



To: Ara Mihranian, AICP – City of Rancho Palos Verdes JN 10-104089
From: Paul Martin, PE, TE – RBF Consulting
Date: July 16, 2008
Subject: RBF Responses to April 29, 2008 Fehr & Peers Review Letter

As you requested, we have prepared a brief memorandum containing responses to the April 29, 2008 Fehr & Peers Review Letter for the *Marymount College Facilities Expansion Project Draft Environmental Impact Report (RBF Consulting, September 28, 2007)*.

The following are our responses:

Page 5 Fehr & Peers Comment:

We could find no discussion in the DEIR of Traffic Study related to Impact Areas D & E other than a notation that the impacts would be less than significant. Is there additional discussion either in Chapter 5 or Chapter 8 of the DEIR related to these impact areas?

RBF Response:

As noted in Section 5.8.4 of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), potential impacts involving emergency vehicle access are discussed in detail, and the conclusion indicates no significant increased demand on fire protection resources. The Project site plan has been reviewed and will continue to be reviewed by the City and Fire Department during the various development milestones in order to determine the effectiveness of internal access and circulation in the parking areas and the driveways. The Fire Department has conceptually approved the site plan and will continue to review of the site plan during the plan check process with City staff. Section 5.3, Traffic and Circulation, of the DEIR provides an analysis of the Project-generated traffic on the local circulation system, parking lot facilities, and driveway. The Project does not propose or require construction of a roadway (i.e., sharp curve), thus, would not substantially increase hazards in this regard. The mitigation measures specified in Section 5.3 require the Applicant to implement various intersection improvements, which would be subject to review and approval by the City through the development review process. The City's review of the intersection improvements would ensure potential hazards associated with an intersection would not substantially increase, due to the proposed Project.

Page 6 Fehr & Peers Comment:

How were the study intersections selected?

RBF Response:

The study area was determined through substantial consultation with City Staff and Consulting Engineers, and RBF as well as review of the Notice of Preparation comments. Additionally, RBF and City staff reviewed prior traffic analysis prepared for the project by other traffic consultants. Key intersections where the proposed project was likely to include left- or right-turns were included in the traffic analysis. The study intersections also include the endpoints of some neighborhoods such as the key entry/exit locations for the Mira Vista Neighborhood. Based on our understanding, the resulting study area is consistent with typical traffic analysis prepared for the City of Rancho Palos Verdes.

Page 6 Fehr & Peers Comment:

Was any quantitative criteria used to determine which study intersections or roadways would be analyzed?

RBF Response:

Quantitative criteria such as minimum peak hour trips or percentage assignment were not utilized to determine the study area. Since the trip generation for the proposed project was pending, use of quantitative criteria to determine the study area was not yet possible. The study area was determined through substantial consultation with City Staff and Consulting Engineers, and RBF as well as review of the Notice of Preparation comments, and review of prior traffic analysis prepared for the project. Key intersections where the proposed project was likely to include left- or right-turns were included in the traffic analysis. The study intersections also include the endpoints of some neighborhoods such as the key entry/exit locations for the Mira Vista Neighborhood. Based on our understanding, the resulting study area is consistent with typical traffic analysis prepared for the City of Rancho Palos Verdes.

Page 6 Fehr & Peers Comment:

Did the analysis consider the inclusion of residential streets in addition to the study intersections and roadways?

RBF Response:

Key intersections where the proposed project was likely to include left- or right-turns were included in the traffic analysis. The study intersections also include the endpoints of some neighborhoods such as the key entry/exit locations for the Mira Vista Neighborhood. Based on our understanding, the resulting study area is consistent with typical traffic analysis prepared for the City of Rancho Palos Verdes. Consistent with typical traffic analysis in the City of Rancho Palos Verdes, residential street analysis was not included in the scope of work for the traffic analysis. In light of comments from Jack Rydell, the City has hired a consultant engineer to review the addition of project-related traffic to residential streets in the Mira Vista neighborhood. The results of the Consultant Traffic Engineer review of project-related traffic added to residential streets in the Mira Vista neighborhood show continued operation of level of service (LOS) "A". Therefore, no further impact to the Mira Vista neighborhood streets is forecast to occur with the addition of project-related traffic. The Mira Vista neighborhood traffic analysis is attached to this letter.

Page 6 Fehr & Peers Comment:

Were there any Notice of Preparation (NOP) comments related to the study area?

RBF Response:

Section 1.3, EIR Scoping Process, of the DEIR summarizes the environmental concerns that were raised during the EIR scoping process. As indicated in Section 1.3, the following related concerns were identified:

- Increase traffic volumes; and
- Noise and traffic level increases from introduction of 24-hour use.

Due to the substantial volume of comments involving neighborhood traffic that were received during both scoping periods, Section 1.3 does not provide a listing of all of the streets that may have been mentioned in the comments. The study area was determined through substantial consultation with City Staff and Consulting Engineers, and RBF.

Page 8 Fehr & Peers Comment:

It is our understanding that the proposed facilities such as a gym could draw students to the campus that may not otherwise travel to the campus for that purpose. Is there any information regarding the geographic distribution of students that might support this contention? For example, are a number of the students located proximate to the school and would therefore be candidates use the facilities at the school like the gym?

RBF Response:

As indicated on Page 5.3-33 of the DEIR, construction of additional square footage for the athletic facility is included in the trip generation for the ITE-based Junior/Community College category. The ITE-based Junior/Community College category is assumed to encompass on-campus uses such as administration and instruction classrooms, as well as ancillary uses such as library, cafeteria, and athletic facilities as observed at typical junior colleges. Since geographic distribution of college students was not available for the traffic analysis, the analysis conservatively assumes trips associated with the Junior/Community College category originate outside of the study area.

Page 8 Fehr & Peers Comment:

Did RBF consider the use of other methods besides ITE rates to estimate trips associated with the dormitories?

RBF Response:

Surveys of sample college facilities throughout Southern California were considered, however, due to schedule limitations and availability of industry-published empirical trip rates based on surveys of representative facilities, new sample surveys were not conducted. ITE-published trip generation rates were utilized for the two primary project components; Junior College and Apartment (dormitory). The traffic analysis utilizes the apartment category to represent traffic associated with the planned project dormitories. As indicated on Page 5.3-33 of the DEIR, ITE trip rates are based on surveys of representative facilities throughout the United States. It is worth noting the traffic and parking analyses consistently review the project based on the two project components; Junior College and Apartment.

Page 8 Fehr & Peers Comment:

Did RBF consider the empirical counts at the existing housing as a method to estimate trips associated with the dormitories?

RBF Response:

As indicated on Page 5.3-31, trip surveys were conducted at the two existing off-campus housing facilities to support identification of applicable internal trip capture reduction. To minimize motorist frustrations, feedback from the data collection sub-consultant indicated not every vehicle was stopped and queried when long lines of traffic were waiting to enter or exit. Since not every entering/exiting vehicle was surveyed, trips surveyed at the off-campus housing facilities were not considered comprehensive for identification of trip generation rates, but were utilized for identification of applicable internal trip capture reduction.

Page 8 Fehr & Peers Comment:

If enrollment is capped at the college, what is the justification for the increase in weekday and weekend trips?

RBF Response:

In addition to the future dormitories, the proposed project consists of additional academic and athletic buildings, as well as relocation and reconfiguration of recreational facilities. Therefore, increased trips by both students and nearby residents to/from the college are anticipated due to improved campus facilities. Also, the addition of on-campus housing is considered a change in the dynamics of the campus, requiring identification of potential traffic generation related to the housing component. Since changes in site usage patterns and behavior are likely to occur with implementation of the proposed project, the trip generation forecast includes increases in traffic and parking demand.

Page 8 Fehr & Peers Comment:

Can RBF provide additional information regarding the internalization percentage that was applied to reduce the weekday and weekend trips?

RBF Response:

Raw count data at the two existing off-campus housing facilities is provided in Section 13.0 of the DEIR. Discussion regarding internal trip capture for both the apartment/dormitory component and the junior college component is provided on Pages 5.3-31 to Page 5.3-33. The internal trip capture percentages for the apartment/dormitory component were based on surveys of motorists at the two off-campus housing facilities. The internal trip capture percentages for the junior college component were based on the number of students anticipated to live on campus compared to the total college enrollment.

Page 8 Fehr & Peers Comment:

The parking demand estimates (Table 5.3-53) include parking demand associated with the dormitory students (250) and non-dormitory students traveling to the site (543). An additional 26 parking spaces are noted for incremental student seats. Are these incremental classrooms already included in the demand estimates for the dormitory and non-dormitory students?

RBF Response:

The ratio for parked vehicles per student included in Table 5.3-53 is based on observed parking activity at the campus based on current college facilities. Increased parking demand at the college is anticipated due to improved campus facilities and the ability to offer more courses more frequently. Therefore, additional parking demand associated with the 131 net new student seats is quantified to account for the improved campus facilities. Student or nearby resident visits to the campus may be longer in duration, resulting in less frequent parking space turnover. Since changes in site usage patterns and behavior are likely to occur with implementation of the

proposed project, the trip generation forecast includes increases in traffic and parking demand. Therefore, the parking analysis is conservative since it addresses increases in demand associated with the enhanced college facility.

Page 8 Fehr & Peers Comment:

Is it appropriate to require guest parking at the dormitories?

RBF Response:

The City Parking Code for the Multi-Family Housing land use category was utilized for consistency with the traffic analysis which itemizes housing separately from the Junior College component. Since the proposed project description does not include restrictions on guest parking at the proposed dormitories the guest parking per City Parking Code is included in the calculations. Therefore, the parking analysis conservatively assumes demand associated with guests to the dormitories.

Page 10 Fehr & Peers Comment:

Since Mitigation Measure TR-3 would require coordination with the City of Los Angeles and Caltrans, this improvement may not be entirely under the jurisdiction of the City and therefore, it may not be “fully enforceable.”

RBF Response:

As noted on Page 5.3-54 of the DEIR, mitigation measure TR-3, the identified improvement at the Western Avenue (SR-213)/Trudie Drive/Capitol Drive intersection requires coordination with the City of Los Angeles and Caltrans for implementation. While coordination is identified as part of the mitigation measure, City staff has indicated the modifications to the Trudie Drive approach at the signalized intersection are located entirely within the City of Ranch Palos Verdes jurisdiction.

Page 11 Fehr & Peers Comment:

Besides increased use of the shuttle, did the analysis consider other mitigation measures that were not included in the analysis? For example, did the analysis consider parking limitations for students in the dormitories?

RBF Response:

As shown on DEIR Pages 5.3-66 and 5.3-67, TR-5, TR-6, and TR-7 include mitigation measures to reduce the forecast project parking impacts and are based on restrictions of parking to guests and establishment of a Parking Management Strategy Program for review by City staff annually. As shown in Table 5.3-29, it is worth noting the weekday trip generation associated with the dormitory land use component ranges between approximately 10 and 30 percent of the total forecast project trip generation. Therefore, further parking limitations on students in the dormitories were expected to have reduced benefit on the traffic level of service calculations.

Page 11 Fehr & Peers Comment:

Does the proposed improvement at Western Avenue (SR-213)/Trudie Drive/Capitol Drive require the approval of any party besides the City of Rancho Palos Verdes? If approval of another party is required, is there any documentation stating that these other agencies agree with or concur with the proposed improvement?

RBF Response:

As noted on Page 5.3-54 of the DEIR, mitigation measure TR-3, the identified improvement at the Western Avenue (SR-213)/Trudie Drive/Capitol Drive intersection requires coordination with the City of Los Angeles and Caltrans for implementation. While coordination is identified as part of the mitigation measure, City staff has indicated the modifications to the Trudie Drive approach at the signalized intersection are located entirely within the City of Ranch Palos Verdes jurisdiction.

Page 11 Fehr & Peers Comment:

Has RBF provided the information to the College regarding the critical movements at the three intersections they had requested?

RBF Response:

RBF provided the information regarding the critical movements at the three requested intersections to the City on December 20, 2007, which was subsequently provided to the College.

Page 11 Fehr & Peers Comment:

Can RBF provide additional documentation regarding the cap on weekend enrollment?

RBF Response:

As indicated on Pages 5.3-7 and 5.3-63 of the DEIR, the 83 student weekend enrollment capacity is based on the highest enrollment between 2004 and 2007. Weekend enrollment information was provided by the College and is utilized in the traffic and parking analysis. Since the traffic and parking analysis mitigation measures are based on maximum weekday and weekend enrollment figures, TR-4 and TR-8 are included to link the remaining mitigation measures with the assumptions regarding maximum student enrollment.

Mitigation Measure Monitoring Program Recommendation:

Based on discussions with City staff, a traffic monitoring program with pre-established triggers for implementation of mitigation measures may be considered. However, due to the time associated with observation, determination, design, and implementation of a mitigation measure, it is recommended the mitigation measures included in the DEIR be implemented prior to issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy. Immediate implementation of mitigation measures will avoid the circumstance of delayed mitigation at a significantly impacted intersection.

Preliminary sensitivity analysis of the traffic analysis scenarios and time periods indicates very few project-generated trips will trigger the significant impact at the Palos Verdes Drive East/Miraleste Drive intersection, approximately ten percent of project-generated trips will trigger the significant impact at the Western Avenue (SR-213)/Trudie Drive-Capitol Drive intersection, and approximately five percent of project-generated trips will trigger the significant impact at the Palos Verdes Drive East/Palos Verdes Drive South intersection. Since significant traffic impacts are likely to occur with relatively few project-generated trips, a traffic monitoring program may achieve minimal relief in the implementation schedule.

Contact me with any questions – Paul.

ATTACHMENT

**Mira Vista Neighborhood
Roadway Segment Analysis
(*Joanne Itagaki, Consultant Traffic Engineer*)**

MEMORANDUM



RANCHO PALOS VERDES

TO: ARA MIHRANIAN, PRINCIPAL PLANNER
SIAMAK MOTAHARI, SENIOR ENGINEER

FROM: JOANNE ITAGAKI, CONSULTANT TRAFFIC ENGINEER

DATE: JUNE 18, 2008

SUBJECT: MARYMOUNT COLLEGE – TRAFFIC COUNT DATA ANALYSIS

I have reviewed the traffic count data (2006 and 2008) taken on various residential streets in the Mira Vista neighborhood. The traffic counts taken in 2006 were in question because during the count dates there was an unusual condition (pot hole) on Western Avenue that may have skewed the traffic counts taken in the residential area.

Updated traffic counts were taken on Tuesday, April 22, 2008 on the following streets:

- **Enrose Avenue between**
 1. Summerland Street and General Street
 2. General Street and Fairhill Drive
 3. Fairhill Drive and Crestwood Street
 4. Crestwood Street and Nobel View Drive
- **General Street between**
 5. Bayend Drive and Bernice Drive (W)
 6. Bayend Drive and Wycliff Avenue
 7. Fairhill Drive and Enrose Avenue
- **Trudie Drive between**
 8. Western Avenue and Highmore Avenue
 9. Homeworth Drive and Bayend Drive
 10. Bayend Drive and Trotwood Avenue
- **Via Colinita between**
 11. Enrose Avenue and Miraleste Drive

Table 1 identifies the changes in the annual daily traffic (ADT) counts taken in 2006 and in 2008. Based on this data, Enrose Avenue and Via Colinita experienced a decrease in traffic volumes; Trudie Drive experienced an increase in traffic volumes; and General Street experienced a decrease between Fairhill Drive and Enrose Avenue and an increase between Bayend Drive and Bernice Drive (W) and Bayend Drive and Wycliff Avenue.

The trip distribution was projected from the Marymount College EIR dated October 2007. Exhibit 5.3-8, from the EIR, indicated that 40% of the project trips would travel through the residential neighborhood. In addition, the EIR indicated in Table 5.3-29 that the project is forecasted to generate the following number of trips during various periods of the day.

- AM Peak Hour Trips = 120
- Mid-day Peak Hour Trips = 120
- Afternoon Peak Hour Trips = 126
- PM Peak Hour Trips = 129
- Total Daily Trips = 1,561

Tables 2 through 5 identify the increase in hourly traffic volumes on the residential streets in question. The Tables reflect the trip generation of the 4 peak periods (AM peak, Mid-day peak, Afternoon peak, and PM peak) analyzed in the EIR. The distribution pattern from the EIR indicated that there would be no additional trips on General Street.

The City uses the Los Angeles County Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines dated January 1, 1997 to determine significant traffic impacts. This document has defined a significant traffic impact on two-lane roadways occurs when a project adds the following percentages based on LOS of the preproject conditions.

TWO-LANE ROADWAYS				
Directional Split	Total Capacity (PCPH)	Percentages Increase in Passenger Car Per Hour (PCPH) by Project		
		Preproject LOS		
		C	D	E/F
50/50	2,800	4	2	1
60/40	2,650	4	2	1
70/30	2,500	4	2	1
80/20	2,300	4	2	1
90/10	2,100	4	2	1
100/0	2,000	4	2	1

Source: Los Angeles County Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines, January 1, 1997.

MARYMOUNT COLLEGE –
TRAFFIC COUNT DATA ANALYSIS
June 18, 2008
Page 3

In comparing this table with Tables 2 to 5, the roadway segments analyzed are operating at an acceptable Level of Service (LOS) "A" during all 4 periods. With the addition of the proposed project, the roadway segments continue to operate at an acceptable LOS "A".

Should you have any questions regarding this issue, please contact me.

Attachments

- Table 1 – ADT Analysis: Difference between 2006 and 2008 Traffic Counts
- Table 2 – Peak Hour Analysis: AM Peak Hour
- Table 3 – Peak Hour Analysis: Mid-day Peak Hour
- Table 4 – Peak Hour Analysis: Afternoon Peak Hour
- Table 5 – Peak Hour Analysis: PM Peak Hour

MARYMOUNT COLLEGE

ADT Analysis

Table 1

Difference between 2006 and 2008 Traffic Counts

Location		2006		2008		ADT Change	ADT Change (%)
		Count Date	ADT	Count Date	ADT		
Enrose Avenue between							
	Summerland St. and General St.	2/1/2006	3,857	4/22/2008	3,395	-462	-12.0%
	General St. and Fairhill Dr.	2/1/2006	2,240	4/22/2008	1,855	-385	-17.2%
	Fairhill Dr. and Crestwood St.	2/1/2006	1,853	4/22/2008	1,708	-145	-7.8%
	Crestwood St. and Nobel View Dr.	3/9/2006	1,791	4/22/2008	1,661	-130	-7.3%
General Street between							
	Bayend Dr. and Bernice Dr. (W)	2/1/2006	2,826	4/22/2008	3,117	291	10.3%
	Bayend Dr. and Wycliff Ave.	3/2/2006	3,293	4/22/2008	3,303	10	0.3%
	Fairhill Dr. and Enrose Ave.	2/1/2006	1,962	4/22/2008	1,536	-426	-21.7%
Trudie Drive between							
	Western Ave. and Highmore Ave.	1/31/2006	3,911	4/22/2008	5,001	1,090	27.9%
	Homeworth Dr. and Bayend Dr.	3/2/2006	2,807	4/22/2008	2,836	29	1.0%
	Bayend Dr. and Trotwood Ave.	3/9/2006	1,325	4/22/2008	1,439	114	8.6%
Via Colinita between							
	Enrose Ave. and Miraleste Dr.	2/1/2006	5,424	4/22/2008	3,415	-2,009	-37.0%

MARYMOUNT COLLEGE

Peak Hour Analysis

Table 2 - AM PEAK HOUR

AM Peak Hour between 7 AM and 10 AM AM Peak Hour Total Trips = 120 40% = 48 trips

Location	AM Peak Hour	Traffic Volume			Preproject		Project Traffic Trips	Total Trips	With Project	
		NB/EB	SB/WB	Total	V/C	LOS			V/C	LOS
Enrose Avenue between										
60/40 split	8:00	220	143	363	0.14	A	48	411	0.16	A
60/40 split	8:00	74	112	186	0.07	A	48	234	0.09	A
70/30 split	8:00	121	52	173	0.07	A	48	221	0.09	A
60/40/split	7:00	100	74	174	0.07	A	48	222	0.08	A
General Street between										
60/40 split	8:00	113	148	261	0.10	A	0	261	0.10	A
60/40 split	8:00	210	151	361	0.14	A	0	361	0.14	A
60/40 split	8:00	101	65	166	0.06	A	0	166	0.06	A
Trudie Drive between										
60/40 split	8:00	381	127	508	0.19	A	48	556	0.21	A
50/50 split	8:00	154	162	316	0.11	A	48	364	0.13	A
60/40 split	8:00	83	56	139	0.05	A	48	187	0.07	A
Via Colinita between										
50/50 split	7:00	190	213	403	0.14	A	48	451	0.16	A

Capacity: pcph = passenger cars per hour
 50/50 split = 2,800 pcph
 60/40 split = 2,650 pcph
 70/30 split = 2,500 pcph

MARYMOUNT COLLEGE

Peak Hour Analysis

Table 3 - MID-DAY PEAK HOUR

Mid-Day Peak Hour between 11 AM and 1 PM Mid-day Peak Hour Total Trips = 120 40% = 48 trips

Traffic Volume	Location		Mid-day Hour	Traffic Volume			Preproject		Project Traffic Trips	Total Trips	With Project	
	NB/EB	SB/WB		Total	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS				
	Enrose Avenue between											
	50/50 split	Summerland St. and General St.	1:00	145	124	269	0.10	A	48	317	0.11	A
	50/50 split	General St. and Fairhill Dr.	1:00	57	67	124	0.04	A	48	172	0.06	A
	60/40 split	Fairhill Dr. and Crestwood St.	1:00	65	48	113	0.04	A	48	161	0.06	A
	50/50 split	Crestwood St. and Nobel View Dr.	1:00	45	53	98	0.04	A	48	146	0.05	A
	General Street between											
	50/50 split	Bayend Dr. and Bernice Dr. (W)	1:00	129	147	276	0.10	A	0	276	0.10	A
	50/50 split	Bayend Dr. and Wycliff Ave.	1:00	158	142	300	0.11	A	0	300	0.11	A
	50/50 split	Fairhill Dr. and Enrose Ave.	1:00	76	76	152	0.05	A	0	152	0.05	A
	Trudie Drive between											
	60/40 split	Western Ave. and Highmore Ave.	1:00	216	124	340	0.13	A	48	388	0.15	A
	50/50 split	Homeworth Dr. and Bayend Dr.	1:00	109	100	209	0.07	A	48	257	0.09	A
	70/30 split	Bayend Dr. and Trotwood Ave.	12:00	59	29	88	0.04	A	48	136	0.05	A
	Via Colinita between											
	50/50 split	Enrose Ave. and Miraleste Dr.	1:00	126	135	261	0.09	A	48	309	0.11	A

Capacity: pcph = passenger cars per hour
 50/50 split = 2,800 pcph
 60/40 split = 2,650 pcph
 70/30 split = 2,500 pcph

MARYMOUNT COLLEGE
Peak Hour Analysis
Table 4 - AFTERNOON PEAK HOUR

Afternoon Peak Hour between 2 PM and 4 PM Afternoon Peak Hour Total Trips = 126 40% = 50 trips

Traffic Volume Directional	Location	Afternoon Hour	Traffic Volume		Preproject		Project Traffic Trips	Total Trips	With Project		
			NB/EB	SB/WB	Total	V/C			LOS	V/C	LOS
Enrose Avenue between											
	60/40 split	3:00	223	139	362	0.14	A	50	412	0.16	A
	60/40 split	3:00	84	146	230	0.09	A	50	280	0.11	A
	70/30 split	3:00	150	68	218	0.09	A	50	268	0.11	A
	70/30 split	3:00	70	139	209	0.08	A	50	259	0.10	A
General Street between											
	50/50 split	3:00	114	109	223	0.08	A	0	223	0.08	A
	50/50 split	3:00	144	115	259	0.09	A	0	259	0.09	A
	50/50 split	3:00	66	62	128	0.05	A	0	128	0.05	A
Trudie Drive between											
	70/30 split	3:00	313	162	475	0.19	A	50	525	0.21	A
	60/40 split	3:00	126	157	283	0.11	A	50	333	0.13	A
	60/40 split	3:00	108	62	170	0.06	A	50	220	0.08	A
Via Colinita between											
	60/40 split	3:00	204	133	337	0.13	A	50	387	0.15	A

Capacity: pcph = passenger cars per hour
50/50 split = 2,800 pcph
60/40 split = 2,650 pcph
70/30 split = 2,500 pcph

MARYMOUNT COLLEGE

Peak Hour Analysis

Table 5 - PM PEAK HOUR

PM Peak Hour between 4 PM and 6 PM

PM Peak Hour Total Trips = 129

40% = 52 trips

Traffic Volume Directional	Location	PM Peak Hour	Traffic Volume			Preproject		Project Traffic Trips	Total Trips	With Project	
			NB/EB	SB/WB	Total	V/C	LOS			V/C	LOS
Enrose Avenue between											
50/50 split	Summerland St. and General St.	5:00	128	132	260	0.09	A	52	312	0.11	A
50/50 split	General St. and Fairhill Dr.	5:00	76	72	148	0.05	A	52	200	0.07	A
50/50 split	Fairhill Dr. and Crestwood St.	5:00	82	67	149	0.05	A	52	201	0.07	A
50/50 split	Crestwood St. and Nobel View Dr.	5:00	67	78	145	0.05	A	52	197	0.07	A
General Street between											
60/40 split	Bayend Dr. and Bernice Dr. (W)	5:00	101	133	234	0.09	A	0	234	0.09	A
50/50 split	Bayend Dr. and Wycliff Ave.	5:00	107	134	241	0.09	A	0	241	0.09	A
60/40 split	Fairhill Dr. and Enrose Ave.	5:00	42	58	100	0.04	A	0	100	0.04	A
Trudie Drive between											
60/40 split	Western Ave. and Highmore Ave.	5:00	164	235	399	0.15	A	52	451	0.17	A
70/30 split	Homeworth Dr. and Bayend Dr.	5:00	64	179	243	0.10	A	52	295	0.12	A
60/40 split	Bayend Dr. and Trotwood Ave.	5:00	59	77	136	0.05	A	52	188	0.07	A
Via Colinita between											
50/50 split	Enrose Ave. and Miraleste Dr.	5:00	127	132	259	0.09	A	52	311	0.11	A

Capacity: pcph = passenger cars per hour
 50/50 split = 2,800 pcph
 60/40 split = 2,650 pcph
 70/30 split = 2,500 pcph