersection.

## OVERLAND GATE QUEUING ANALYSIS

For the purposes of evaluating the effect of Project related trips on the operating conditions at the Overland Gate, specifically as it concerns the potential for vehicles to queue back onto Overland Avenue and affect vehicular circulation through the corridor, a Queuing Model was developed based on a Poisson distribution of the estimated vehicular arrivals per minute. The Queuing Model was run multiple times to simulate thousands of peak hours of arrival patterns. The simulation results then were used to determine both the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue and the maximum queue expected under Baseline plus Project Conditions.

## Determination of Vehicle Processing Rate

The Overland Gate currently provides two inbound lanes, each of which is controlled by a key card access system capable of processing one vehicle every six seconds, resulting in the capacity to process approximately 10.0 vehicles/minute/lane (or 1200 vehicles/hour in total) through this entrance. For conservative purposes, however, the processing capacity of this entrance was reduced to 900 vehicles/hour to account for unforeseen variances that could potentially affect the operational efficiency.

Based on a review of the Baseline plus Project AM peak hour traffic volumes, the anticipated peak inbound demand at the Overland Gate during the peak hour is approximately 478 vehicles, which is far below the processing capacity ranges described above.

## Determination of Required Storage Area

Table 4 summarizes the calculations used to determine the both the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue (vehicles) and the maximum queue (vehicles) for the Overland Gate driveway, as well as the associated storage capacity requirements. As summarized Table 4, it was assumed that 478 vehicles were distributed across the peak hour in 15-minute increments as follows:

## Arrival Distribution

- 8:00-8:00 AM - 104 Vehicles
- 8:15-8:30 AM - 135 Vehicles
- 8:30-8:45 AM - 135 Vehicles
- 8:45-9:00 AM - 104 Vehicles

As summarized in Table 4, based on the previously discussed assumptions and methodology, the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue is projected at 4.0 vehicles for the Overland Gate driveway under Baseline plus Project Conditions, while the maximum queue is projected at 7.0 vehicles. As such,
assuming an average storage requirement of approximately 20 feet/vehicle ${ }^{2}$, under Baseline plus Project Conditions, the Overland Gate driveway would need to provide approximately 140 feet of total combined storage capacity behind the interior entry control points.

## Conclusions

As previously discussed, under Baseline plus Project Conditions, the Overland Gate driveway would need to accommodate up to 7.0 vehicles and provide approximately 140 feet of total combined storage capacity behind the interior control points. The Overland Gate currently provides approximately 240 feet of total storage capacity across both inbound lanes behind the interior entry control points.

As such, based on the results of the analysis and a detailed review of the associated Overland Gate driveway observational queuing data documented in the Monitoring Report (the findings of which are consistent with the analysis results detailed above), it is our professional opinion that the storage capacity at the Overland Gate driveway could readily accommodate the addition of 25 net new Project related inbound trips during the AM peak hour and would not require the implementation of any additional improvements.

[^1]



TABLE 1
SCENIC ARTS PROJECT - NET NEW TRIP GENERATION ESTIMATES

| SONY STUDIOS 1992 TRAFFIC STUDY - SITE GENERATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Rate | Daily | Morning Peak Hour |  |  | Afternoon Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Trip Generation Rates [a] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office | per ksf | 7.64 | 94\% | 6\% | 0.96 | 14\% | 86\% | 0.73 |
| Support | per ksf | 4.14 | 65\% | 35\% | 0.20 | 22\% | 78\% | 0.36 |
| Proposed Project <br> Net New Area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office | 25.757 ksf | 197 | 23 | 2 | 25 | 3 | 16 | 19 |
| Support | 13.322 ksf | 55 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 39.079 ksf | 252 | 25 | 3 | 28 | 4 | 20 | 24 |

## Notes

ksf: 1,000 square feet
[a] Scenic Arts trip generation estimates were based on the empirically derived Site Generation Peak Hour Rates for Office and Support uses fromSony Pictures Studios Comprehensive Plan (Crain \& Associates, March 19, 1992).


Notes:
[a] No mitigation/improvement measures are required for the Scenic Arts Project.
[b] February 2021 counts were taken from Sony Pictures Studios Annual Trip Generation and Parking Survey Report Year 2021 (Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., March 2021).
[c] Baseline counts were taken from Sony Pictures Studios 1994 Annual Parking Survey and Trip Generation Monitoring Report (Crain \& Associates, 1994).
[d] Scenic Arts trip generation estimates were based on Site Generation Peak Hour Rates for Office and Support uses from Sony Pictures Studios Comprehensive Plan (Crain \& Associates, March 19, 1992).
[e] Improvement rejected by LADOT; in-lieu payment accepted by LADOT.
[f] Improvement no longer necessary due to alternative impromements completed by Metro.
[g] Improvement rejected by Culver City.
[h] Improvement rejected by Caltrans; in-lieu payment accepted by Culver City.

SCENICE ARTS PROJECT - INTERSECTION QUEUING ANALYSIS

| Intersection | Lane Description | Baseline Conditions |  | Baseline plus Project Conditions |  | Change in Queue Length |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
|  |  | Queue Length [a] | Queue Length [a] | Queue Length [a] | Queue Length [a] | Queue Length [a] | Queue Length [a] |
| Overland Avenue \& Palm Court Way | SBL | 7.1 | 1.6 | 7.5 | 1.7 | 0.4 | 0.1 |
|  | NBR [b] | 9.4 | 17.4 | 9.8 | 17.5 | 0.4 | 0.1 |

Notes
[a] The 95th percentile queue, as calculated based on HCM methodology, are expressed as vehicles/lane within the Synchro worksheets
[b] The 95th percentile queue for the northbound right-turn movement, as calculated based on HCM methodology, refelcts the shared through/right-turn characteristics of the lane and the associated shared demand.

TABLE 4
SCENIC ARTS PROJECT - OVERLAND GATE DRIVEWAY QUEUING SUMMARY

| Baseline plus Project Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total Queue (Vehicles) | Occurences | Percentile | Storage Requirements (ft.)* |
| Transactions per Minute: | 15 |  |  | 0.0 | 482 | 48.2\% | 0 |
| Start Time: | 8:00 AM |  |  | 1.0 | 206 | 68.8\% | 20 |
| Minutes per Period: | 15 |  |  | 2.0 | 139 | 82.7\% | 40 |
|  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 93 | 92.0\% | 60 |
|  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 42 | 96.2\% | 80 |
|  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 18 | 98.0\% | 100 |
|  |  |  |  | 6.0 | 14 | 99.4\% | 120 |
|  | Begin | End | Volume | 7.0 | 6 | 100.0\% | 140 |
|  | 8:00 AM | 8:15 AM | 104 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 8:15 AM | 8:30 AM | 135 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 8:30 AM | 8:45 AM | 135 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 8:45 AM | 9:00 AM | 104 |  |  | centile Queue: | 80 |
|  |  |  | 478 |  |  | ximum Queue: | 140 |
| Number of Hours: | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Tests: | 1,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* Assumes an average storage requirement of approximately 20ft/vehicle.


## Attachment

## Synchro HCM Worksheets

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {F }}$ |  | ${ }^{717}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 12 | 1 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 21 | 7 | 755 | 226 | 227 | 877 | 17 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 12 | 1 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 21 | 7 | 755 | 226 | 227 | 877 | 17 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 13 | 1 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 23 | 8 | 821 | 246 | 247 | 953 | 18 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 38 | 3 | 36 | 53 | 0 | 189 | 758 | 1907 | 571 | 309 | 1805 | 34 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.29 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.09 | 0.51 | 0.51 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1660 | 128 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 2695 | 807 | 3456 | 3568 | 67 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 14 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 23 | 8 | 541 | 526 | 247 | 475 | 496 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1787 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 1777 | 1725 | 1728 | 1777 | 1858 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 8.4 | 21.6 | 21.6 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 8.4 | 21.6 | 21.6 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.93 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.47 | 1.00 |  | 0.04 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 41 | 0 | 36 | 53 | 0 | 189 | 758 | 1257 | 1221 | 309 | 899 | 940 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.27 | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.01 | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.80 | 0.53 | 0.53 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 270 | 0 | 239 | 269 | 0 | 381 | 758 | 1257 | 1221 | 429 | 899 | 940 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 57.7 | 0.0 | 57.6 | 56.9 | 0.0 | 47.2 | 9.7 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 53.6 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 4.8 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 7.1 | 2.2 | 2.1 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（95\％），veh／In | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 9.6 | 9.4 | 7.1 | 14.4 | 14.9 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 62.6 | 0.0 | 61.6 | 59.8 | 0.0 | 47.5 | 9.7 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 60.7 | 22.2 | 22.1 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | A | E | E | A | D | A | A | A | E | C | C |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 24 |  |  | 38 |  |  | 1075 |  |  | 1218 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 62.2 |  |  | 52.3 |  |  | 8.5 |  |  | 30.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 15.2 | 89.4 | 7.3 | 39.5 | 65.2 | 8.1 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 14.9 | 50.9 | 18.1 | 5.1 | 60.7 | 18.1 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋I1），s | 10.4 | 17.4 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 23.6 | 3.6 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.3 | 8.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.6 | 0.1 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 20.9 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {F }}$ |  | 41 | 中 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 12 | 1 | 9 | 15 | 0 | 23 | 7 | 755 | 238 | 240 | 877 | 17 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 12 | 1 | 9 | 15 | 0 | 23 | 7 | 755 | 238 | 240 | 877 | 17 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 13 | 1 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 25 | 8 | 821 | 259 | 261 | 953 | 18 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 38 | 3 | 36 | 55 | 0 | 198 | 756 | 1866 | 588 | 324 | 1805 | 34 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.29 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.09 | 0.51 | 0.51 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1660 | 128 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 2658 | 838 | 3456 | 3568 | 67 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 14 | 0 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 25 | 8 | 549 | 531 | 261 | 475 | 496 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1787 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 1777 | 1720 | 1728 | 1777 | 1858 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 8.9 | 21.6 | 21.6 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 8.9 | 21.6 | 21.6 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.93 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.49 | 1.00 |  | 0.04 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 41 | 0 | 36 | 55 | 0 | 198 | 756 | 1248 | 1207 | 324 | 899 | 940 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.27 | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.80 | 0.53 | 0.53 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 270 | 0 | 239 | 269 | 0 | 388 | 756 | 1248 | 1207 | 452 | 899 | 940 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 57.7 | 0.0 | 57.6 | 56.8 | 0.0 | 46.7 | 9.8 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 53.3 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 4.8 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 7.1 | 2.2 | 2.1 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（95\％），veh／In | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 10.0 | 9.8 | 7.5 | 14.4 | 14.9 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 62.6 | 0.0 | 61.6 | 59.7 | 0.0 | 47.0 | 9.8 | 8.8 | 8.9 | 60.4 | 22.2 | 22.1 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | A | E | E | A | D | A | A | A | E | C | C |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 24 |  |  | 41 |  |  | 1088 |  |  | 1232 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 62.2 |  |  | 51.9 |  |  | 8.9 |  |  | 30.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 15.8 | 88.8 | 7.3 | 39.3 | 65.2 | 8.2 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 15.7 | 50.1 | 18.1 | 5.1 | 60.7 | 18.1 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋I1），s | 10.9 | 18.0 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 23.6 | 3.7 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.4 | 8.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.6 | 0.1 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 21.2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 | 「 |  | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 虫 |  | ${ }^{7} 1$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 11 | 1 | 10 | 150 | 0 | 305 | 8 | 1277 | 36 | 53 | 1262 | 13 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 11 | 1 | 10 | 150 | 0 | 305 | 8 | 1277 | 36 | 53 | 1262 | 13 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 12 | 1 | 11 | 163 | 0 | 332 | 9 | 1388 | 39 | 58 | 1372 | 14 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 38 | 3 | 36 | 272 | 0 | 298 | 434 | 2256 | 63 | 123 | 1820 | 19 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.17 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.04 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1650 | 138 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 3530 | 99 | 3456 | 3604 | 37 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 13 | 0 | 11 | 163 | 0 | 332 | 9 | 698 | 729 | 58 | 676 | 710 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1788 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 1777 | 1853 | 1728 | 1777 | 1864 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 10.2 | 0.0 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 28.0 | 28.1 | 2.0 | 36.5 | 36.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 10.2 | 0.0 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 28.0 | 28.1 | 2.0 | 36.5 | 36.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.92 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.05 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 41 | 0 | 36 | 272 | 0 | 298 | 434 | 1135 | 1184 | 123 | 897 | 941 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.60 | 0.00 | 1.11 | 0.02 | 0.61 | 0.62 | 0.47 | 0.75 | 0.75 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 268 | 0 | 238 | 272 | 0 | 298 | 434 | 1135 | 1184 | 331 | 897 | 941 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 57.7 | 0.0 | 57.7 | 47.4 | 0.0 | 48.7 | 25.7 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 56.8 | 23.7 | 23.7 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 4.3 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 86.1 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 5.8 | 5.6 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（95\％），veh／ln | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 23.7 | 0.3 | 16.8 | 17.4 | 1.6 | 22.9 | 23.8 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 62.0 | 0.0 | 62.2 | 51.1 | 0.0 | 134.8 | 25.7 | 15.4 | 15.3 | 59.5 | 29.6 | 29.3 |


| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 62.0 | 0.0 | 62.2 | 51.1 | 0.0 | 134.8 | 25.7 | 15.4 | 15.3 | 59.5 | 29.6 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | E | A | E | D | A | F | C | B | B | E | C |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 24 |  |  | 495 |  | 1436 |  | 1444 |  |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 62.1 |  |  | 107.2 |  |  | 15.4 |  | 30.7 |  |
| Approach LOS | E |  |  | F |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 8.8 | 81.2 | 7.3 | 24.8 | 65.1 | 22.8 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 11.5 | 54.2 | 18.0 | 5.1 | 60.6 | 18.3 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋I1），s | 4.0 | 30.1 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 38.5 | 20.3 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.1 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.6 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 35.6 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | D |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 | 7 |  | 4 | 7 | ${ }^{1}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{71}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 11 | 1 | 10 | 157 | 0 | 318 | 8 | 1277 | 38 | 55 | 1262 | 13 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 11 | 1 | 10 | 157 | 0 | 318 | 8 | 1277 | 38 | 55 | 1262 | 13 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 12 | 1 | 11 | 171 | 0 | 346 | 9 | 1388 | 41 | 60 | 1372 | 14 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 38 | 3 | 36 | 272 | 0 | 299 | 434 | 2250 | 66 | 125 | 1820 | 19 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.17 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.04 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1650 | 138 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 3524 | 104 | 3456 | 3604 | 37 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 13 | 0 | 11 | 171 | 0 | 346 | 9 | 699 | 730 | 60 | 676 | 710 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1788 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 1777 | 1852 | 1728 | 1777 | 1864 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 28.1 | 28.2 | 2.0 | 36.5 | 36.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 28.1 | 28.2 | 2.0 | 36.5 | 36.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.92 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.06 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 41 | 0 | 36 | 272 | 0 | 299 | 434 | 1135 | 1182 | 125 | 897 | 941 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.63 | 0.00 | 1.16 | 0.02 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.48 | 0.75 | 0.75 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 268 | 0 | 238 | 272 | 0 | 299 | 434 | 1135 | 1182 | 334 | 897 | 941 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 57.7 | 0.0 | 57.7 | 47.7 | 0.0 | 48.7 | 25.7 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 56.7 | 23.7 | 23.7 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 4.3 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 101.9 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 5.8 | 5.6 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(95\%),veh/ln | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 8.9 | 0.0 | 25.9 | 0.3 | 16.9 | 17.5 | 1.7 | 22.9 | 23.8 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 62.0 | 0.0 | 62.2 | 52.3 | 0.0 | 150.5 | 25.7 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 59.6 | 29.6 | 29.3 |


| LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh | 62.0 | 0.0 | 62.2 | 52.3 | 0.0 | 150.5 | 25.7 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 59.6 | 29.6 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | E | A | E | D | A | F | C | B | B | E | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 24 |  |  | 517 |  |  | 1438 |  | 1446 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 62.1 |  |  | 118.0 |  |  | 15.5 |  | 30.7 |  |
| Approach LOS | E |  |  | F |  |  | B | C |  |  |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 8.8 | 81.1 | 7.3 | 24.8 | 65.1 | 22.8 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 11.6 | 54.1 | 18.0 | 5.1 | 60.6 | 18.3 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s | 4.0 | 30.2 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 38.5 | 20.3 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.1 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.6 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 37.7

HCM 6th LOS D


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ As noted in Table 3, the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue for the northbound right-turn movement, as calculated based on HCM methodology, reflects the shared through/right-turn characteristics of the lane and the associated shared demand.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ For consistency purposes, the average storage requirement was taken directly from the Monitoring Report, which was previously reviewed and approved by the City.

