# Draft Project Report for the SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements to Authorize the Public Release of the Draft Environmental Document 

On Route $\qquad$
Between $\qquad$
And
Lincoln Boulevard (PM 12.8)

I have reviewed the right of way information contained in this report and the R/W Data attached hereto, and find the data to be complete, current and accurate:


APPROVED:


## Vicinity Map



This project report has been prepared under the direction of the following registered civil engineer. The registered civil engineer attests to the technical information contained herein and the engineering data upon which recommendations, conclusions, and decisions are based.
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| RCB | reinforced concrete box |
| :--- | :--- |
| RTP | regional transportation plan |
| SACOG | Sacramento Area Council of Government |
| SPRTA | South Placer Regional Transportation Authority |
| SR | State Route |
| TMP | Transportation Management Plan |
| UCL | Upper Confidence Limit |
| VA | Value Analysis |

## 1. INTRODUCTION

## Project Description:

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), in cooperation with the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA), Placer County, and the Cities of Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln, proposes to widen State Route (SR) 65 from north of Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road to Lincoln Boulevard. This project has been assigned the Project Development Processing Category 4A for widening the existing freeway without requiring a revised freeway agreement. The project is subject to federal and state environmental review requirements. Caltrans is the lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act and under the California Environmental Quality Act.

The project is needed to relieve traffic operation and safety issues stemming from recurring morning and evening peak-period demand that exceeds the current design capacity along SR 65 . The additional mainline capacity will accommodate future growth along the corridor.
The project proposes to relieve existing mainline congestion by adding capacity to improve traffic operations and safety. The additional capacity would help planned and anticipated growth along the corridor and would help achieve the mobility and economic development goals of PCTPA. The construction cost is estimated at $\$ 51.5 \mathrm{M}$, with $\$ 50,000$ for utilities. Two viable alternatives are being considered and include the following features:

1. Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane) - This alternative would add a 12 -foot-wide carpool/high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane in the southbound direction of SR 65 in the median from the Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange to north of the Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road interchange. The carpool/HOV lane would conform to the carpool/HOV lanes proposed from the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Project.

The separate I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements project will add a third lane in each direction of SR 65 from I-80 to Pleasant Grove Boulevard. This SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements project alternative would also add one 12 -foot general purpose lane through the Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange, to create a third lane on SR 65 in both directions from I-80 to Blue Oaks Boulevard, and add the following auxiliary lanes in each direction of SR 65:

- The Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road interchange to the Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange
- The Blue Oaks Boulevard Interchange to the Sunset Boulevard interchange
- The Whitney Ranch Parkway Interchange to the Twelve Bridges Drive interchange

2. Alternative 2 (General Purpose Lane) - This alternative would add a 12 -foot general purpose lane in the southbound direction of SR 65 from the Blue Oaks

Boulevard interchange to the Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road offramp. The separate I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements project will add a third lane in each direction of SR 65 from I-80 to Pleasant Grove Boulevard. For added capacity on southbound SR 65, as recommended by the VA study, this alternative also includes an additional general purpose lane from the Blue Oaks Boulevard slip on-ramp to the Pleasant Grove Boulevard loop on-ramp. On northbound SR 65, a 12-foot general purpose lane would be added through the Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange. These improvements would result in a third lane in both directions of SR 65 from I-80 to Blue Oaks Boulevard.

This alternative would also add an auxiliary lane on northbound SR 65 from the Galleria Boulevard interchange to the Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange; and in both directions of SR 65 from the Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange to the Sunset Boulevard interchange, and from the Whitney Ranch Parkway interchange to the Twelve Bridges Drive interchange.

The project is listed in the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS). The project is programmed in the SACOG 2015/2018 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) for preliminary engineering.

The project design and construction will be locally funded by the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA) Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee Program, which includes Placer County and the Cities of Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln. Exhibits showing the proposed improvements are contained in Attachment A.

| Project Limits | 03-Pla-65 <br> PM 6.5/12.8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Number of Alternatives | Three: <br> 1. Carpool/High Occupancy Vehicle [HOV] Lane <br> 2. General Purpose Lane <br> 3. No Build Alternative |
| Current Capital Outlay <br> Construction Estimate | Carpool/HOV Lane: \$51.5M (2015 dollars) <br> General Purpose Lane: \$50.4M (2015 dollars) |
| Current Capital Outlay <br> Right-of-Way and Utility <br> Estimate | Carpool/HOV Lane: \$50,000 (2015 dollars) <br> General Purpose Lane: \$50,000 (2015 dollars) |
| Funding Source | Local Agency |
| Funding Year | 2016 |
| Type of Facility | Freeway |
| Number of Structures | 2 |
| Environmental <br> Determination or <br> Document | Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration <br> (IS/MND) - California Environmental Quality Act <br> (CEQA) |


| Legal Description | In Placer County in the Cities of Rocklin, Roseville, <br> and Lincoln. Construct high-occupancy vehicle lanes or <br> general purpose lanes and operational improvements. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Development <br> Category | 4 A |

## 2. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Draft Project Report (DPR) be approved and that the IS/MND be circulated for public review and comment and that a public hearing be held.

## 3. BACKGROUND

SR 65 was part of the first State Highway System authorized by the State Highway Act of 1909. The original construction from Roseville to Lincoln took place between 1912 and 1914. This section of highway was adopted as freeway by the California Highway Commission on May 20, 1964.

SR 65 begins at the Interstate 80 (I-80) junction and is an important interregional route that serves local and regional traffic. SR 65 generally runs north/south and serves as a major connector for automobile and truck traffic originating from the I-80 corridor in the Roseville/Rocklin area to the SR 70/99 corridor in the Marysville/ Yuba City area. SR 65 is a vital economic link from residential areas to shopping and employment centers in southern Placer County. It is also an important route for transporting aggregate, lumber, and other commodities that is shaped by a significant growth of industrial, commercial, and residential development. The southern Placer County region is one of the fastest growing areas in California, both in terms of housing and economic development.

SR 65 was constructed as a two-lane expressway in 1971. The Roseville Bypass from I-80 to Blue Oaks Boulevard was constructed in 1985. SR 65 from Blue Oaks Boulevard to Twelve Bridges Drive was widened to a four-lane facility in 1999. The SR 65 Corridor System Management Plan (Caltrans, 2009) identified major mobility challenges including highway and roadway traffic congestion, lack of roadway capacity, and inadequate transit funding. A supplemental traffic report (Caltrans, 2012) indicated that the segment of SR 65 from Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road to Lincoln Boulevard was experiencing operational problems caused by high peak-period traffic volumes, vehicles hours of delay, average speeds, travel time, and other traffic performance measures that were deteriorating by the increasing growth in the surrounding areas.

PCTPA identified the proposed project as a high-priority regional network project in the 2036 Placer County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) (PCTPA, 2010). This project is included in the SPRTA Regional Traffic Congestion and Air Quality Mitigation Fee Program.

The Project Study Report - Project Development Support (PSR-PDS) for Capital Support was completed and approved on January 1, 2013 (EA-2F920K). The PSR-PDS identified and estimated the necessary project scope, schedule, and support
cost to complete the studies and work needed for the Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA\&ED) phase. Several alternatives were also developed for adding one vehicle lane in each direction in the median of SR 65 from 0.5 mile north of Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road to Lincoln Boulevard.

## Other Related Projects

## Rocklin Road Interchange Improvements

The City of Rocklin is proposing to improve Rocklin Road and the on- and off-ramps at the I-80 Interchange. The PSR-PDS has been completed and PA\&ED is in progress.

## Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road/SR 65 Northbound Ramps

The Highway 65 Joint Powers Authority, including the PCTPA and the cities of Rocklin and Roseville, completed the PA\&ED phase of this project, which proposes to reconfigure the northbound ramps of the Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road interchange to improve operations and add capacity.

## I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements

The project is currently in the PA\&ED phase, led by the PCTPA, to improve the I-80/SR 65 interchange with high-speed connector ramps, add one additional lane to each connector ramp, add an HOV direct connector between I-80 and SR 65, and local interchange ramp improvements and street widening to accommodate these improvements.

Phase 1 of the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Project are scheduled to commence in spring 2017. The Phase 1 improvements were selected based on their ability to address the highest priority congestion and safety issues in the I-80 and SR 65 corridors. Phase 1 will widen the East Roseville Viaduct to accommodate the addition of a third northbound lane along SR 65 from I-80 to just north of the Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road interchange. Phase 1 will include the proposed Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road/SR 65 Northbound Ramps project improvements and improvements to the southbound Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road slip on-ramp.

The proposed geometrics have been coordinated with the SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements Project to provide the appropriate and contiguous improvements along the SR 65 corridor.

## Placer Parkway Phase 1

Placer County led the PA\&ED phase of this project to provide access and improve circulation between and across SR 65 to support current and planned urban development within the county and the city of Rocklin. The interchange and associated improvements are needed to improve traffic capacity and enhance traffic operations and mobility that will accommodate future traffic demands in the region. The project is currently in the Plans, Specifications, and Estimate (PS\&E) phase.

## Whitney Ranch Interim Interchange

Construction is currently in progress for an interim interchange to connect to the existing Whitney Ranch Parkway/University Avenue. The interim improvements represent the most cost effective solution for providing adequate access to the city while maintaining an acceptable level of service on SR 65 and adjacent interchanges within the proposed project limits.

## Community Interaction

The following public outreach efforts were conducted through August 2016:

- PCTPA Board Public Meeting on May 5, 2014
- Community open house on July 24, 2014
- Community meeting flyers
- Web site updates
- PCTPA e-newsletter updates
- Press releases to various publications
- PCTPA Board Public Meeting on March 25, 2015

Project stakeholders consisting of business owners, tenants, residents, and other interested organizations and individuals that may be directly affected by the proposed project were contacted including the following:

- Adventure Christian Church
- Best Step Transportation Collaborative
- Bureau of Indian Affairs
- California Trucking Association
- Cattlemen’s Restaurant
- Cinemark Century Theater
- Cirby Hills Town Homes
- Courtyard Marriott Residence Inn
- Creekside Town Center
- Cresthaven
- Dry Creek Conservancy
- Golfland Sunsplash
- Hearthstone Condos
- Kaiser Permanente
- Larkspur Landing
- Lincoln Chamber of Commerce
- Lincoln Crossing Community Association
- Lincoln Transit
- Maidu Neighborhood Association
- Meadow Oaks
- Placer County Transit
- Roseville Coalition of Neighborhood Associations
- Renesus/Telfunken
- Rocklin Chamber of Commerce
- Roseville Unified School District
- Roseville Galleria
- Roseville Transit
- Stoneridge Village 1 Owners Association
- Sun City Lincoln Hills Community Association
- Sunset Plaza
- Sutter Roseville
- The Fountains
- The Preserve at Creekside
- Thunder Valley Casino Resort
- Western Placer Unified School District
- Whitney Oaks Community Association
- William Jessup University


## Support and Opposition

To date, feedback regarding the proposed project, particularly during the Community Open House, has been generally supportive.

## Existing Facility

In the northbound direction, SR 65 begins at I-80 as a three-lane facility consisting of the two eastbound I-80 to northbound SR 65 connector ramp lanes joined with the one-lane westbound I-80 to northbound SR 65 connector ramp. The outside lane immediately ends along the East Roseville Viaduct, and SR 65 continues north with two lanes through the Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road interchange. A partial auxiliary lane begins prior to the Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange and ends at the northbound off-ramp, with an overall length of approximately 1,300 feet. Past the Pleasant Grove Boulevard, northbound SR 65 continues toward the city of Lincoln as a two-lane facility with an auxiliary lane between the Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Blue Oaks Boulevard interchanges, a partial auxiliary lane for the northbound Sunset Boulevard off-ramp, and an auxiliary lane between the Twelve Bridge Drive interchange and the Lincoln Boulevard interchange.

In the southbound direction from the city of Lincoln, SR 65 has two lanes with an auxiliary lane between the Lincoln Boulevard and the Twelve Bridges Drive interchanges, a partial auxiliary lane at the southbound Sunset Boulevard off-ramp, and an auxiliary lane between the Blue Oaks Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchanges. A third mainline lane develops under the Galleria Boulevard/ Stanford Ranch Road interchange prior to the southbound Galleria Boulevard/ Stanford Ranch Road slip on-ramp. The three lanes continue across the East Roseville Viaduct and split into four lanes, two serving the southbound SR 65 to westbound I-80 connector ramp and two serving the SR 65 to eastbound I-80 connector ramp.

## 4. PURPOSE AND NEED

## Purpose:

The primary purpose of the proposed project is to relieve existing mainline congestion by adding additional mainline capacity. Adding additional capacity would help planned and anticipated growth along the corridor and would help achieve the mobility and economic development goals of the PCTPA.

The project will improve traffic operations and safety in this segment of the highway.

## Need:

Recurring morning and evening peak-period demand exceeds the current design capacity along SR 65, creating traffic operations and safety issues. These issues result in high delays and wasted fuel, all of which will be exacerbated by traffic from future population and employment growth.
Projected growth along the SR 65 corridor in Roseville, Lincoln, Rocklin, and South Placer County will result in additional mainline congestion. SR 65 connects major regional routes and must operate efficiently in order to serve commuter traffic, goods movement, and regional traffic in south Placer County.

## 4A. Problem, Deficiencies, Justification

Prior to the recent downturn in the economy, the SR 65 corridor included some of the fastest growing communities in the Sacramento region - Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln. The SACOG 2016 MTP/SCS estimates that these communities will continue to grow toward build-out conditions by the year 2036. Although growth in these areas will continue at a slower pace than originally estimated, the continued growth will place additional travel demands on the SR 65 and I-80 corridors and the regional roadway network. Congestion delay currently exists in the southbound and northbound directions all day, from 7 AM to 7 PM.

Because of planned development, the 2040 projected traffic volumes anticipate significantly increased congestion along SR 65.

## 4B. Regional and System Planning

## A. State Planning

SR 65 is the principal north/south freeway connecting Placer County and Yuba County. In Caltrans District 3, the SR 65 corridor extends from the I-80/SR 65 junction north to the SR 70/SR 65 junction in Yuba County. SR 65 is important as a major lifeline route for industrial, commercial and agricultural purposes and serves as a major commuter route within and between cities located along its length.
The State Route 65 Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP) (Caltrans, 2009) is the State's plan for the SR 65 corridor and covers the segment between I-80 and SR 70 in Yuba County. The CSMP reviewed. The CSMP reviewed existing traffic data and projected it to a Design Year 2027. In addition, the plan determined that the freeway currently operates at Level of Service (LOS) D and that, without expanding the freeway, it will operate at LOS F.

SR 65 is identified as a principal arterial route on the National Highway System and is a Terminal Access (Surface Transportation Assistance Act) route.
The State's concept facility is a six-lane freeway plus two HOV lanes and two auxiliary lanes; the ultimate facility is an eight-lane freeway plus two HOV lanes and two auxiliary lanes.

## B. Regional Planning

The proposed project is included in the 2036 Placer County RTP, with SPRTA as the lead agency.

## C. Local Planning

The proposed project design and construction will be locally funded by the SPRTA Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee Program, which includes the county and the cities of Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln.

## 4C. Traffic

The transportation analysis used an integrated modeling approach that has three levels of detail (or modeling platforms): (1) macro, (2) meso, and (3) micro. At the macro level, the regional travel forecasting model (i.e., SACMET) was used to forecast peak period origin-destination (OD) traffic volume flows between traffic analysis zones
internal and external to the study area. At the meso level, the peak period OD flows were divided into four 1-hour trip tables and disaggregated into three modes-single occupant vehicle (SOV), HOV, and truck-and then assigned to the sub-area roadway network by using Visum software. The assignment process was based on congested travel times that reflect roadway link speeds and capacity. At the micro level, the traffic volumes were converted to individual vehicles that were assigned to the operational study area using the Vissim software, which contains detailed inputs governing traffic controls (signal timings), geometrics (lane configurations), and driver behavior.

The traffic forecasts were developed using the first two modeling platforms (macro and meso). The first platform uses a modified version of the regional SACMET model developed by the SACOG for the MTP/SCS. The second modeling platform uses the Visum sub-area trip assignment model, which was used to assign the trips generated from the SACMET model to a detailed roadway network within the study area.

The SACMET and Visum models were calibrated and validated according to the 2010 California Regional Transportation Guidelines (California Transportation Commission, 2010) and criteria approved by the Project Development Team (PDT). Both models passed applicable static and dynamic validation tests. The detailed validation results are contained in Chapter 4 of the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Transportation Analysis Report (Fehr and Peers, 2014).

Traffic volume forecasts are derived from future socioeconomic projections that started with regional socioeconomic projections developed by SACOG for the regional MTP/SCS. These were reviewed by the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Project Development Team and modified to better reflect local plans. Socioeconomic projections have the greatest influence on volume forecasts and will affect volume projections to a greater extent than roadway network changes or other modeling components. If these forecasts vary in reality, it will have a direct effect on future traffic volumes.

The traffic volume forecasts (and operations analysis) are also influenced by modifications to the existing transportation network caused by improvement projects anticipated to be implemented by the Construction Year and Design Year. This includes projects identified in the financially constrained project list in the MTP/SCS and projects the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Project Development Team believes would likely be constructed by the Design Year. The rationale for adding projects to the MTP/SCS list was that the Design Year is 5 years beyond the 2035 horizon of the MTP/SCS. This creates a longer timeframe for revenue to accumulate. Furthermore, the additional socioeconomic growth added to the model would also contribute to transportation revenue to help pay for these improvements.
A Transportation Analysis Report (Fehr and Peers, 2015) for the SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements Project; a copy of the report can be found in
Attachment B. The base year used is 2012, the Construction Year used is 2020, and the Design Year is 2040. The report identified needed improvements along SR 65 to support population and economic growth through the year 2040.

## Existing (2012) Conditions

Traffic operations were analyzed for baseline conditions under AM and PM peak hour conditions. Table 1 shows the LOS and average delay at the studied ramps along SR 65 under the baseline conditions. Congestion occurs at the I-80 on-ramp and along southbound SR 65 between the Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Blue Oaks Boulevard interchanges because of the high demand along the mainline combined with the Pleasant Grove on-ramp volume.

| Freeway | Location | Type | LOS/Average Density |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| NB SR 65 | I-80 WB on-ramp | Merge | F/53 | F/95 |
|  | I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Basic | D/32 | F/77 |
|  | Stanford Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | D/33 | F/62 |
| SB SR 65 | Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | F/60 | B/20 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | F/75 | C/21 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd Off- to On-ramp | Basic | F/89 | C/25 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | F/72 | D/31 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | F/53 | E/39 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | E/36 | D/32 |
|  | Galleria Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | E/35 | D/32 |
| EB I-80 | Eureka Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | C/26 | F/46 |
|  | Eureka Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | C/21 | C/23 |
|  | Eureka Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | B/19 | B/20 |
|  | Eureka Rd to Taylor Rd | Weave | C/23 | E/42 |
|  | Taylor Rd. to SR 65 | Basic | D/28 | E/42 |
|  | SR 65 Off-ramp | Diverge | C/28 | F/52 |
| WB I-80 | SR 65 Off-ramp | Diverge | B/18 | E/35 |
|  | Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | D/32 | C/26 |
|  | Douglas Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | E/36 | D/34 |
|  | Douglas Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | E/42 | E/37 |
|  | Douglas Blvd to Riverside Ave | Basic | D/33 | D/31 |
|  | Riverside Ave Off-ramp | Diverge | E/40 | E/36 |

Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015
Notes:
Bold and underline font indicate LOS F conditions.
The LOS and average density for the study segment are reported.

In the baseline year existing conditions, the traffic analysis shows that the intersections within the proposed project area operate at an acceptable LOS, except for at two locations. The intersection at Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard/SR 65 southbound ramps in the AM peak hour operates at LOS D because it serves inbound (employees) and outbound (residents) commuters for west Roseville. The Rocklin Road/Granite Drive intersection, in the PM peak hour, operates at LOS D. Table 2 shows the LOS and average delay at the study intersections under baseline conditions.

| Table 2. Baseline (2012) Intersection Operations Results |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Minimum Acceptable LOS | AM Peak Hour (LOS/delay) | PM Peak <br> Hour <br> (LOS/delay) |
| 6. Blue Oaks Blvd/Washington Blvd/SR 65 SB Ramps | C | D/43 | C/33 |
| 10. Stanford Ranch Rd/Five Star Blvd | C | B/19 | C/32 |
| 11. Stanford Ranch Rd/SR 65 NB Ramps | D | A/9 | B/15 |
| 12. Galleria Blvd/SR 65 SB Ramps | D | B/13 | B/19 |
| 13. Galleria Blvd/Antelope Creek Drive | C | B/10 | C/24 |
| 14. Galleria Blvd/Roseville Pkwy | E | C/30 | D/36 |
| 15. Roseville Pkwy/Creekside Ridge Drive | C | A/6 | B/17 |
| 16. Roseville Pkwy/Taylor Rd | D | C/30 | C/28 |
| 17. Roseville Pkwy/Sunrise Avenue | E | D/37 | D/37 |
| 18. Atlantic Street/Wills Rd | C | B/10 | B/12 |
| 19. Atlantic Street/I-80 WB Ramps | C | A/7 | B/11 |
| 20. Eureka Rd/Taylor Rd/I-80 EB Ramps | E | C/26 | E/61 |
| 21. Eureka Rd/Sunrise Avenue | C | C/24 | C/30 |
| 26. Douglas Blvd/Sunrise Avenue | D | C/26 | D/35 |
| 28. Pacific Street/Sunset Blvd | C | B/18 | C/29 |
| 29. Rocklin Rd/Granite Drive | C | B/15 | D/37 |
| 30. Rocklin Rd/I-80 WB Ramps | C | C/21 | B/17 |
| 31. Rocklin Rd/I-80 EB Ramps | C | B/17 | B/20 |
| 32. Rocklin Rd/Aguilar Rd | C | A/8 | B/13 |

Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015
Notes:
Bold and underline font indicate unacceptable operations.
The LOS and average delay in seconds per vehicle are reported.

## Construction Year (2020)

In the Construction Year (2020), during the AM peak hour, the Build alternatives operate unacceptably at the Sunset Boulevard westbound off-ramp to on-ramp segment and at the Sunset Boulevard westbound on-ramp; potential mitigation includes more restrictive ramp metering at the upstream on-ramps. Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane) would have an impact at the Galleria Boulevard on-ramp to southbound SR 65 during the AM peak hour. A potential mitigation could include more restrictive ramp metering at the upstream on-ramps or construction of the ultimate phase of the planned I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Project.

All three alternatives would operate at LOS D or better during the PM peak hour.
Table 3 shows the LOS and delay for the freeway operations under Construction Year No Build and Build conditions.

03-Pla-65-PM6.5/12.8
SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements
Table 3. Construction Year (2020) Conditions Freeway Operations Results

| Freeway | Location | Type ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Alternative 1 Carpool Lane (LOS/density) |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Alternative } 2 \\ \text { GP Lane } \\ \text { (LOS/density) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Alternative } 3 \\ & \text { No Build } \\ & \text { (LOS/density) } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AM <br> Peak <br> Hour | PM Peak Hour | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { NB } \\ \text { SR } 65 \end{gathered}$ | I-80 Eastbound Connector Ramp | Basic | F/45 | F/61 | F/47 | F/63 | E/44 | F/61 |
|  | Stanford Ranch |  |  |  |  |  | D/31 | D/32 |
|  | Grove Blvd | Weave |  |  |  |  | E/36 | E/36 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd On-ramp | Merge | D/33 | D/39 | D/33 | D/40 | C/27 | D/29 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | C/27 | D/32 | C/27 | D/32 |  |  |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | C/19 | D/26 | C/19 | D/27 | C/25 | D/29 |
|  | Whitney Ranch | Weave | B/13 | C/23 | B/13 | C/23 | B/16 | D/29 |
|  | Bridges Drive |  |  |  |  |  | B/17 | D/30 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { SB } \\ \text { SR } 65 \end{gathered}$ | Twelve Bridges | Weave | C/28 | B/16 | D/28 | B/16 | D/33 | B/19 |
|  | Pkwy |  |  |  |  |  | D/31 | B/19 |
|  | Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | F/68 | C/25 | F/75 | C/25 | D/29 | C/21 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | D/30 | C/26 | C/24 | C/21 | F/56 | C/26 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | D/29 | C/25 | C/27 | C/24 | D/31 | D/27 |
|  | Galleria Blvd On-ramp | Merge | F/54 | D/34 | E/42 | D/33 | E/39 | D/33 |
|  | I-80 WB <br> Connector Ramp | Basic | E/41 | D/32 | E/40 | D/32 | E/38 | D/32 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { EB } \\ \text { I-80 } \end{gathered}$ | Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | Basic | D/34 | F/108 | E/35 | D/34 | E/39 | F/81 |
|  | Eureka Rd Offramp | Diverge | D/30 | F/118 | D/30 | F/110 | D/39 | F/106 |
|  | SR 65 Off-ramp | Diverge | D/33 | F/91 | D/32 | F/95 | D/31 | F/92 |
|  | SR 65 to Rocklin Rd | Basic | C/22 | C/22 | C/22 | C/23 | C/21 | C/23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB } \\ & \text { I-80 } \end{aligned}$ | Rocklin Rd to Carpool Lane Start | Basic | D/29 | C/24 | D/28 | C/24 | D/29 | C24 |
|  | Atlantic Street On-ramp | Merge | E/37 | D/30 | E/37 | D/30 | E/38 | D/30 |
|  | Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | D/33 | C/27 | D/33 | C/28 | D/33 | C/27 |
|  | Douglas Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | E/35 | D/33 | E/37 | D/30 | E/39 | D/31 |
|  | Riverside Avenue Off-ramp | Diverge | D/34 | D/31 | D/33 | D/31 | D/33 | D/31 |

SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements


As shown in Table 4, the following intersections operate at an unacceptable level under the Construction Year No Build and Build conditions:

- Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard/SR 65 Southbound Ramps (PM peak hour only)
- Stanford Ranch Road/Five Star Avenue (PM peak only)
- Rocklin Road/Granite Drive (PM peak only)
- Rocklin Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps (AM peak only)

During the PM peak, the proposed project would have impacts at the following study intersections:

- Stanford Ranch Road/Five Star Boulevard
- Atlantic Street/Willis Road
- Douglas Boulevard/Harding Boulevard (Alternative 2 only)
- Douglas Boulevard/I-80 Eastbound Ramps
- Douglas Boulevard/Sunrise Avenue (Alternative 2 only)
- Rocklin Road/Granite Drive
- Rocklin Road/Aguilar Road

Signal timing adjustments are a potential mitigation for the Stanford Ranch Road, Atlantic Street, and Douglas Boulevard intersections. The impacts at the Rocklin Road intersections can be mitigated by the planned improvements to the I-80/Rocklin

Road interchange. These intersections would need capacity enhancements with and without the proposed project to operate at acceptable levels.

Table 4 shows the LOS and delay for the study intersections under Construction Year No Build and Build conditions.

| Intersection | Threshold | Alternative 1 Carpool Lane (LOS/delay) |  | Alternative 2GP Lane(LOS/delay) |  | Alternative 3 No <br> Build (LOS/delay) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM <br> Peak <br> Hour | PM <br> Peak <br> Hour | AM <br> Peak <br> Hour | $\begin{gathered} \text { PM } \\ \text { Peak } \\ \text { Hour } \end{gathered}$ | AM <br> Peak <br> Hour | PM <br> Peak <br> Hour |
| 6. Blue Oaks Blvd/ Washington Blvd/SR 65 SB Ramps | C | C/31 | D/47 | C/35 | D/44 | D/53 | F/126 |
| 10. Stanford Ranch Rd/ Five Star Blvd | C | C/27 | F/92 | C/27 | E/76 | C/29 | D/48 |
| 11. Stanford Ranch Rd/ SR 65 NB Ramps | D | B/15 | C/23 | B/20 | C/25 | B/18 | B/12 |
| 12. Galleria Blvd/SR 65 SB Ramps | D | B/17 | B/16 | B/17 | B/17 | B/17 | B/16 |
| 16. Roseville Pkwy/ Taylor Rd | D | D/49 | D/51 | D/46 | D/53 | F/133 | D/42 |
| 18. Atlantic Street/Wills Rd | C | C/24 | D/39 | C/24 | $\underline{D / 36}$ | B/19 | C/22 |
| 20. Eureka Rd/Taylor Rd/ I-80 EB Ramps | E | C/25 | D/52 | C/25 | E/72 | C/22 | D/41 |
| 21. Eureka Rd/Sunrise Avenue | C | C/32 | D/44 | C/33 | D/44 | C/26 | E/62 |
| 23. Douglas Blvd/Harding Blvd | E | D/51 | E/77 | C/30 | F/128 | D/36 | F/92 |
| 24. Douglas Blvd/I-80 <br> WB Ramps | C | C/23 | C/35 | C/24 | C/31 | B/20 | C/31 |
| 25. Douglas Blvd/I-80 EB Ramps | C | B/20 | D/41 | A/10 | D/35 | B/12 | C/29 |
| 26. Douglas Blvd/Sunrise Avenue | D | C/33 | D/54 | C/33 | F/86 | C/28 | D/39 |
| 28. Pacific Street/Sunset Blvd | C | C/24 | C/30 | C/24 | C/29 | C/27 | F/86 |
| 29. Rocklin Rd/Granite Drive | C | B/17 | F/130 | B/18 | F/130 | B/19 | F/127 |
| 30. Rocklin Rd/I-80 WB Ramps | C | C/23 | C/27 | C/29 | C/25 | C/21 | D/38 |
| 31. Rocklin Rd/I-80 EB Ramps | C | D/42 | E/57 | D/49 | D/46 | D/37 | C/33 |
| Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 <br> Notes: <br> Bold and underline font ind Shaded cells indicate a proj <br> The LOS and average delay | cate unaccep ect impact. in seconds p | ble ope vehicl | tions. <br> are repo |  |  |  |  |

## Phase 1

A Phase 1 analysis was conducted to determine what additional benefits would improve the AM peak period during the Construction Year (2020). Phase 1 would widen SR 65 to provide an additional lane between the Pleasant Grove Boulevard offramp and loop on-ramp, resulting in three lanes in each direction from I-80 to the Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange. Auxiliary lanes would also be added in both directions between the Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road and Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchanges. Table 5 compares the Phase 1 improvements to the baseline conditions, which assumes that Phase 1 of the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Project would also be in place to reduce the majority of congestion that currently occurs along mainline SR 65.

Construction of Phase 1 would improve conditions at the Blue Oaks Boulevard ramps but would deliver more volume to the Galleria Boulevard interchange, causing a minor bottleneck until the future phases of the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Project are constructed. The Traffic Analysis Memorandum - Phase 1 (Fehr \& Peers, 2016) is included in Attachment C.

| Freeway | Location | Baseline Alternative |  | Phase 1 Alternative |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | LOS/ Density | Type | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { LOS/ } \\ \text { Density } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| NB SR 65 | I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Basic | D/27 | Basic | D/26 |
|  | Stanford Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | C/24 | Diverge | C/24 |
|  | Stanford Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | D/31 | - | - |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-Ramp | Diverge | E/36 | - | - |
|  | Stanford Ranch Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | - | - | Weave | C/23 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-ramp to Onramp | Basic | E/36 | Basic | C/23 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Weave | C/27 | - | - |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd On-ramp | - | - | Merge | D/31 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | - | - | Diverge | C/25 |
| SB SR 65 | Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | F/78 | Merge | E/40 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | F/54 | -- |  |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd EB On-Ramp | - | - | Merge | D/32 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-ramp | - | - | Diverge | C/27 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-ramp to Onramp | Basic | E/36 | Basic | C/24 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | D/30 | Merge | C/22 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | D/29 | Merge | C/24 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | D/31 | Basic | D/28 |
|  | Galleria Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | D/32 | Diverge | C/27 |
|  | Galleria Blvd On-ramp | Merge | E/37 | Merge | F/46 |
|  | I-80 Off-ramp | Diverge | D/33 | Diverge | D/33 |
| Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 5. Construction Year AM Peak Hour - Phase 1 and Baseline Alternative Freeway Operations

| Freeway | Baseline Alternative | Phase 1 Alternative |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | LOS/ |  | LOS/ |
|  | Density | Type | Density |  |  |

Note:
Bold and underline font indicate unacceptable operations.
Design Year (2040)
Table 6 compares the daily forecast volumes for mainline SR 65 in the Design Year with the existing conditions for all vehicles and trucks in the proposed project area.

| Segment | Existing Conditions ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | Design Year Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Alternative 1 Carpool Lane |  | Alternative 2 General Purpose Lane |  | Alternative 3 <br> No Build |  |
|  | Total | Trucks | Total | Trucks | Total | Trucks | Total | Trucks |
| I-80 to Galleria Blvd/Stanford Ranch Rd | 106,100 | 3,500 | 168,100 | 6,300 | 169,000 | 6,400 | 158,000 | 6,200 |
| Stanford Ranch Rd/ Galleria Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | 104,400 | 3,500 | 169,200 | 6,600 | 170,900 | 6,700 | 152,400 | 6,300 |
| Pleasant Grove Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | 83,400 | 3,100 | 159,800 | 6,300 | 162,300 | 6,400 | 140,800 | 6,000 |
| Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | 65,300 | 2,400 | 134,600 | 4,900 | 135,700 | 4,900 | 112,100 | 4,600 |
| Sunset Blvd to Whitney Ranch Pkwy/Placer Pkwy |  | 1,900 | 114,000 | 3,700 | 114,600 | 3,700 | 96,900 | 3,300 |
| Whitney Ranch Pkwy/Placer Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr |  |  | 126,500 | 3,500 | 127,000 | 3,500 | 112,700 | 3,400 |
| Twelve Bridges Drive to Lincoln Blvd ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 48,800 | 1,900 | 104,300 | 3,200 | 104,500 | 3,200 | 93,600 | 3,000 |
| Lincoln Blvd to Ferrari Ranch Rd | - | - | 61,100 | 2,700 | 61,400 | 2,700 | 56,300 | 2,600 |

Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015
${ }^{\text {a }}$ The existing conditions total volume data is from 2009 as reported in the PeMS database. The existing truck volumes are estimated from the base year SACMET model.

Freeway operations improve under Build conditions, except for one location for each alternative:

- Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane) - Westbound I-80 at Elkhorn Boulevard eastbound On-ramp (Carpool Lane alternative) (AM peak)
- Alternative 2 (General Purpose Lane) - Westbound I-80 at Truck Scales On-ramp AM peak)

| Table 7. Design Year (2040) Conditions Freeway Operations Results |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Freeway | Location | Type ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Alternative 1 Carpool Lane (LOS/density) |  | Alternative 2 General Purpose Lane (LOS/density) |  | Alternative 3 No Build (LOS/density) |  |
|  |  |  | AM <br> Peak <br> Hour | $\begin{gathered} \text { PM } \\ \text { Peak } \\ \text { Hour } \end{gathered}$ | AM <br> Peak <br> Hour | PM <br> Peak <br> Hour | AM <br> Peak <br> Hour | PM <br> Peak <br> Hour |
| NB <br> SR 65 | I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Weave | C/28 | D/33 | C/28 | D/32 | C/26 | F/79 |
|  | Stanford Ranch Rd |  |  |  |  |  | E/40 | F/67 |
|  | to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | D/30 | D/33 | D/30 | D/34 | E/40 | E/40 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd On-ramp | Merge | D/31 | D/33 | D/31 | D/35 | C23 | C/22 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | C/27 | D/31 | C/28 | D/32 |  |  |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | C/19 | C/26 | C/19 | C/26 | C/21 | C/21 |
|  | Whitney Ranch Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Drive | Weave | B/15 | C/24 | B/16 | C/24 | C/19 | C/24 |
| SB <br> SR 65 | Lincoln Blvd to Twelve Bridges Drive | Weave | D/34 | B/17 | D/33 | B/17 | D/28 | B/17 |
|  | Twelve Bridges Drive to Placer Pkwy | Weave | D/30 | B/17 | D/29 | C/22 | D/30 | C/19 |
|  | Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Weave | D/34 | C/24 | D/34 | C/24 | F/102 | D/29 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | D/32 | C/27 | D/32 | C/27 | F/107 | F/48 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | D/33 | C/28 | D/32 | D/28 | F/79 | $\underline{\mathrm{F} / 48}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/32 | D/29 |  |  |
|  | Pleasant Grove <br> Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | D/33 | D/30 | F/46 | D/34 | F/82 | F/89 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | E/35 | D/34 | E/36 | D/33 | E/37 | E/37 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB } \\ & \text { I-80 } \end{aligned}$ | Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | Basic | E/39 | D/32 | D/32 | E/36 | E/42 | E/35 |
|  | Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd | Weave | C/27 | C/27 | C/23 | C/27 | C/27 | E/41 |
|  | SR 65 Off-ramp | Diverge | C/24 | C/24 | C/22 | C/25 | C/24 | $\underline{\mathrm{F} / 58}$ |
|  | SR 65 to Rocklin Rd | Basic | C/26 | C/26 | C/24 | D/27 | C/24 | D/26 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB } \\ & \text { I-80 } \end{aligned}$ | Rocklin Rd to Carpool Lane Start | Basic | D/31 | D/30 | D/27 | D/33 | D/30 | D/30 |
|  | SR 65 to Atlantic Street | Weave | C/27 | C/23 | C/24 | C/24 | C/25 | C/24 |


| Freeway | Location | Type ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Alternative 1 Carpool Lane (LOS/density) |  | Alternative 2 General Purpose Lane (LOS/density) |  | Alternative 3 No Build (LOS/density) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AM <br> Peak <br> Hour | PM <br> Peak <br> Hour | AM <br> Peak <br> Hour | PM <br> Peak <br> Hour | AM <br> Peak <br> Hour | PM <br> Peak <br> Hour |
|  | Atlantic Street On-ramp | Merge | E/41 | E/37 | E/36 | E/38 | E/38 | E/39 |
|  | Douglas Blvd Offramp | Diverge | E/36 | D/34 | D/32 | D/32 | D/34 | D/32 |
|  | Douglas Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | E/39 | D/33 | D/31 | E/35 | E/35 | E/36 |
|  | Riverside Avenue Off-ramp | Diverge | D/35 | D/33 | D/33 | D/34 | D/34 | D/35 |
|  | Antelope Rd to Truck Scales | Weave | F/48 | C/26 | F/59 | C/26 | F/70 | C/28 |
|  | Truck Scales On-ramp | Merge | F/79 | C/27 | F/88 | D/29 | F/87 | D/29 |
|  | Elkhorn Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | F/91 | C/27 | F/54 | C/28 | F/61 | C/28 |

Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015
${ }^{\text {a }}$ The facility type reported is for Alternative 1. The other results are contained in the Technical
Appendix in the Transportation and Analysis Report (Fehr and Peers, 2015)
Notes:
Bold and underline font indicate LOS F conditions.
Shaded cells indicate a project impact.
The LOS and average density for the study segment are reported.

Table 8 shows the LOS and delay for the study intersections under Design Year, No Build and Build conditions. Fourteen study intersections are projected to operate at an unacceptable level under No Build conditions.

The project would eliminate unacceptable operations at 2 or 3 out of 11 intersections, depending on the Build alternative (Roseville Parkway/Sunrise Avenue and Rocklin Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps for both alternatives and Eureka Road/Taylor Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps for Alternative 1 Carpool Lane. Compared to the No Build scenario, the Build alternatives would increase delays at the following locations:

- Roseville Parkway/Taylor Road (AM peak)
- Douglas Boulevard/Harding Boulevard (PM peak)
- Douglas Boulevard/Sunrise Avenue (PM peak)
- Rocklin Road/I-80 Westbound Ramps (PM peak)

Signal timing may be adjusted to mitigate delays at the Roseville Parkway/Taylor Road intersection.

Table 8 shows the LOS and delay for the freeway operations under Design Year No Build and Build conditions.

| Intersection | Minimum <br> Acceptabl e LOS | Alternative 1 Carpool Lane (LOS/delay) |  | Alternative 2 General <br> Purpose Lane (LOS/delay) |  | Alternative 3 No Build (LOS/delay) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM <br> Peak <br> Hour | PM <br> Peak <br> Hour | AM Peak <br> Hour | PM <br> Peak <br> Hour | AM <br> Peak <br> Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| 6. Blue Oaks Blvd/Washington Blvd/SR 65 SB Ramps | C | E/57 | F/140 | E/59 | F/153 | F/90 | F/214 |
| 7. Blue Oaks Blvd/SR 65 NB Ramps | C | B/17 | D/45 | B/16 | D/49 | B/17 | F/94 |
| 10. Stanford Ranch Rd/Five Star Blvd | C | C/27 | F/82 | C/26 | E/57 | C/26 | F/85 |
| 11. Stanford Ranch Rd/SR 65 NB Ramps | D | B/11 | D/36 | B/12 | B/19 | B/19 | C/21 |
| 12. Galleria Blvd/SR 65 SB Ramps | D | B/19 | C/25 | B/17 | B/19 | D/55 | C/27 |
| 13. Galleria Blvd/Antelope Creek Rd | C | A/10 | C/28 | A/10 | C/29 | A/8 | C/28 |
| 14. Galleria Blvd/Roseville Pkwy | E | D/47 | F/93 | D/45 | F/82 | D/41 | F/93 |
| 15. Roseville Pkwy/Creekside Ridge Drive | C | A/8 | D/50 | A/8 | D/47 | A/8 | D/50 |
| 16. Roseville Pkwy/Taylor Rd | D | E/70 | D/52 | E/66 | D/52 | E/60 | E/55 |
| 17. Roseville Pkwy/Sunrise Avenue | E | C/33 | E/70 | C/35 | E/57 | C/33 | F/89 |
| 20. Eureka Rd/Taylor Rd/I-80 EB Ramps | E | C/30 | E/75 | C/30 | F/81 | C/30 | F/99 |
| 21. Eureka Rd/Sunrise Avenue | C | D/41 | F/94 | D/41 | F/103 | D/41 | F/104 |
| 23. Douglas Blvd/Harding Blvd | E | C/26 | F/91 | C/28 | F/96 | $\underline{C / 26}$ | E/69 |
| 24. Douglas Blvd/I-80 WB Ramps | C | C/21 | C/28 | B/19 | C/33 | C/22 | C/20 |
| 25. Douglas Blvd/I-80 EB Ramps | C | C/28 | D/37 | C/24 | D/37 | C/29 | D/39 |
| 26. Douglas Blvd/Sunrise <br> Avenue | D | D/54 | F/254 | D/44 | F/241 | D/43 | F/239 |
| 29. Rocklin Rd/Granite Drive | C | C/29 | F/95 | C/28 | F/84 | C/26 | F/101 |
| 30. Rocklin Rd/I-80 WB Ramps | C | C/23 | E/68 | C/24 | E/63 | C/22 | D/54 |
| 31. Rocklin Rd/I-80 EB Ramps | C | C/30 | C/21 | C/26 | B/20 | D/41 | C/21 |
| Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 <br> Notes: <br> Bold and underline font indicate unacceptable operations. <br> Shaded cells indicate a project impact. <br> The LOS and average delay in seconds per vehicle are reported. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Collision Analysis

Caltrans Traffic Accident Surveillance and Analysis System (TASAS) traffic collision data for mainline SR 65 and the ramp connections were compiled for the 3-year period between October 1, 2009 and September 30, 2012.

A total of 247 collisions were reported on the freeway sections in both directions of SR 65, including 3 fatalities. As shown in Table 9, the actual accident rate on SR 65 is lower than the statewide average for a similar type facility. The accident rates for fatal accidents are higher than the statewide average, but the incidents occurred at different locations along the freeway segment. Actual fatal and injury accidents are lower than the statewide average.

During the 3-year period, the following types of accidents occurred on SR 65:

- 124 rear-ends ( 50 percent)
- 57 hit objects ( 23 percent)
- 37 sideswipes ( 15 percent
- 13 overturns (5 percent)
- 8 broadsides (3 percent)
- 5 auto-pedestrian (2 percent)
- 2 other factors (1 percent)
- 1 head on ( 0.4 percent)

The most frequent collision type (50 percent) is a rear end collision, which is typical of congested conditions. The next most frequent collision types are hit objects and sideswipes. The remaining types of collisions make up less than 12 percent of all collisions.

| Direction | Total <br> Accidents | $\underset{\text { Fatalities }}{\text { Total }}$ | Actual Collision Rate |  |  | Average Collision Rate |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northbound | 116 | 0 | F | F\&I | Total | F | F\&I | Total |
| Southbound | 131 | 3 | 0.008 | 0.14 | 0.38 | 0.007 | 0.23 | 0.66 |
| Total | 247 | 3 | 0.004 | 0.14 | 0.37 | 0.007 | 0.23 | 0.66 |

Source: Caltrans District 3 TASAS Table B, October 1, 2009 to September 30, 2012
Notes:
Bold and underline font indicate unacceptable conditions.
F = Fatalities
F\&I = Fatalities and Injuries

## 5. ALTERNATIVES

## 5A. Viable Alternatives

## Build Alternatives

There are two Build alternatives being considered in this project: Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane) and Alternative 2 (General Purpose Lane). These alternatives are shown on the Geometric Approval Drawings in Attachment A. This section summarizes the features that are common to both Build alternatives. Unique features
of each alternative are described in their respective sections. Both Build alternatives described below would:

- Allow for inside highway widening as a future project along SR 65 from north of the Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange to Lincoln Boulevard
- Accommodate the I-80/SR 65 project improvements
- Take into consideration the carpool/HOV lane restrictions and weaving volumes from the carpool/HOV lanes proposed by the I-80/SR 65 project


## Structures

The northbound and southbound bridges over Pleasant Grove Creek would need to be widened to accommodate the median widening and auxiliary lanes. Widened bridge structures would be similar to the existing reinforced concrete slab bridges with piles.

A tie-back wall would be needed at the Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange to accommodate the highway and ramp widening (see Advanced Planning Studies in Attachment D).

Existing box culverts would need to be extended at various locations to accommodate the proposed auxiliary lanes along the corridor. The following culverts would need to be extended:

- Double 72-inch reinforced concrete pipe between Galleria Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Boulevard
- Double 10- by 5-foot RCB between Blue Oaks Boulevard and Sunset Boulevard
- 7- by 5-foot RCB between Whitney Ranch Parkway and Twelve Bridges Drive


## Enforcement Areas

California Highway Patrol (CHP) pull-out areas would be provided on each on-ramp adjacent to HOV lanes and ramp metering points. These pull-out areas would be intended to enforce the ramp-meter area of the interchange.

## HOV (Bus and Carpool) Lanes

All of the on-ramps for both Build alternatives include a preferential 12-foot-wide HOV lane, except for the Pleasant Grove Boulevard Northbound loop on-ramp, the Blue Oaks Boulevard Northbound Loop On-ramp, and the Sunset Boulevard southbound loop on-ramp. The ingress to the HOV lanes is standard on all ramps.

## Ramp Metering

Accepting the recommendation from the Value Analysis (VA) study (CH2M, 2015), both Build alternatives would include ramp metering modifications for the slip onramps to a $2+1$ configuration (two metered lanes plus one carpool preferential lane) and a $1+1$ configuration (one metered general purpose lane plus one carpool preferential lane) for the loop on-ramps. These modifications, which would be constructed along SR 65 from the Galleria Boulevard interchange to Lincoln Boulevard, where not already planned by another project.

The southbound Pleasant Grove Boulevard slip and loop on-ramps, Blue Oaks Boulevard slip and loop on-ramps, and Lincoln Boulevard slip on-ramp would be modified to include these ramp metering changes. Table 10 summarizes ramp metering modification locations, by project.

## Park-and-Ride Facilities

There are several existing park-and-ride facilities near the proposed project area that are enroute to the SR 65 corridor, including the following:

- Foothills Boulevard and Junction Boulevard (California Family Fitness) 25 parking spaces available
- 1000 Pleasant Grove Boulevard (Highland Crossing Shopping Center) 25 parking spaces available
- Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Michener Drive (Mahany Park) - 42 parking spaces available
- Galleria Circle and West Drive (Galleria Transfer Point) - 50 parking spaces available
- Stanford Ranch Road and Five Star Boulevard - 35 parking spaces available

| $\begin{array}{r}\text { Table 10. SR } 65 \text { Ramp Configuration } \\ \text { Ramp } \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Existing |  | Proposed <br> (Alternatives 1 and 2) |  |
|  |  | Lanes | HOV | Lanes | HOV |
| Northbound | Stanford Ranch Rd ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1 | No | 3 | Yes |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd | 2 | No | 2 | No |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd | 1 | No | 2 | No |
|  | Sunset Blvd EB | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes |
|  | Sunset Blvd WB | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes |
|  | Whitney Ranch Pkwy EB ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Not Applicable |  | 2 | Yes |
|  | Whitney Ranch Pkwy WB ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Not Applicable |  | 2 | Yes |
|  | Twelve Bridges $\mathrm{Dr}^{\text {d }}$ | 2 | No | 3 | Yes |
| Southbound | Lincoln Blvd | 2 | No | 3 | Yes |
|  | Twelve Bridges Dr | 2 | No | 2 | No |
|  | Placer Pkwy WB ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Not Applicable |  | 2 | Yes |
|  | Placer Pkwy EB ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Not Applicable |  | 2 | Yes |
|  | Sunset Blvd WB | 2 | Yes | 2 | No |
|  | Sunset Blvd EB | 3 | Yes | 3 | Yes |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd WB | 1 | No | 2 | Yes |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd EB | 2 | Yes | 3 | Yes |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd WB | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd EB | 2 | No | 3 | Yes |
|  | Galleria Blvd ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | 1 | No | 3 | Yes |


| Table 10. SR 65 Ramp Configuration | Proposed <br> Ramp$\quad$Existing <br> (Alternatives 1 and 2) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lanes | HOV | Lanes | HOV |

Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015
Notes:
Shading indicates a change from the existing configuration.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ To be constructed under the Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road/SR 65 Northbound Ramps Project
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ To be constructed under the Placer Parkway project
${ }^{\text {c }}$ To be constructed under the SR 65/Whitney Ranch Parkway Interchange Project
${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$. To be constructed under the SR 65/Twelve Bridges Drive Interchange Project
${ }^{\mathrm{e}}$. To be constructed under the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Phase 1 Project

## Right-of-way

All proposed project improvements are anticipated to remain within the existing State right-of-way. Approximately $\$ 100,000$ has been estimated for right-of-way for the utility relocations described in the following section. Per the Master Agreement between State and PG\&E, the liability will be split 50-50 and local agency's share will be $\$ 50,000$ and owner's share will be $\$ 50,000$. Right-of-Way Data Sheets for each Build alternative are included in Attachment E.

## Utility and Other Owner Involvement

Existing utilities have been approximately located, based on available as-built plans obtained from Caltrans and the local utility companies. Utility A letters were sent out to the following utility owners:

- AT\&T
- Comcast
- Consolidated Communications
- Frontier Communications
- PG\&E
- Sprint
- Verizon
- Wave Broadband
- Kinder Morgan
- Placer County Water Agency
- City of Roseville
- Electric Lightwave

The following existing utilities have been identified as being within the proposed project limits and are described in the Right-of-Way Data Sheets (see Attachment E).

- PG\&E owns utility poles east and west of SR 65 at the Pleasant Grove Creek Bridge. PG\&E overhead lines between the poles are anticipated to be protected in place or be temporarily relocated to address potential conflicts with pile-driving activities associated with the bridge widening for both Build alternatives.
- City of Roseville Sewer owns a 50-inch-diameter sewer line that runs beneath the Pleasant Grove Creek Bridge. Based on preliminary utility alignment and the existing bridge piers, it is anticipated that the bridge widening will avoid conflicts with the sewer line.


## Erosion Control

The draft Storm Water Data Report (Mark Thomas and Company, 2016) was prepared for this project (see Attachment F). Best management practices will be implemented during the construction to meet the water quality discharge requirements under the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. Proposed embankment slopes will be primarily at $4: 1$ (horizontal:vertical) with the exception of the design exceptions described in the Nonstandard Design Features section below. All graded areas will be vegetated and erosion control measures will be implemented, such as slope rounding, seeding, and planting. Approximately 55 acres of disturbed soil are anticipated for this project. Proposed permanent best management practices include biofiltration strips and swales to treat water quality flow and carry storm runoff. The draft Storm Water Data Report will be finalized upon selection of the preferred alternative.

## Noise Barriers

The project area consists of residential subdivisions, a place of worship, schools, a jail, a hospital, a hotel, several commercial uses that do not include apparent outdoor areas of frequent human use, and undeveloped land as identified in the Noise Study Report (ICF International [ICF], 2016a). The residential subdivisions in the study area are generally set back from SR 65 and buffered by commercial use and undeveloped land. Existing traffic noise levels range from 47 to 73 A-weighted equivalent sound level (dBA Leq[h]) at modeled receiver locations. Predicted worstcase traffic noise levels range from 51 to 76 dBA Leq (h) for Design Year No Build conditions and 52 to 77 dBA Leq(h) for Design Year Build conditions.

Traffic noise levels under Design Year conditions are predicted to approach or exceed the noise abatement criteria for six land uses adjacent to SR 65 including: The Placer County Jail (institutional use), Placer Center for Health, the Western Sierra Collegiate Academy, Rocklin Academy Gateway, and Creekside Church. However, there are no areas of frequent outdoor human use associated with these locations. In accordance with 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 772, noise abatement is considered only for areas of frequent human use that would benefit from a lower noise level. Therefore, noise abatement was not considered.

## Interim Improvements

Because of funding constraints, the proposed project considers implementing phased improvements. The proposed interim phase for both Build alternatives would construct northbound and southbound auxiliary lanes from Galleria Boulevard/ Stanford Ranch Road to Pleasant Grove Boulevard on SR 65. In addition, the proposed project would widen SR 65 from four to six lanes with one general purpose lane southbound and northbound from north of Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road to Blue Oaks Boulevard.

Any potential phased improvements are being considered/sequenced in coordination with the planned phased improvements for the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Project. The I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Project is currently in the design
phase and is being completed by the PCTPA. The proposed geometrics have been coordinated with the SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements Project to provide appropriate and contiguous improvements along the SR 65 corridor.

## Cost Estimate

The roadway, structure, and utility costs for the Alternatives 1, Carpool Lane and Alternative 2, General Purpose Lane are summarized in Table 11.

| Table 11. Preliminary Project Costs for Ultimate Condition |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Item | Alternative 1 Carpool Lane |  |
| Alternative 2 General <br> Purpose Lane |  |  |
| Roadway | $\$ 49,418,400$ | $\$ 48,248,600$ |
| Structure | $\$ 2,063,000$ | $\$ 2,063,000$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 50,000$ | $\$ 50,000$ |
| Total | $\$ 51,532,000$ | $\$ 50,362,000$ |

Attachment G provides a full preliminary cost estimate for each alternative.
Alternative 1: Carpool Lane
In addition to the features that are common to both Build alternatives, this alternative adds a 12 -foot-wide carpool/HOV lane in the southbound direction of SR 65 in the median from the Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange to north of Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road. The carpool/HOV lane would connect to the carpool/HOV lanes proposed as part of the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements project.

The separate I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements project will add a third lane in each direction of SR 65 from I-80 to Pleasant Grove Boulevard. This SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements project alternative would add one 12-foot general purpose lane through the Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange, to create a third lane on SR 65 in both directions from I-80 to Blue Oaks Boulevard. This alternative would also add an auxiliary lane in each direction of SR 65 from the Galleria Boulevard interchange to the Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange, from the Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange to the Sunset Boulevard interchange, and from the Whitney Ranch Parkway interchange to the Twelve Bridge Drive interchange.

## Alternative 2: General Purpose Lane

In addition to the features that are common to both Build alternatives, this alternative would add a 12-foot-wide general purpose lane in the southbound direction of SR 65 from the Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange to the Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road off-ramp. The separate I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements project will add a third lane in each direction of SR 65 from I-80 to Pleasant Grove Boulevard. For added capacity on southbound SR 65, as recommended by the VA study, this alternative also includes an additional general purpose lane from the Blue Oaks Boulevard slip onramp to the Pleasant Grove Boulevard loop on-ramp. On northbound SR 65, a 12-foot general purpose lane would be added through the Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange. These improvements would result in a third lane in both directions of SR 65 from I-80 to Blue Oaks Boulevard.

This alternative would also add an auxiliary lane on SR 65 from the Galleria Boulevard/Standard Ranch Road interchange to the Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange; and in both directions of SR 65 from the Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange to the Sunset Boulevard interchange, and from Whitney Ranch Parkway interchange to the Twelve Bridges Drive interchange.

Alternative 3 (No Build Alternative)
The No Build Alternative is the basis for comparison of the Build Alternatives. It satisfies the statutory requirements under CEQA and NEPA for an alternative that does not include any new action or project beyond what is already committed. The No Build Alternative represents the state and local transportation system in its current condition. It includes implementation of programs or projects projected in RTPs that have identified funds for implementation and that are expected to be in place by 2040; it also reflects major planned land use changes.

The No Build Alternative includes programs and projects identified in the SACOG financially constrained project list in the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SACOG 2012) and input from the I-80/ SR 65 PDT regarding projects that would be built by the Design Year.

Under the No Build Alternative, the proposed project would not be implemented. The I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvement project would be constructed starting in 2017. The I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvement project would be in place with added HOV direct connectors in each direction between I-80 and SR 65, eastbound I-80 to northbound SR 65 flyover connector, southbound SR 65 to eastbound I-80 flyover connector, widening the East Roseville Viaduct, replacing the Taylor Road overcrossing, and widening southbound SR 65 to westbound I-80 and westbound I-80 to northbound SR 65 connectors with added capacity and associated auxiliary lanes and ramp realignment.

## Nonstandard Design Features

Caltrans design standards were used to develop the preliminary geometrics within State right-of-way. A summary of exceptions to mandatory and advisory design standards is in included in Attachment H. Four design standards (at the locations listed below) will need an exception.

The exceptions to Caltrans advisory design standards are as follows:
A. Advisory Design Exception Feature 1

Non-standard Feature: Superelevation Transition
Location 1: Blue Oaks Boulevard northbound loop on-ramp (B1) will have a runoff length of 166.67 feet.

The standard runoff length for a 10 percent superelevation rate along a two-lane ramp is 240 feet.

Location 2: Pleasant Grove Boulevard southbound off-ramp (P3) will have a runoff length of 223 feet

The standard runoff length for a 12 percent superelevation rate along a two-lane ramp is 300 feet

Location 3: Pleasant Grove Boulevard southbound off-ramp (P3) will have a runoff length of 186 feet

The standard runoff length for a 10 percent superelevation rate along a two-lane ramp is 210 feet

A standard design would require substantial reconstruction of the ramp intersection including both ramp structures and the northbound exit lane, resulting in right of way impacts and added cost.

## B. Advisory Design Exception Feature 2

Non-standard Feature: Side Slope Standards
Location 1: Galleria Boulevard off-ramp from STA $164+00$ to $171+50$ will have a side slope steeper than $4: 1(\mathrm{H}: \mathrm{V})$.

For new construction, widening, or where slopes are otherwise being modified, embankment (fill) slopes should be $4: 1$ or flatter.

Location 2: SR 65 - southbound direction from STA 191+00 to 202+00 will have a side slope as steep as $2: 1$ or flatter.

Location 2: SR 65 - NB direction from STA 191+00 to 200+00 will have a side slope as steep as 2:1 or flatter.

For new construction, widening, or where slopes are otherwise being modified, embankment (fill) slopes should be 4:1 or flatter.

Location 3: SR 65 - southbound direction from STA 241+50 to 248+00 will have a side slope as steep as $2: 1$ or flatter.

For new construction, widening, or where slopes are otherwise being modified, embankment (fill) slopes should be 4:1 or flatter.

Each nonstandard location is steeper than a standard $4: 1$ to avoid right-of-way and environmental impacts, similar to existing conditions. The current design improvements remain within existing State right-of-way throughout the entire project limits.

The exceptions to Caltrans mandatory design standards are as follows:

## A. Mandatory Design Exception Feature 1

Location A: The proposed shoulder width of the inside shoulder along southbound SR 65 at the Pleasant Grove overcrossing from STA 218+50 to 219+50 will be $\pm .9$ feet

## Left paved shoulder width should be $\mathbf{1 0}$ feet for six or more lanes

Location B: The proposed shoulder width of the inside shoulder along southbound SR 65, at the Blue Oaks Boulevard Overcrossing from STA 269+30 to 270+30 will be 9 feet $\pm$.

## Left paved shoulder width should be $\mathbf{1 0}$ feet for six or more lanes

Location C: The proposed shoulder width of the inside shoulder along the Blue Oaks southbound off-ramp Overcrossing from STA $273+90$ to 274+40 will be 9 feet $\pm$.

## Left paved shoulder width should be $\mathbf{1 0}$ feet for six or more lanes

The three locations mentioned above are physically constrained by the existing bridge column. Providing a standard design would require outside widening, impacting the SB on ramps of the Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Blue Oaks Boulevard interchanges. The required ramp reconstruction and ground anchor walls would be cost prohibitive.

## A. Mandatory Design Exception Feature 2

Curve C24 along the Blue Oaks Boulevard northbound loop on-ramp ("B1" Line) has a radius of 159 ft with a non-standard superelevation rate of $10 \%$.

## The standard superelevation rate for a 159’ curve radius is $\mathbf{1 2 \%}$.

A standard design would require increasing the tangent runoff length on either side of the curve to provide adequate runoff for a $12 \%$ superelevation transition. Providing this length would impact the Blue Oaks Boulevard overcrossing and negatively impact operations and safety of the freeway and interchange.

## Ramp Metering

The proposed ramp metering is common to both Build alternatives. Table 12 shows the existing and proposed ramp configuration. The table includes number of ramp lanes and HOV lane restrictions.

| Table 12 SR65 Ramp Configuration |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ramp |  | Existing |  | Proposed |  |
|  |  | Lanes | HOV | Lanes | HOV |
| Northbound | Stanford Ranch Rd | 1 | No | 3 | Yes |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd | 2 | No | 2 | No |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd | 1 | No | 2 | No |
|  | Sunset Blvd Eastbound | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes |
|  | Sunset Blvd Westbound | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes |
|  | Whitney Ranch Pkwy Eastbound ${ }^{2}$ | n/a |  | 2 | Yes |
|  | Whitney Ranch Pkwy Westbound ${ }^{3}$ | n/a |  | 2 | Yes |
|  | Twelve Bridges $\mathrm{Dr}^{4}$ | 2 | No | 3 | Yes |


| Southbound | Lincoln Blvd | 2 | No | 3 | Yes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Twelve Bridges Dr | 2 | No | 2 | No |
|  | Placer Pkwy Westbound ${ }^{3}$ | n/a |  | 2 | Yes |
|  | Placer Blvd Eastbound ${ }^{2}$ | n/a |  | 2 | Yes |
|  | Sunset Blvd Westbound | 2 | Yes | 2 | No |
|  | Sunset Blvd Eastbound | 3 | Yes | 3 | Yes |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd Westbound | 1 | No | 2 | Yes |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd Eastbound | 2 | Yes | 3 | Yes |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd Westbound | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd Eastbound | 2 | No | 3 | Yes |
|  | Galleria Blvd ${ }^{5}$ | 1 | No | 3 | Yes |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. To be constructed under the Stanford Ranch Road/SR65 NB Ramp Project |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. To be constructed under the Placer Parkway Project |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. To be constructed under the SR65/Whitney Ranch Interim Interchange project |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. To be constructed under the SR65/Twelve Bridges Drive Interchange project |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. To be constructed under the I-80/SR65 Interchange Phase 1 project |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |

Ramp meter installation will be provided under separate projects for the Stanford Ranch Road/Galleria Boulevard, Whitney Ranch Parkway/Placer Parkway, and Twelve Bridges Drive interchanges. In the northbound direction, the Blue Oaks Boulevard on-ramp would be widened to provide an additional lane for storage. In the southbound direction, widening for an HOV preferential lane would also be provided at Lincoln Boulevard, Blue Oaks Boulevard westbound, and Pleasant Grove Boulevard eastbound on-ramps.

At the Sunset Boulevard westbound on-ramp, design year demand volume would increase such that a second lane of storage would be needed to prevent ramp meter queues from extending onto the local street. As a result, the existing HOV preferential lane would be converted to a general purpose lane.

At Blue Oaks Boulevard, widening for a third lane to maintain the HOV preferential lane is not feasible due to the geometry of the loop ramp. At the Blue Oaks Boulevard eastbound on-ramp, the ramp would be widened to provide a second general purpose lane for storage.

## 5B. Rejected Alternatives

The following alternatives were considered and rejected by the PDT:

- Build Alternative with Full Carpool Lane - This alternative would add a 12-foot-wide carpool/HOV lane in the median and an auxiliary lane in each
direction of SR 65 from Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Rd interchange to Lincoln Boulevard. The PDT reviewed and rejected the alternative because of the low demand for HOV lanes north of Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange.
- Build Alternative with Mix Flow to Bus/Carpool Conversion - This alternative would convert an existing mixed-flow lane for carpool/HOV use within the proposed project limits. The alternative was reviewed and rejected by the PDT as infeasible because the highway is a four-lane facility (two lanes in each direction) and the low demand for HOV lanes north of Blue Oaks Boulevard.
- Reversible Lanes - This alternative would add one or two reversible lanes in the median of SR 65, generally between the Blue Oaks Boulevard and Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road interchanges. The motivation for reversible lanes, in general, is to minimize the pavement required by allowing vehicles in both directions to use the reversible median lanes, by reversing the direction of flow twice a day (at least) for the peak direction. Operations of reversible lanes are generally controlled with a series of gates, moveable and static barriers, and/or delineators. Reversible lanes are relatively uncommon, although they are used regularly on the Golden Gate (San Francisco) and Coronado (San Diego) bridges, and at times on the I-15 Express Lanes in San Diego. Assembly Bill (AB) 2542 requires consideration of reversible lanes.

A reversible lanes alternative was evaluated for SR 65, but determined to be infeasible for several reasons. First, reversible lanes work best when volumes are unbalanced in the peak period (much higher in one direction). For SR 65, 2040 peak hour volumes are only 50 to 55 percent in the peak direction (nearly balanced). Adding reversible lanes would only help traffic in one direction. Second, reversible lanes are typically implemented on extended segments of freeway, especially where there is limited access (at bridges or express lanes). The SR 65 corridor is a relatively short segment with closely-spaced interchanges, including the system interchange at I-80. Finally, construction and maintenance costs would be high with reversible lanes. Some type of barrier infrastructure would be needed in both directions. The wide median would necessitate long access connections between the mainline traffic on both sides. After construction, the maintenance costs and safety risks associated with the twice-daily direction switches would be substantial.

## 6. CONSIDERATIONS REQUIRING DISCUSSION

## 6A. Hazardous Waste

The Phase I Initial Site Assessment (ISA) (Blackburn Consulting, Inc., 2014) identified recognized environmental conditions at the site. The ISA was performed in general conformance with ASTM E1527-13 "Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process." The investigations included a review of aerial photographs and topographic maps for historical uses of the property, and a database search for records of known storage tank sites and known sites of hazardous materials generation, storage, or contamination. The ISA also included a
visual inspection of the proposed project site to evaluate the potential for existing sources of contamination on or nearby the site. The ISA report is included in Attachment I.

Based on the information obtained as part of the ISA, the following conclusions were made:

- No site was identified with known or potential hazardous material issues within or adjacent to the proposed project site that is likely to have an impact on the proposed project.
- The project is not within a rock formation that is likely to include naturally occurring asbestos.
- An aerially deposited lead (ADL) investigation was conducted along SR 65. A total of 66 samples were collected along the northbound shoulders within the top 6 inches and southbound shoulders and median within the top 24 inches of soil. No trace of lead was detected along the northbound lanes and the concentration of total lead vary from 52 to 160 milligrams per kilogram ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \mathrm{)} \mathrm{along} \mathrm{the}$ southbound lanes. This is probably because the southbound lanes were the original SR 65, and the northbound lanes were built after leaded gasoline was discontinued. All of results are less than the $1,000 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ concentration at which the soil would be considered contaminated. The Waste Extraction Test was performed on the six samples with the highest total lead concentrations to determine if they exceed the 5 milligrams per liter ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ ) hazardous waste threshold. The tests results ranged from 3.8 to $15 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$; three of the six samples analyzed exhibit soluble lead levels above the $5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ threshold. Of those three samples, two were obtained from one sampling location; the surrounding sampling locations detected lead concentrations below the $50 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ criteria. The sampling location was deemed not representative of the proposed project site. In addition, the regression analysis to predict soluble lead levels indicates the 95 percent UCL for soluble lead levels is below the threshold of $5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$. Therefore, based on the concentrations of total lead and soluble lead and the depth of the proposed improvements, specialized soil management is not warranted. The ADL assessment report is included in Attachment I.


## Yellow Traffic Stripe

Yellow traffic stripes may contain heavy metals, such as lead and chromium, at concentrations that exceed the hazardous waste thresholds established by the California Code of Regulations; the stripes may produce toxic fumes when heated. Consequently, removal or disturbance of any yellow traffic striping within the proposed project area will require development of an appropriate lead compliance plan.

## Asbestos-containing Material (ACM) and Lead Based Paint (LBP)

The Hazardous Materials Survey Report (Entek Consulting, 2014) evaluated the presence of ACM and LBP at the Pleasant Grove Creek bridges. The report concluded that ACM is not present in the concrete that comprises the bridge deck and supporting columns beneath the bridges. Entek Consulting did not observe existing paints or coatings associated with the bridges that would require sampling for LBP.

Although asbestos was not found during the survey, written notification to the California Air Resources Board may be required.

Metal Beam Guardrail Wood Post
If metal beam guardrail wood posts are removed as part of the proposed project, the contractor shall prepare and submit a safety and health work practices plan for handling treated wood waste by an American Board of Industrial Hygene, Certified Industrial Hygienist. Treated wood waste must be disposed of in an approved treated wood waste facility.

## 6B. Value Analysis

The estimated project cost is above $\$ 50$ million; therefore, a VA study is required if federal funding will be used for the proposed project (including right-of-way, construction, and support). A VA study was held at Caltrans District 3 Field Office in Rocklin February 9-12, 2015. Findings from the final VA study (CH2M, 2015) were issued in May 2015. The VA team consisted of representatives from Caltrans, Placer County, and the City of Roseville from multiple disciplines and independent from the project team.

Three VA alternatives were accepted (two with modifications):

1. The first alternative concept for both Build alternatives would modify all slip on-ramps to southbound and northbound SR 65 to a $2+1$ configuration (two metered lanes plus one carpool preferential lane). All southbound and northbound loop on-ramps would be modified to a $1+1$ configuration (one metered lane plus one carpool preferential lane) from Galleria Boulevard to Twelve Bridges Drive. Metering improvements would only be added within the proposed project limits along SR 65 and on-ramps where metering is not already proposed as part of another project.
2. The second alternative concept would build upon the General Purpose Lane alternative by adding an additional general purpose lane in the southbound direction from Blue Oaks Boulevard to Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road.

After the implementation meeting, the design team modified the second alternative to provide additional capacity. The modified alternative connects the auxiliary lanes on either side of Pleasant Grove Boulevard so that a fourth lane is provided between Blue Oaks Boulevard and Galleria Boulevard. This modification would allow the Galleria Boulevard off-ramp traffic to use two mainline lanes at the Pleasant Grove Boulevard off-ramp rather than be concentrated in just one lane.
3. The third alternative concept would build on the General Purpose Lane alternative by adding an additional general purpose lane in the southbound direction from Blue Oaks Boulevard to Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road. In the northbound direction, the proposed general purpose lane would be eliminated north of Galleria Boulevard.

After the implementation meeting, the design team modified this alternative to add an auxiliary lane between each of the interchanges along SR 65 from Galleria Boulevard to Ferrari Ranch Rd, with the following outside widening for the General Purpose Lane alternative:

- Galleria Boulevard to Pleasant Grove Boulevard Northbound - four lanes (three general purpose lanes and one auxiliary lane)
- Pleasant Grove Boulevard to Blue Oaks Boulevard Northbound - three general purpose lanes
- Blue Oaks Boulevard to Galleria Boulevard Southbound - four general purpose lanes


## 6C. Resource Conservation

Features to reduce wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy and nonrenewable resources in construction, operations and maintenance of the proposed project will be included wherever possible, including recycling the existing structural sections and concrete structures, such as aggregate base, through provisions in the contract documents. Other measures include recycling structural steel and other steel materials within the proposed project limits, using concrete washout materials on the job site, not idling construction equipment, and adding HOV lanes and HOV bypass lanes to encourage carpooling.

## 6D. Right-of-way Issues

Right-of-way acquisitions are not anticipated to be necessary to construct the proposed project. A Right of-Way Data Sheet for each alternative can be found in Attachment E.

The utility impacts described in Section 5 will require the permanent relocation of utilities.

## 6E. Environmental Issues

Caltrans is the lead agency under CEQA, and Caltrans, under authority delegated by Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and is also the lead agency under NEPA. The project is Categorically Excluded under NEPA. The Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with Caltrans environmental procedures, as well as State and federal environmental regulations. The attached IS/MND is the appropriate document for the proposal. A draft IS/MND was prepared for this project by the PCTPA, pursuant to CEQA, and is included in Attachment J.

## Waters of the United States

The wetland delineation (ICF, 2016b) was performed in accordance with the Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers [USACE], 1987), the Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region (USACE, 2008) and the Minimum Standards for Acceptance of Preliminary Wetlands Delineations (USACE, 2001). The USACE regulations in 33 CFR 328 were used to determine the presence of waters of the United States other than wetlands. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Jurisdictional

Determination Form Instructional Guidebook (USACE, 2007) was consulted in evaluating the jurisdictional status of the various waterbodies existing within the study area. The National Wetland Plant List (USACE, 2016) was used to determine the wetland indicator status of species observed in the study area.

Of the approximately 589 acres of study area, 19.359 acres of water features were mapped, including the following:

- 2.786 acres of vernal pools
- 4.101 acres of depressed seasonal wetlands
- 8.807 acres of emergent wetlands
- 0.517 acre of riparian scrub wetlands
- 1.198 acres of perennial streams
- 0.683 acre of ephemeral streams
- 1.267 acres of drainage ditches

Table 13 summarizes the mitigation agreements that will be implemented during the project to ensure that the proposed project minimizes effects on wetlands and other waters of the United States within and adjacent to the construction area.

| Table 13. Avoidance and Minimization Efforts and Compensatory Mitigation |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| Avoidance and Minimization Efforts |  |
| Measure | $\quad$ Description of Measure |
| Measure 1: | Install Fencing and/or Flagging to Protect Biological Resources |
| Measure 2: | Conduct Mandatory Environmental Awareness Training for Construction Personnel |
| Measure 3: | Retain a Qualified Biologist to Conduct Periodic Monitoring during Construction in <br> Sensitive Habitat |
| Measure 4: | Protect Water Quality and Minimize Sedimentation Runoff in Wetlands and Other Waters |
| Measure 7: | Avoid and Minimize Potential Indirect Impacts on Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp and Vernal <br> Pool Tadpole Shrimp Habitat |
| Measure 9: | Provide Escape Ramps for Wildlife and Inspect Pits and Trenches Daily |
| Measure 10: | Conduct a Pre-Construction Survey for Northern Western Pond Turtle and Exclude <br> Turtles from the Work Area |
| Measure 11: | Conduct Pre-Construction Surveys for Burrowing Owl and Establish Exclusion Zones, if <br> Necessary |
| Measure 12: | Conduct Pre-Construction Surveys for Swainson's Hawk and Establish Exclusion Zones, <br> if Necessary |
| Measure 13: | Conduct Vegetation Removal during the Non-Breeding Season and Conduct Pre- <br> Construction Surveys for Nesting Migratory Birds and Raptors |
| Measure 14: | Conduct Occupancy Surveys for California Black Rail and Implement Avoidance <br> Measures, if Necessary |
| Measure 15: | Modify Existing Structures during the Non-Breeding Season for Purple Martin and Other <br> Structure-Nesting Migratory Birds or Implement Exclusion Measures to Deter Nesting |
| Measure 16: | Conduct Pre-Construction Surveys for Roosting Bats and Implement Protection Measures |
| Measure 17: | Avoid and Minimize the Spread of Invasive Plant Species during Project Construction |
| Compensatory Mitigation |  |
| Measure 5: | Compensate for the Placement of Permanent Fill into Wetlands |
| Measure 6: | Compensate for the Placement of Permanent Fill into Waters of the United States/Waters <br> of the State |


| Table 13. Avoidance and Minimization Efforts and Compensatory Mitigation |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| Avoidance and Minimization Efforts |  |
| Measure | Description of Measure |
| Measure 8: | Compensate for Direct and Indirect Impacts on Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp and Vernal <br> Pool Tadpole Shrimp Habitat |
| Source: ICF International |  |

## Floodplains

Encroachment on existing FEMA Floodplains have been evaluated and documented in the project Preliminary Drainage Report (PDR). The project crosses FEMA defined 100-year floodplain for:

## Pleasant Grove Creek Tributary 1

Pleasant Grove Creek
Orchard Creek Tributary 2
Orchard Creek Tributary 2-1
Orchard Creek North Branch
Orchard Creek
The hydrologic and hydraulic analysis of the cross culverts involved demonstrated that they are capable of passing the 50-year or 100-year event without overtopping of the adjacent roadway.

## Endangered Species

The proposed project has the potential to affect two federally listed wildlife species, vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp. Because the project is likely to result in direct modification of vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp habitat i.e. permanent and/or temporary fill and/or excavation, the project may affect, and is likely to adversely affect vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp. The minimization and avoidance measure described in Table 12 above are intended to mitigate some of these impacts.

## Air Quality Conformity

The Air Quality Study Report (ICF, 2016c) identifies several impacts that could result from implementing the proposed. Each project alternative is fully compatible with the design concept and scope described in the current 2036 Placer County RTP (PCTPA, 2016). Table 14 summarizes the impacts, mitigation measures, and significance conclusions discussed in the Air Quality Study Report.

| Table 14. Air Quality Study Report Summary |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Build Alternatives | Impacts | Avoidance, Minimization and <br> Mitigation Measures |  |  |
| AQ-1: Conformity with the <br> RTP with the State <br> Implementation Plan | The complete project is included in the <br> regional emissions and conformity analysis <br> for the 2036 MTP/SCS and 2015-2018 <br> MTIP. | None required |  |  |


| Build Alternatives | Impacts | Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AQ-2: Potential Violations of Carbon Monoxide NAAQS or CAAQS | The Build Alternatives are not anticipated to exceed 1- or 8-hour NAAQS or CAAQS for CO. | None required |
| AQ-3: Potential Violations of $\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$ NAAQS or CAAQS | Placer County is currently classified as a nonattainment area for the federal $\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$ NAAQS. However, due to minimal change in AADT between the No Build and Build Alternatives, the proposed project is determined not be a Project of Air Quality Concern. SACOG's PLCG issued concurrence that the proposed project is not a Project of Air Quality Concern August 9, 2016. | None required |
| AQ-4: Potential for Generation of MSAT Emissions | The project is not anticipated to have meaningful impacts on traffic volumes, thus based on FHWA's 2012 MSAT guidance, this project is considered to have No Meaningful Potential MSAT Effects, and a quantitative analysis of MSAT emissions is not required. | None required |
| AQ-5: Generation of Operation-related <br> Emissions of $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ <br> Precursors, Carbon <br> Monoxide, and Particulate Matter | The project would result in decreases in ROG, $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$, and CO but minor increases in $\mathrm{PM}_{10}$ and $\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$ between existing (2012) and design year (2040) conditions. The project would also result in increases in ROG, $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$, $\mathrm{CO}, \mathrm{PM}_{10}$, and $\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$ emissions between the No Build and Build alternatives. | None required |
| AQ-6: Potential Temporary Increase in $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ Precursors (ROG and $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ ), CO, and Particulate Matter Emissions during Grading and Construction Activities | The project would result in temporary increases in $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ precursors, $\mathrm{CO}, \mathrm{PM}_{10}$, and $\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$ during construction. | Addressed by constructionrelated $\mathrm{PM}_{10}$ emission minimization measures in Caltrans Standard Specifications Section 14 |
| AQ-7: Potential for Generation of GHG Contaminant Emissions | The project would result in minor increases in GHG emissions during construction and long-term operation. Operational emissions increases are a result of background growth in VMT between the existing (2012) and design (2040) years and increased VMT between the No Build and Build alternatives. | GHG reduction strategies identified in Chapter 3 of the Air Quality Conformity Report contained in the draft IS/MND (ICF, 2016d) |
| Notes: |  |  |
| CAAQS $=$ California Ambient Air Quality Standards |  |  |
| $\mathrm{CO}=$ carbon monoxide |  |  |
| GHG = greenhouse gas |  |  |
| MSAT = mobile source air toxics |  |  |
| MTIP $=$ Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program |  |  |
| MTP $=$ Metropolitan Transportation Plan |  |  |
| NAAQS $=$ National ambient air quality standards |  |  |



## Cultural Resources

The Historical Property Survey Report (HPSR) and Archaeological Survey Report (ASR) concluded that there are no cultural resources that are listed or are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) within the Area of Potential Effect (APE). Also there are no previously unevaluated cultural resources present within the APE. All previously recorded resources within the APE have since been destroyed or displaced by modern development and original highway construction and therefore no longer exist within the project limits.

## 6G. Title VI Considerations

All considerations under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes have been included in this project. Caltrans' commitment to upholding the mandates of Title VI is evidenced by its Title VI Policy Statement, signed by the Director.

## 6H. Noise Abatement Decision Report

This section represents the Noise Abatement Decision Report, which:

- Is an evaluation of the reasonableness and feasibility of incorporating noise abatement measures into this project;
- Constitutes the preliminary decision on noise abatement measures to be incorporated into the Draft Environmental Document; and
- Is required for Caltrans to meet the conditions of Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 772 in accordance with the Federal Highway Administration noise standards.

The Noise Study Report (ICF, 2016a) was approved by Kendall Schinke, Chief Environmental Management M1 Branch on February 22, 2016.

The project area consists of residential subdivisions, a church, schools, a jail, a hospital, a hotel, several commercial uses that include no apparent outdoor areas of frequent human use, and undeveloped land. The residential subdivisions in the study area are generally set back from SR 65 and buffered by commercial use and undeveloped land. In accordance to 23 CFR 772, noise abatement is considered only for areas of frequent human use that would benefit from a lower noise level. Because
the traffic noise impacts are not predicted to occur in areas where there is frequent human use, noise abatement was not considered for this project.

## 6I. Fish Passage

The SR 65 corridor includes numerous crossings over permanent and seasonal waterways. Those crossings are generally classified as either bridges or culverts. Typical culvert design of the crossing extension due to highway widening would take passage of aquatic organisms into consideration. The crossing design would be in conformance with California Department of Fish and Wildlife and NOAA Fisheries requirements.

## 7. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS AS APPROPRIATE

## 7A. Public Hearing Process

A public workshop was conducted on July 24, 2014, to review the project need preliminary goals, preliminary alternative concepts, and schedule.
The IS/MND and the DPR will be available for public review and comment, and a public hearing will be held.

## 7B. Route Matters

An updated Freeway Agreement is not required for SR 65 within the proposed project limits.

## 7C. Permits

Table 15 lists the permits that are anticipated to be required prior to construction of the proposed improvements project:

| Table 135. Anticipated Approvals, Permits, and Coordination |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | Permit/Approval | Status |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife <br> Service | Section 7 consultation for threatened <br> and endangered species. | Formal consultation for impacts on <br> vernal pool branchiopod species <br> will need to be completed before <br> the PA\&ED milestone can be met. |
| USACE Sacramento <br> District | Section 404 Nationwide Permit for <br> filling or dredging waters of the <br> United States. | Pending completion of the PS\&E <br> phase of the process. |
| Federal Highways <br> Administration | Executive Order 11990: Protection of <br> Wetlands | Pending completionin the PS\&E <br> phase of the process |
| Federal Highways <br> Administration | Executive Order 13112: Prevention <br> and Control of Invasive Species | Pending completion in the PS\&E <br> phase of the process |
| Central Valley Regional <br> Water Quality Control <br> Board | Section 401 Water Quality <br> Certification. Waste Discharge Permit <br> Review and approval of storm water <br> discharge treatments. | Pending completion in the PS\&E <br> phase of the process. |
| Central Valley Regional <br> Water Quality Control <br> Board | Section 402 National Pollutant <br> Discharge Elimination System. | Pending completion of the PS\&E <br> phase of the process. |
| California Department of <br> Fish and Wildlife | Section 1602 Lake or Streambed <br> Alteration Agreement may be needed <br> for crossing the tributaries of Orchard | Pending completion in the PS\&E <br> phase of the process. |
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| Table 135. Anticipated Approvals, Permits, and Coordination |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | Permit/Approval | Status |
|  | Creek | Pending completion in the PS\&E <br> phase of the process |
| California Department of <br> Fish and Wildlife | California Fish and Game Code <br> Sections 3503 and 3503.5: protection <br> of birds and raptors | Pending completion in the PS\&E <br> phase of the process |
| California Department of <br> Fish and Wildlife | California Fish and Game Code <br> Sections 3511, 3513, 4700 and 5050: <br> fully protected species | Encroachment permit for construction <br> of improvements within State right-of- <br> way. | | Pending completion of the PS\&E |
| :--- |
| phase of the process. |

## 7D. Cooperative Agreements

The project is a PCTPA lead effort. The existing cooperative agreement between the PCTPA and the State of California was executed on April 16, 2013, and it covers all work including the PA\&ED. A separate design and construction cooperative agreement will be executed prior to construction.

Any additional required cooperative agreements will be in place as needed prior to construction.

## 7E. Other Agreements

Other agreements are not anticipated to be required.

## 7F. Transportation Management Plan for Use during Construction

The Transportation Management Plan (TMP) Datasheet (Mark Thomas and Company, 2016) is included as Attachment K. Consistent with Caltrans District 3 policy and procedures, it is expected that construction of the proposed project, especially staging and traffic control systems, would be coordinated closely with the district TMP coordinator. These traffic control systems would include appropriate work zone measures, including extinguishable message signs and changeable message sign. It is also anticipated that there will be a Construction Zone Enhanced Enforcement Program (COZEEP) in place as part of traffic management during construction, including setting and removal of K-rails. It is expected that no work will be allowed on holiday weekends or the Friday preceding holiday weekends.

The alternatives considered in this report cannot be constructed without traffic impacts, primarily due to driver curiosity, construction area signs and controls. These impacts can be reduced by implementing a well-planned stage construction/traffic management plan and aggressive public awareness education during construction. It is anticipated that a project this large will require the following traffic control features:

- Temporary striping to shift traffic away from construction zones
- Temporary railing (Type K) to separate construction zones from traffic
- Work-period lane closures (e.g., during pavement removal, pavement delineations, and setting K-rails and pavement conforms)


## 7G. Staged Construction

Temporary striping will be necessary to shift traffic away from construction zones, with continuous temporary railing (Type K) to separate construction zones from traffic. Work-period lane closures (e.g., while removing delineations and setting K-rails and pavement conforms) would be performed during non-peak traffic hours.

## 7H. Phased Construction

Recommended Project Phasing:
The SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements Project will consider implementing phased improvements to coincide with the approved planning document and phased improvements for the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Project. The phased improvements would construct auxiliary lanes on SR 65 from Stanford Ranch Road/Galleria Boulevard to Pleasant Grove Boulevard (northbound and southbound). SR 65 will be widened from four to six lanes, with one general purpose lane southbound and northbound from north of Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road to Blue Oaks Boulevard.

The PCTPA conducted a sequencing study (T.Y. Lin International, 2015) to determine when and what phases of planned transportation infrastructure projects, using limited funding, should be constructed in the next 10 years to provide the best value. The first phase of the SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements Project was identified as the highest ranking Tier 2 project of the freeway improvement projects when considering travel time, traffic congestion, economic development, goods movement, cost effectiveness, traffic safety, and other criteria. Subsequent phases of the proposed project were ranked in the middle of Tier 3, with lower priority than the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Project Phases 3A, 3B, and 4, and higher priority than the eastbound I-80 auxiliary lane.

## 7I. Landscape Assessment

A Landscape Assessment Sheet (see Attachment L) was prepared taking into account the SR 65 Aesthetic Corridor Master Plan (Caltrans District 3, 2012). The landscape architecture approach is pending coordination with Caltrans District 3, Landscape.

## 7J. Accommodation of Oversize Loads

The segment of SR 65 within the proposed project limits will maintain the required minimum height capabilities during freeway operating hours during the proposed project.

## 7K. Graffiti Control

Placer County is not considered a graffiti-prone area, and no special measures necessary for this project.

## 8. FUNDING, PROGRAMMING, AND ESTIMATE

## 8A. Programming

Project design and construction will be locally funded by the SPRTA Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee Program, which includes the county
and the cities of Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln. However, it has been determined that this project is eligible for federal funding.

Table 16 indicates the proposed capital and support cost for the proposed project; the construction capital cost for the two Build alternatives is included.

| Table 16 - Capital and Support Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fund Source | Fiscal Year Estimate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20.10 .400 .610 | $2013 / 14$ | $2014 / 15$ | $2015 / 16$ | $2016 / 17$ | $2017 / 18$ | $2018 / 19$ | $2019 / 20$ | $2020 / 21$ | Total |
| Component | (in thousands of dollars) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PA\&ED <br> Support | 300 | 300 | 750 | 400 |  |  |  |  | 1,750 |
| PS\&E Support |  |  |  | 1,150 | 1,150 |  |  |  | 2,300 |
| Right-of-way <br> Support |  |  |  | 75 | 75 |  |  |  | 150 |
| Construction <br> Support |  |  |  |  |  | 1,500 | 1,500 | 500 | 3,500 |
| Right-of-way <br> Capital |  |  |  |  |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |
| Construction <br> Capital |  |  |  |  |  | 5,000 | 15,000 | 31,500 | 51,500 |
| Total | 300 | 300 | 750 | 1,625 | 1,225 | 6,550 | 16,500 | 32,000 | 59,250 |

The support cost ratio is 16.8 percent.

## 8B. Funding

Funding for the proposed project can be summarized as follows:

PA\&ED
1,750,000
PS\&E
Right of Way Support
2,300,000 150,000
Construction Support
Right of Way Capital
Construction Capital
Total
3,500,000
50,000
51,500,000

8C. Preliminary Cost Estimate
A preliminary cost estimate was prepared for each Build alternative (see Attachment G). Both Build alternatives include $\$ 2.06 \mathrm{M}$ for structures and $\$ 50,000$ for utility relocation costs.

## 9. SCHEDULE

Table 17 summarizes the schedule of project milestones.

| Table 17- Project Milestone Schedule |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Project Milestones |  | Scheduled Delivery Date |
| Program Project | M015 | December 2012 |
| Begin Environmental | M020 | February 2015 |
| Notice of Intent (NOI) | M035 | May 2016 |
| Circulate DPR and DED Externally | M120 | November 2016 |


| Table 17- Project Milestone Schedule |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Project Milestones |  | Scheduled Delivery Date |
| PA\&ED | M200 | May 2017 |
| Project PS\&E | M380 | 2017 |
| Right-of-way Certification | M410 | 2017 |
| Ready to List | M460 | 2018 |
| Award | M495 | 2018 |
| Approve Contract | M500 | 2018 |
| Contract Acceptance | M600 | 2020 |
| End Project | M800 | 2020 |
| Notes: <br> DPR $=$ draft project report <br> DED $=$ draft environmental document |  |  |

## 10. RISKS

Twenty risks are involved with the proposed project. Seven of the risks are in the design category, 12 are in the environmental category, and 1 is in the right-of-way category. The right-of-way risk is categorized as high because the design exception for nonstandard side slopes has not been approved. These risks would delay the project, add cost to the project, or both, and could result in a funding issue. The risk register is provided in Attachment M.

## 11. PROJECT REVIEWS

In accordance with the stewardship agreement, the project does not require FHWA approval. The PCTPA and Caltrans Headquarters Design will review this project report, and all comments will be addressed or incorporated. Constructability and safety reviews will also be required and addressed for this project report.

| District Maintenance | Mike Gunn | Date: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Headquarters Design Coordinator | Tim Sobelman | Date: |
| Project Manager | Rodney Murphy | Date: |
| District 3 TMP, Signing, and Striping | Joyce Loftus | Date: |
| District Landscape Architect | Jeff Pietrzak | Date: |
| District 3 Design | Scott Mann | Date: |
| District 3 Right of Way | Steve Mattos | Date: |
| District 3 Right of Way Utilities | Brian Goldman | Date: |

## 12. PROJECT PERSONNEL

| Celia McAdam | PCTPA | (530) 823-4030 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Luke McNeel-Caird | PCTPA | (530) 823-4033 |
| Matt Brogan | Project Manager <br> Mark Thomas \& Company | $(916) 381-9100$ |
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| Zach Siviglia | Project Manager <br> Mark Thomas \& Company | $(916) 381-9100$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rodney Murphy | Caltrans Special Funded Project Management | $(530) 701-1305$ |
| Thaleena Bhattal | Caltrans Office of Environmental Management | $(530) 741-4597$ |
| Brent Massey | Caltrans Structures |  |
| Christine Zdunkiewicz | Caltrans District 3 Traffic Operations |  |
| Jennifer Elwood | CH2M HILL, Inc. - Structures Design | $(916) 773-1900$ |
| Ron Milam | Fehr \& Peers - Traffic Analysis | $(916) 737-3000$ |
| Claire Bromund | ICF International -Environmental Coordinator | $(916) 625-5118$ |
| Dave Palmer | City of Rocklin | $(916) 746-5339$ |
| Scott Gandler | City of Roseville | $(916) 746-1300$ |
| Rhon Herndon | City of Roseville | $(530) 745-7533$ |
| Richard Moorehead | Senior Civil Engineer <br> Placer County |  |
| Ray Leftwich | City of Lincoln | $(916) 434-2457$ |
| Gladys Cornell | Public Outreach <br> AIM Consulting |  |

## 13. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

A. Attachment A. Geometric Approval Drawings
B. Attachment B. Transportation Analysis Report
C. Attachment C. Traffic Analysis Memorandum - Phase 1
D. Attachment D. Advanced Planning Studies
E. Attachment E. Right-of-Way Data Sheets (DRAFT)
F. Attachment F. Storm Water Data Report (DRAFT)
G. Attachment G. Preliminary Cost Estimate
H. Attachment H. Exceptions to Design Standards (DRAFT)
I. Attachment I. Initial Site Assessment and Aerially Deposited Lead Assessment
J. Attachment J. Draft Environmental Document
K. Attachment K. Transportation Management Plan Checklist and Data Sheet
L. Attachment L. Landscape Architecture Assessment Sheet (DRAFT)
M. Attachment M. Risk Register
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## Chapter 1. Introduction

This transportation analysis report was prepared for the State Route 65 (SR 65) Capacity and Operational Improvements project. The report contains the results and findings of the traffic forecasts and traffic operation analysis, while the detailed analysis calculations are compiled in the separately bound Technical Appendix.

### 1.1. Purpose of the Transportation Analysis Report

The purpose of this report is to analyze project design alternatives and their effects on the highway and arterial transportation network. The report focuses on a comparison of alternatives that are each designed to improve future traffic operations and safety for the SR 65 corridor consistent with the purpose and need statement. Portions of the analysis results will also be used to comply with environmental impact analysis requirements for the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

### 1.2. Project Description

The proposed project is located on SR 65 in Placer County from the Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road Interchange in Roseville to the Ferrari Ranch Road Interchange in Lincoln. Figure 1 shows the project vicinity and location map. The project would increase capacity for the SR 65 corridor with the following improvements.

- Widen southbound SR 65 from Blue Oaks Boulevard to Pleasant Grove Boulevard by one lane in the median
- Widen northbound and southbound SR 65 to add a lane to the outside at Pleasant Grove Boulevard
- Construct an auxiliary lane in each direction between Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road and Pleasant Grove Boulevard, Blue Oaks Boulevard and Sunset Boulevard, and Placer Parkway/Whitney Ranch Parkway (a future interchange) and Twelve Bridges Drive
- Install ramp meters and widen ramps as needed to provide storage from Pleasant Grove Boulevard to Lincoln Boulevard

Along with the separate projects for the I-80/SR 65 interchange and the SR 65/Placer Parkway/Whitney Ranch Parkway interchange, auxiliary lanes ultimately would be provided between all interchanges on SR 65 between I-80 in Roseville and Lincoln Boulevard in Lincoln.


Figure 1

### 1.3. Project Purpose and Need

The current purpose and need statement for the SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements project is provided below.

The primary purpose of this project is to relieve existing mainline congestion by adding additional mainline capacity. Adding additional capacity would help planned and anticipated growth along the corridor and would help achieve the mobility and economic development goals of the PCTPA. The project will improve traffic operations and safety in this segment of the highway.

The project is needed for the following reasons.

- Recurring morning and evening peak-period demand exceeds the current design capacity along SR 65, creating traffic operations and safety issues. These issues result in high delays and wasted fuel, all of which will be exacerbated by traffic from future population and employment growth.
- Projected growth along the SR 65 corridor in Roseville, Lincoln, Rocklin, and South Placer County will result in additional mainline congestion. This state route connects major regional routes and must operate efficiently in order to serve commuter traffic, goods movement, and regional traffic in South Placer County.


### 1.3.1. Logical Termini and Independent Utility

Project limits for proposed improvements were developed through an iterative process involving engineering design and traffic operations analysis. Preliminary design concepts were tested with the traffic operations analysis model to evaluate how lane transitions and weaving influenced peak hour conditions. Refinements were made to ensure that mainline lane balance was logical and that transitions did not cause unacceptable traffic operations such as extensive queuing or reduced speeds.

### 1.4. Project Alternatives

The project study report (PSR) evaluated two main build alternatives: widen to provide carpool or general purpose lanes between Roseville and Lincoln. Through an alternative assessment and screening process, the project development team (PDT) refined the alternatives and deferred the mainline widening north of Blue Oaks Boulevard to a separate future project. The final set of alternatives is listed below.

1. Carpool Lane
2. General Purpose Lane
3. No Build

Each of the alternatives is described below. See Figures 13, 14, and 15 for lane configuration details.

Both build alternatives would have the following three elements.

- An additional general purpose lane would be constructed to the outside in both directions at the Pleasant Grove Boulevard overcrossing to connect the existing auxiliary lanes between Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Blue Oaks Boulevard with future lanes to be built south of Pleasant Grove Boulevard under the separate I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Phase 1 project.
- Auxiliary lanes would be constructed in both directions between Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road and Pleasant Grove Boulevard, Blue Oaks Boulevard and Sunset Boulevard, and Placer Parkway/Whitney Ranch Parkway (a future interchange) and Twelve Bridges Drive.
- Ramp meters would be installed at all ramps in both directions from Pleasant Grove Boulevard to Lincoln Boulevard with some ramps widened to provide an HOV preferential lane or a second storage lane. See Section 5.1.3 for the recommended ramp meter configurations.

The Carpool Lane Alternative would widen southbound SR 65 in the median to provide a lane restricted to HOVs - carpools, vanpools, buses, motorcycles, or any non-truck vehicle with two or more occupants during the AM and PM peak periods from just north of the Blue Oaks Boulevard westbound on-ramp to the Galleria Boulevard overcrossing. The lane is designed to fit with the ultimate configuration of the I80/SR 65 Interchange, which has a median direct connector ramp from southbound SR 65 to westbound I-80. Under construction year conditions, the HOV restriction would end midway between Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Galleria Boulevard. A lane drop would be needed south of the Galleria Boulevard off-ramp to conform to the Phase 1 of the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements project that is anticipated to be built by construction year conditions ${ }^{1}$. In the General Purpose Lane Alternative, the added southbound median lane would be open to all traffic. The median widening would end just after the Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange under this alternative because no lane drop would be needed to conform to the I80/SR 65 Interchange Phase 1 project improvements.

Under the No Build (or No Project) Alternative, no widening of the SR 65 mainline would be made at Pleasant Grove Boulevard or in the southbound direction between Blue Oaks Boulevard and Galleria Boulevard. Additionally, the auxiliary lanes at the three locations noted above would not be constructed. However, numerous transportation capacity expansion projects are planned to be constructed within the study area under construction year (2020) and design year (2040) conditions as displayed in Figures 2 and 3 , respectively. In addition, the ramp meter installations are assumed to be provided under a separate project if one of the build alternatives is not built. All of these projects are assumed to be in place under

[^0]all alternatives. The Lincoln Bypass and the Eureka Road widening at Taylor Road are shown as future projects because the traffic data for existing conditions was collected before these project were completed. Please see Chapter 2 for further details.

### 1.5. Design Options

As mentioned above, the PSR considered widening of SR 65 from Roseville to Lincoln. When developing the initial set of project alternatives, the build alternatives included mainline widening throughout the project limits. In particular, the initial Carpool Lane Alternative had the additional mainline lane restricted to high-occupancy vehicles. The initial build alternatives were evaluated at a conceptual level. While the initial Carpool Lane Alternative showed lower travel time for HOVs, the delay for all vehicles in the network was higher. In addition, the design year peak hour demand volume in the carpool lane north of Sunset Boulevard was less than 1,000 vehicles per hour (vph). The Caltrans guideline that the carpool lane should have a peak hour volume of at least 800 vph within five years of construction would be difficult to meet for this segment. As a result, the full-length carpool lane alternative was dropped from further consideration. For further details, please see the technical memorandum on this topic in the Appendix.

The initial operations analysis using the Vissim software showed a bottleneck for the General Purpose Lane Alternative under design year AM peak hour conditions at Pleasant Grove Boulevard. As a result, a southbound through lane was added through the interchange. This lane would connect the auxiliary lanes on either side of the Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange (see Figure 14 for the final configuration).

For the Carpool Lane Alternative, the initial operations analysis showed a bottleneck in the northbound direction at Blue Oaks Boulevard during the design year PM peak hour. At the Blue Oaks Boulevard overcrossing, northbound SR 65 was two general purpose lanes and an HOV lane compared to three general purpose lanes with the other build alternative.

To comply with air quality conformity and funding limitations, the build alternatives were modified to defer mainline widening into the median to a separate project. In the southbound direction, mainline inside widening was dropped north of the Blue Oaks Boulevard westbound on-ramp. In the northbound direction, all mainline widening into the median was removed. The inside widening is assumed to occur as a separate project to construct a general purpose lane by the 2040 design year.


Figure 2


Figure 3

An alternate configuration for the final Carpool Lane Alternative was tested. In this option, the lane addition starting just upstream of the Blue Oaks Boulevard westbound on-ramp would be a general purpose lane. The carpool lane would start downstream of the Blue Oaks Boulevard eastbound on-ramp. This configuration was evaluated under construction year conditions during the AM peak period. Both the regular and alternate configurations showed acceptable operations. Under design year conditions, the two configurations would be the same since the separate median widening project would construct the additional lanes. The option with the carpool lane starting farthest north was retained so that vehicles eligible for the carpool lane would have an advantage and to allow for the option of the future median widening to be a carpool lane.

## Chapter 2. Analysis Methodology

### 2.1. Study Area

The project study area for transportation analysis extends beyond the immediate vicinity of the SR 65 corridor as shown in Figure 4. The larger study area for transportation analysis purposes was based on two key factors.

1. The area needed to be large enough to capture the influence of potential changes along the SR 65 corridor. This was determined through field observations and travel forecasting analysis that assessed traffic volume changes associated with the project's general purpose and carpool lane changes. This information revealed peak period traffic operations on SR 65 influence upstream and downstream conditions through multiple local interchanges and the adjacent I-80 corridor.
2. The Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) developed a travel forecasting and traffic operations model for the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements project that would be used for future projects such as SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvement project.

Depending on the analysis scenario, up to 155 individual analysis locations are included in the study area. These locations consist of freeway mainline segments, freeway ramp junctions, freeway weaving areas, and intersections. For a complete listing of all analysis locations, refer to the Technical Appendix.

### 2.2. Data Collection Methods

This section describes the data that were collected for use in the traffic analysis.

### 2.2.1. Geometric Data

Roadway geometric data were gathered using aerial photographs, design plans (for the I-80 carpool lane project through the City of Roseville), and field observations. The lane configurations that were taken initially from aerial photographs were confirmed or revised based on field observations.


Figure 4

### 2.2.2. Traffic Control Data

Traffic control data (i.e., signal phasing/timings) were provided by the responsible operating agencies including Caltrans, the City of Roseville, the City of Rocklin, and Placer County. The Caltrans Traffic Operations Sacramento Area office provided timing information for the ramp meters that were operating when the traffic counts were collected. The posted speed limits for the network were collected during field observations.

Traffic signals are modeled as either free operation or coordinated according to the control plans specified in the controller. Traffic control at unsignalized intersections were taken from aerial photographs and confirmed during field observations.

### 2.2.3. Traffic Flow Data

Freeway and intersection traffic counts were collected in 15-minute intervals for the 6 to 10 AM and 3 to 7 PM peak periods during January and February 2012. At intersections, cars, trucks, bicycles, and pedestrians were counted by turning movement. For freeways, traffic counts include vehicle classification by number of occupants for passenger cars and vehicle type. Table 1 contains the hourly HOV and truck percentages at the freeway gateway locations from the traffic counts (complete traffic count data are contained in the Technical Appendix).

| TABLE 1: HOURLY HOV AND TRUCK PERCENTAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastb Riv | 80 at Ave | West Sierra | -80 at <br> Blvd | Southb Twelv | R 65 at <br> es Dr |
| Hour | HOV | Truck | HOV | Truck | HOV | Truck |
| 6 to 7 AM | 12.4\% | 7.9\% | 11.6\% | 3.8\% | 13.1\% | 1.8\% |
| 7 to 8 AM | 13.7\% | 3.7\% | 10.7\% | 3.8\% | 10.5\% | 1.4\% |
| 8 to 9 AM | 15.6\% | 4.0\% | 13.9\% | 5.2\% | 14.8\% | 1.1\% |
| 9 to 10 AM | 18.3\% | 5.3\% | 18.1\% | 5.9\% | 19.0\% | 2.2\% |
| 3 to 4 PM | 20.0\% | 3.2\% | 24.3\% | 7.5\% | 31.1\% | 1.7\% |
| 4 to 5 PM | 19.2\% | 2.6\% | 24.5\% | 5.1\% | 26.6\% | 0.9\% |
| 5 to 6 PM | 13.9\% | 2.2\% | 18.8\% | 5.1\% | 31.0\% | 1.0\% |
| 6 to 7 PM | 12.7\% | 2.8\% | 17.1\% | 5.2\% | 29.5\% | 1.5\% |
| Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### 2.2.4. Travel Time Data

Travel time surveys were conducted during the same day of the mainline counts using global positioning system (GPS) units. The following routes were traveled for a minimum of every 15 minutes during the morning and evening peak periods.

- Southbound SR 65 at Blue Oaks Boulevard to westbound I-80 at Elkhorn Boulevard
- Eastbound I-80 at Elkhorn Boulevard to northbound SR 65 at Blue Oaks Boulevard
- Westbound I-80 from Sierra College Boulevard to Elkhorn Boulevard
- Eastbound I-80 from Elkhorn Boulevard to Sierra College Boulevard


### 2.3. Travel Forecasting Methodology

The transportation analysis used an integrated modeling approach that has three different levels of detail: macro, meso, and micro. At the macro level, the regional travel forecasting model (SACMET) was used to forecast peak period origin-destination (OD) traffic volume flows between traffic analysis zones both internal and external to the study area. At the meso level, the peak period OD flows were divided into four one-hour trip tables and disaggregated into three modes - single occupant vehicle (SOV), HOV, and truck - and then assigned to the sub-area roadway network using the Visum software. The assignment process was based on congested travel times that reflect roadway link speeds and capacity. At the micro level, the traffic volumes were converted to individual vehicles that were assigned to the operational study area using the Vissim software that contains detailed inputs governing traffic controls (signal timings), geometrics (lane configurations), and driver behavior.

The traffic forecasts were developed using the first two modeling platforms (macro and meso). The first platform is a modified version of the regional SACMET model developed by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The second platform is the Visum sub-area trip assignment model, which was used to assign the trips generated from the SACMET model to a detailed roadway network within the study area. Figure 4 above shows the mesoscopic and microscopic analysis areas.

The SACMET and Visum models were calibrated and validated according to the 2010 California Regional Transportation Guidelines (California Transportation Commission, 2010) and criteria approved by the PDT. Both models passed applicable static and dynamic validation tests. The detailed validation results are contained in Chapter 4 of the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Transportation Analysis Report (August 2014).

Traffic volume forecasts were developed for construction year (2020) and design year (2040) conditions. The forecasts relied on modified inputs to the MTP/SCS SACMET model based on refinements by the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements PDT to land use projections and the planned roadway network as explained below.

### 2.3.1. Socioeconomic Forecasts

The traffic volume forecasts are derived from future socioeconomic projections that started with regional socioeconomic projections developed by SACOG for the regional MTP/SCS. These were reviewed by the I80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements PDT and modified to better reflect local plans. Figure 5 displays the final growth projections within the study area. Socioeconomic projections are the largest single influence on traffic volume forecasts, so they will affect volume projections to a greater extent than the roadway network changes or any other modeling component. If these forecasts vary in reality, it will have a direct effect on future traffic volumes.

### 2.3.2. Planned Transportation Network

The traffic volume forecasts (and operations analysis) are influenced by modifications to the existing transportation network according to improvement projects anticipated to be constructed by the construction and design years (refer to Figures 2 and 3). These projects are based on the financially constrained project list contained in the MTP/SCS, but also consider projects the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements PDT agreed would likely be constructed by the design year. The rationale for adding projects to the MTP/SCS list was that the design year is five years beyond the 2035 horizon of the MTP/SCS. This creates a longer timeframe for revenue to accumulate. Further, the additional socioeconomic growth added to the model would also be contributing to transportation revenue to help pay for these improvements.

A list of the planned projects is provided in Table 2. Related projects are shown in bold. The SR 65/Galleria Boulevard Interchange Improvements Phase II project area overlaps with the Stanford Ranch Road/SR 65 Northbound Ramps project. For this analysis, the Phase II project is assumed to cover only improvements at the Stanford Ranch Road/Fairway Drive intersection (a third northbound through lane and a northbound right-turn lane). Descriptions of the projects located in the analysis area are provided below.

As discussed above, the separate project to widen into the median north of Blue Oaks Boulevard in the southbound direction and north of Pleasant Grove in the northbound direction was originally part of the proposed project. The forecasts for design and construction years were developed with these definitions of the project alternatives. To minimize disruption to the project development process, the forecasts were not updated when the build alternatives were revised since the design year network changes would be minor for the build alternatives and would generate higher volumes for the no build alternative. So,
revising the forecasted volumes would have shown about the same impacts for the build alternatives and worse conditions for the no build alternative. This outcome was verified with a test of the forecast models.

The unadjusted forecast model volumes were prepared for the final project alternatives and compared with the original unadjusted model volumes. For Alternative 1, the AM and PM peak hour volumes were less than 100 vph higher between Stanford Ranch Road/Galleria Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Boulevard in both directions. For Alternative 2, the AM and PM peak hour volumes at the same location were about 100 vph lower in the southbound direction and less than 50 vph lower in the northbound direction. The differences are largely due to changes in location of the HOV lane.

For the No Build Alternative, the volume difference in the southbound direction was similar to the differences for Alternative 1. In contrast, the northbound direction had much higher volumes - 550 to 750 vph higher during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. These higher volumes would generate even worse levels of congestion than are reported below in Chapter 5.

### 2.4. Traffic Operations Analysis Methodology

Because the study area already experiences peak period congestion, which is forecast to worsen, the traffic operations analysis required the use of simulation-based analysis. A congested network is very sensitive to any change in capacity or demand and the analysis tools need to be able to capture how changes in one location of the network affect the overall performance. Therefore, a Vissim traffic simulation model was developed as follows.

- The model was constructed from roadway network (lane configuration), traffic volume (traffic counts), and traffic control (traffic signal and ramp meter) data.
- Additional detail was incorporated into the Vissim network (posted speed limits, grades, etc.) to reflect observed field conditions.
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## TABLE 2: PLANNED SEPARATE PROJECTS

| Category | Project |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | - Atkinson St: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Foothills Blvd to south of Dry Creek <br> - Baseline Rd: widen from 3 to 4 lanes from Brady Ln to Fiddyment Rd <br> - Baseline Rd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Fiddyment Rd to Watt Ave <br> - Baseline Rd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Watt Ave to (future) 16th St <br> - Baseline Rd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from (future) 16th St to county line <br> - Blue Oaks Blvd: construct 4 lanes from Fiddyment Rd to Hayden Pkwy and 2 lanes from Hayden Pkwy to Westbrook Blvd <br> - Blue Oaks Blvd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Hayden Pkwy to Westbrook Blvd and construct 4 lanes from Westbrook Blvd to Santucci Blvd <br> - Blue Oaks Blvd/Washington Blvd widening <br> - Cirby Way: widen from 4 to 5 lanes from Riverside Ave to Regency Ave <br> - Cook Riolo Rd: widen from 1 to 2 lanes Dry Creek Bridge <br> - Domiguez Rd: construct 2 lanes from Granite Dr to Sierra College Blvd <br> - East Joiner Pkwy: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Del Webb Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr <br> - Eureka Rd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Sierra College Blvd to city limits <br> - Ferrari Ranch Rd: construct 2 lanes from city limit to Moore Rd <br> - Fiddyment Rd: widen to 4 lanes from Pleasant Grove Blvd to Baseline Rd <br> - I-80/Eureka Rd On-ramp Improvements <br> - I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Phase 1 <br> - Industrial Ave: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from SR 65 to Twelve Bridges Dr <br> - Industrial Ave: replace 2 lane bridge at Pleasant Grove Creek <br> - Market St: construct 2 lanes from Baseline Road to Pleasant Grove Blvd <br> - Pacific St: widen to 4 lanes from Sierra Meadows Dr to Loomis town limits |
| Complete by 2020 <br> (Construction Year) | - PFE Rd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Watt Ave to Walerga Rd <br> - Placer I-80 Auxiliary Lanes: Eastbound Auxiliary Lane and Westbound 5th Lane Alternative <br> - Placer Pkwy: construct 4-lane expressway from SR 65 to Santucci Blvd <br> - Pleasant Grove Blvd: widen from 4 to 6 lanes from Foothills Blvd to Woodcreek Oaks Blvd <br> - Pleasant Grove Blvd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Fiddyment Road to Santucci Blvd <br> - Rocklin Rd: widen from 4 to 6 lanes from Granite Dr to I-80 Westbound Ramps <br> - Roseville Rd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from city limits to Cirby Way <br> - Santucci Blvd: construct 4 lanes from Baseline Road to Blue Oaks Blvd <br> - Sierra College Blvd: widen to 6 lanes from county line to Olympus Dr <br> - Sierra College Blvd: widen from 4 to 5 lanes from Nightwatch Dr to Aguilar Tributary <br> - Sierra College Blvd: widen from 4 to 6 lanes from Aguilar Tributary to I-80 <br> - Sierra College Blvd: widen from 4 to 6 lanes from Granite Dr to Bankhead Rd <br> - Sierra College Blvd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Taylor Rd to north town limits <br> - SR 65 Lincoln Bypass - Phase 1 \& 2A <br> - SR 65/Ferrari Ranch Rd Interchange <br> - SR 65/Whitney Ranch Pkwy: construct interchange <br> - Stanford Ranch Road/Northbound SR 65 Ramps <br> - Sunset Blvd: construct 2 lanes from Fiddyment Rd to Foothills Blvd <br> - Sunset Blvd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Cincinnati Ave to SR 65 <br> - Sunset Blvd: widen to 6 lanes from SR 65 to West Stanford Ranch Rd <br> - Twelve Bridges Dr: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Industrial Ave to SR 65 including interchange <br> - University Ave: construct 4 lanes from Sunset Blvd to Ranch View Dr <br> - Walerga Rd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Baseline Rd to county line <br> - Washington Blvd: widen to 4 lanes from Sawtell Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd <br> - Whitney Ranch Pkwy: construct 6 lanes from SR 65 to east of Wildcat Blvd |


| TABLE 2: PLANNED SEPARATE PROJECTS |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Category | Project |
| Complete by 2035 | - Aviation Blvd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Venture Dr to 0.5 mi north of Venture Dr <br> - Dyer Ln: construct 4 lanes from Watt Ave to Baseline Rd <br> - Fiddyment Rd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Roseville city limits to Athens Rd <br> - Foothills Blvd: construct 2 lanes from Roseville city limits to Sunset Blvd <br> - I-80/Horseshoe Bar Rd Interchange: widen overcrossing from 2 to 4 lanes <br> - I-80/Rocklin Rd Interchange improvements <br> - Industrial Ave: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Twelve Bridges Dr to Athens Ave <br> - Nicolaus Rd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Airport Rd to Aviation Blvd <br> - Midas Ave: construct grade separation at UPRR <br> - Rocklin Rd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Sierra College Blvd to Loomis town limits <br> - Rocklin Rd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from west Loomis town limits to Barton Rd <br> - North Antelope Rd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from county line to PFE Rd <br> - Sierra College Blvd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from SR 193 to Loomis town limits <br> - Sierra College Blvd: widen to 4 lanes from (future) Valley View Pkwy to Loomis town limits <br> - SR 65/Blue Oaks Blvd Interchange Improvements <br> - SR 65/Galleria Blvd Interchange Improvements (Phase II) ${ }^{1}$ <br> - Sunset Blvd: widen from 4 to 6 lanes from Stanford Ranch Rd to Topaz Ave <br> - Sunset Blvd: widen from 4 to 6 lanes from Topaz Ave to Whitney Blvd <br> - Sunset Blvd: widen from 4 to 6 lanes from Whitney Blvd to Pacific St <br> - Taylor Rd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Horseshoe Bar Rd to King Rd <br> - Valley View Pkwy: construct 2 lanes from Park Dr to Sierra College Blvd <br> - West Oaks Blvd: construct 4 lanes from terminus to (future) Whitney Ranch Pkwy <br> - Whitney Ranch Pkwy: construct 4 lanes from terminus to Whitney Oaks Dr <br> - Watt Ave: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Baseline Rd to county line |
| Assumed to be Complete by 2040 (Design Year) | - Baseline Rd: widen from 4 to 6 lanes from Fiddyment Rd to Watt Ave <br> - Blue Oaks Blvd: widen to 6 lanes from Crocker Ranch Rd to Foothills Blvd <br> - Blue Oaks Blvd: widen to 8 lanes from Foothills Blvd to Washington Blvd <br> - Foothills Blvd: widen to 6 lanes from Cirby Way to Misty Wood Dr <br> - I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements: Collector-Distributor System Ramps Alternative <br> - Nelson Ln: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from SR 65 (Lincoln Bypass) to Nicolaus Rd <br> - PFE Rd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from North Antelope Rd to Roseville city limits <br> - Santucci Blvd: construct 6 lanes from Baseline Road to Blue Oaks Blvd <br> - SR 65 Widening from Pleasant Grove Blvd to Ferrari Ranch Rd <br> - Taylor Rd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Roseville Pkwy to I-80 <br> - Taylor Rd: widen from 2 to 4 lanes from I-80 to city limits <br> - Westbrook Blvd: construct new road from Baseline Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd <br> - Westbrook Blvd: construct new road from Pleasant Grove Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd <br> - Westbrook Blvd: construct new road from Blue Oaks Blvd to city limits |
| Note: 1. Stanford <br> Sources: SACOG, 2012 | anch Road/Fairway Drive improvements only. and Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |

- Driver behavior parameters were adjusted based on field observations.
- The distribution of vehicle types was calibrated to local conditions so that the percentages of trucks and HOVs match the traffic counts.

The Vissim model was validated to existing conditions using the criteria contained in Traffic Analysis Toolbox Volume III: Guidelines for Applying Traffic Microsimulation Modeling Software (Federal Highway Administration, 2004). The default Vissim parameters for geometrics and driver behavior were iteratively adjusted until the model was validated to observed conditions (refer to the Technical Appendix for a complete summary of the Vissim model validation). Since microsimulation models, like Vissim, rely on the random arrival of vehicles, multiple runs are needed to provide a reasonable level of statistical accuracy and validity. Therefore, the results of 10 separate runs (each using a different random seed number) were averaged to determine the final results.

The calibrated and validated model was used to generate a variety of traffic operations performance measures including person throughput, vehicle throughput, vehicle delay, passenger car density, travel time, speed, and percent demand served. Some of these measures were used to determine level of service (LOS) values for analysis locations consistent with the methodology contained in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) (Transportation Research Board, 2011).

The HCM methods use quantitative performance measures to determine LOS for analysis locations under AM and PM peak hour conditions. LOS is a qualitative measure of traffic operations from a driver's perspective, which varies from LOS A (the best) to LOS F (the worst), and is one of the main evaluation criteria for this study. Tables 3 and 4 describe the LOS thresholds from the HCM for freeway sections and signalized intersections, respectively.

To analyze construction year and design year conditions, Vissim models were built for each alternative based on the calibrated/validated existing conditions model. The network changes for each alternative were coded into the respective models. All models included separately planned projects (listed in Table 2) that were located in the microsimulation analysis area.

The roadway assumptions for the separately planned projects are listed below.

- Blue Oaks Boulevard Widening (design year only) - widening of the eastbound approach to Washington Boulevard to four lanes
- Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard Widening - widening of Washington Boulevard to provide a second northbound right turn pocket lane

| TABLE 3: FREEWAY LOS THRESHOLDS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average Density (vplpm) |  | Description |
| LOS | Basic Sections | Ramp Junction \& Weave Sections |  |
| A | $<11$ | < 10 | Free-flow speeds prevail. Vehicles are almost completely unimpeded in their ability to maneuver. |
| B | > 11 to 18 | > 10 to 20 | Free-flow speeds are maintained. The ability to maneuver with the traffic stream is only slightly restricted. |
| C | > 18 to 26 | > 20 to 28 | Flow with speeds at or near free-flow speeds. Freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is noticeably restricted, and lane changes require more care and vigilance on the part of the driver. |
| D | > 26 to 35 | > 28 to 35 | Speeds decline slightly with increasing flows. Freedom to maneuver with the traffic stream is more noticeably limited, and the driver experiences reduced physical and psychological comfort. |
| E | > 35 to 45 | > 35 to 43 | Operation at capacity. There are virtually no usable gaps within the traffic stream, leaving little room to maneuver. Any disruption can be expected to produce a breakdown with queuing. |
| F | > 45 | > 43 | Represents a breakdown in flow. |
| Notes: vplpm = vehicles per lane per mile <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |


| TABLE 4: SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION LOS THRESHOLDS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| LOS | Average Delay <br> (sec/veh) |  |
| A | $<10$ | Very low delay occurs with favorable progression and/or short cycle length. |
| B | $>10$ to 20 | Low delay occurs with good progression and/or short cycle lengths. |
| C | $>20$ to 35 | Average delays result from fair progression and/or longer cycle lengths. Individual <br> cycle failures begin to appear. |
| D | $>35$ to 55 | Longer delays occur due to a combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle <br> lengths, or high volume-to-capacity ratios. Many vehicles stop and individual cycle <br> failures are noticeable. |
| E | $>55$ to 80 | High delay values indicate poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high volume-to- <br> capacity ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences. This is considered to <br> be the limit of acceptable delay. |
| F | $>80$ | Delays are unacceptable to most drivers due to over-saturation, poor progression, or <br> very long cycle lengths. |
| Notes: <br> Source: | sec/veh $=$ seconds per vehicle <br> Fehr $\&$ Peers, 2015 |  |

- I-80/Eureka Road On-ramp Improvements - widening westbound Eureka Road from Sunrise Avenue to Taylor Road and the westbound to eastbound on-ramp to I-80 (project completed in 2013)
- I-80/Rocklin Road Interchange (design year only) - widening Rocklin Road to six lanes from Granite Drive to Aguilar Road, with dual left-turn lanes eastbound at Granite Drive, westbound at westbound I-80, and eastbound at eastbound I-80 ${ }^{2}$
- I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Phase 1 (construction year only) - adding a lane to the westbound I-80 to northbound SR 65 connector ramp, the northbound SR 65 mainline from the I80 westbound connector ramp to Pleasant Grove Boulevard, and the southbound SR 65 mainline from the Pleasant Grove Boulevard westbound on-ramp to the Galleria Boulevard overcrossing ${ }^{3}$
- I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements (design year only) - reconfiguring the interchange to provide a direct connector for the eastbound to northbound movement, widening of all connector ramps by one lane, adding median HOV-only connector ramps from eastbound to northbound and southbound to westbound, widening of SR 65 from I-80 to Pleasant Grove Boulevard, widening of Taylor Road to four lane between Roseville Parkway and the Rocklin city limits, adding a collector-distributor roadway on eastbound I-80 between Eureka Road and SR 65, and widening of westbound I-80 between SR 65 at Atlantic Street
- Placer I-80 Auxiliary Lanes - adding a fifth lane to westbound I-80 from the westbound Douglas Boulevard off-ramp to the Riverside Avenue northbound on-ramp, adding an eastbound I-80 lane from the lane drop east of SR 65 to the deceleration lane at the Rocklin Road off-ramp, and widening of the Rocklin Road eastbound off-ramp to two lanes
- Stanford Ranch Road/SR 65 Northbound Ramps - reconfiguring the northbound ramp terminal intersection to control all movements at the signal and adding a second northbound left-turn lane, a third northbound through lane, a second eastbound right-turn lane, and a southbound right turn pocket lane
- SR 65 Lincoln Bypass Phase 1 - realigning SR 65 and constructing the Lincoln Boulevard and Ferrari Ranch Road interchanges (project completed in 2013)
- $\quad$ SR 65/Twelve Bridges Drive Interchange - widening Twelve Bridges Drive from one to two through lanes in both directions, widening the southbound off-ramp to provide a second left-turn pocket lane, and widening the northbound on-ramp to provide an HOV preferential lane

[^1]- SR 65/Placer Parkway/Whitney Ranch Parkway Interchange - constructing a partial cloverleaf interchange with connections to Whitney Ranch Parkway to the east and Placer Parkway to the west and auxiliary lanes to and from Sunset Boulevard to the south
- SR 65 Widening from Pleasant Grove Boulevard to Ferrari Ranch Road (design year only) widening to provide an additional general purpose lane northbound from south of Pleasant Grove Boulevard off-ramp to Ferrari Ranch Road and southbound from Ferrari Ranch Road to south of the Blue Oaks Boulevard off-ramp ${ }^{4}$
- Sunset Boulevard Widening (design year only) - widening of Sunset Boulevard at Pacific Street to provide a third northbound and eastbound left-turn lanes and a second southbound right-turn lane.


### 2.5. Evaluation Criteria

The analysis evaluation criteria from the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements project are applied to this project since the study area is the same. The criteria were developed in collaboration with the PDT because the project has the potential to affect traffic operations across multiple jurisdictions. The main criteria used for this study is LOS as described below since each affected agency has establish policies and thresholds related to LOS expectations.

According to the Interstate 80 and Capital City Freeway Corridor System Management Plan and the State Route 65 Corridor System Management Plan (Caltrans District 3, May 2009), Caltrans has identified the route concept LOS for the following segments.

- LOS F for I-80 from Riverside Avenue/Auburn Boulevard to Sierra College Boulevard
- LOS F for SR 65 from I-80 to Blue Oaks Boulevard
- LOS E for SR 65 from Blue Oaks Boulevard to Industrial Avenue (Lincoln Boulevard)

LOS E conditions are desired when feasible but LOS F conditions are likely to occur in the study area under no build conditions as recognized by the concept LOS thresholds. The LOS E threshold will be used to identify minimum acceptable operations (that is, deficiencies) and potential impacts to State highway mainline segments, ramp junctions, and weaving segments. For locations with LOS F under the no build condition, an impact would occur if the project alternatives would worsen the LOS F condition based on the quantitative performance measure associated with the specific type of analysis.

[^2]For study intersections within the City of Lincoln, the City of Lincoln General Plan (Adopted March 2008) contains the following LOS policies:

- Strive to maintain a LOS C at all signalized intersections in the City during the PM peak hours.
- The City shall coordinate with Caltrans in order to strive to maintain a minimum LOS "D" for SR 65 and SR 193.

With the construction of the SR 65 bypass, the analysis locations on Lincoln Boulevard in Lincoln are local intersections. As a result, LOS C will serve as the minimum acceptable LOS for the intersections on Lincoln Boulevard and Twelve Bridges Drive for both AM and PM peak hours.

For study intersections within the City of Roseville, the City of Roseville General Plan (Adopted May 5, 2010) LOS policy states:

- Maintain a level of service (LOS) "C" standard at a minimum of 70 percent of all signalized intersections and roadway segments in the City during the PM peak hours.

Some of the study intersections are shown in the General Plan to operate at worse than LOS C under 2025 conditions. For this project, the following criteria are proposed.

- For intersections shown to be operating at LOS C or better in the General Plan under 2025 conditions, LOS C will be used as the minimum acceptable LOS.
- For intersections shown to be operating at LOS D in the General Plan under 2025 conditions, LOS D will be used as the minimum acceptable LOS.
- For intersections shown to be operating at LOS E in the General Plan under 2025 conditions, LOS $E$ will be used as the minimum acceptable LOS.
- For intersections shown to be operating at LOS F in the General Plan under 2025 conditions, LOS F and the corresponding delay will be used as the minimum acceptable LOS.

Using the above criteria, the Stanford Ranch Road/SR 65 Northbound Ramps, Galleria Boulevard/SR 65 Southbound Ramps, Roseville Parkway/Taylor Road, and Douglas Boulevard/Sunrise Avenue intersections will have a LOS D threshold, and the Galleria Boulevard/Roseville Parkway, Roseville Parkway/Sunrise Avenue, Eureka Road/Taylor Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps, and Douglas Boulevard/Harding Boulevard intersections will have a LOS E threshold. All other Roseville intersections will have a LOS C threshold. These thresholds will be used for both the AM and PM peak hours in both the construction and design year analysis.

For study intersections within the City of Rocklin, the City of Rocklin General Plan (October 2012), Policy C-10 states (in part):

- Maintain a minimum traffic Level of Service " $C$ " for all signalized intersections during the p.m. peak hour on an average weekday

Based on this standard and for the purposes of this study, LOS C is the minimum acceptable LOS for intersections in the City of Rocklin during both AM and PM peak hours.

For this report, a project impact must satisfy two conditions. First, the study location must operate at a worse LOS than the threshold identified above. Second, the study location must operate at a worse condition (higher delay for intersections or higher density for freeway segments) than the similar case for Alternative 3 (No Build).

## Chapter 3. Existing (2012) Conditions

The existing conditions analysis includes meso-scale network performance, micro-scale traffic operations, and traffic safety. The meso-scale network performance evaluates the entire network within the mesoscale study area based on vehicle miles of travel (VMT), vehicle hours of travel (VHT), vehicle hours of delay (VHD), and freeway VHD. VHD includes all hours of travel below the free-flow speed (for example, the free-flow speed on freeways is 65 miles per hour). Freeway VHD includes only hours of freeway travel below 35 miles per hour ( mph ). The operations analysis is more detailed and analyzes individual facilities with separate discussions for freeways and arterial intersections. The traffic safety evaluation focuses on freeway facilities.

### 3.1. Meso-Scale Network Performance

Table 5 contains estimates of existing (2012) meso-scale study area VMT, VHT, VHD, and Freeway VHD for AM and PM peak period conditions. This information shows that the PM peak period has the highest level of travel with VHD equal to almost 35 percent of all VHT. The AM peak period also experiences congested conditions with a VHD at approximately 25 percent of all VHT.

| TABLE 5: PEAK PERIOD MESO-SCALE NETWORK PERFORMANCE SUMMARY - |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EXISTING (2012) CONDITIONS |  |  |  |

### 3.2. Traffic Operations

Traffic operations were analyzed for existing (2012) conditions under AM and PM peak period and peak hour conditions. This analysis relied on the AM and PM four-hour, peak period Vissim models from which peak hour results were extracted. The Vissim model only includes the freeway network and the immediate arterial network around the I-80/SR 65 interchange. As a result, performance measures such as VMT and VHT reported from this model will contain much smaller values compared to the larger meso-scale network results presented in Table 5. Overall traffic operations performance of the micro-scale network is summarized in Table 6.

| TABLE 6: PEAK PERIOD MICRO-SCALE NETWORK PERFORMANCE <br> SUMMARY - EXISTING (2012) CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Measure of Effectiveness |  |  |  | AM Peak Period <br> (6:00 to 10:00) | PM Peak Period <br> (3:00 to 7:00) |
| VMT | 645,270 | 730,100 |  |  |  |
| VHT | 13,760 | 16,850 |  |  |  |
| VHD | 2,670 | 3,950 |  |  |  |
| Average Travel Speed $(\mathrm{mph})$ | 46.9 | 43.3 |  |  |  |

Similar to the Table 5 results, the PM peak period has the highest level of travel and delay with the most congestion lasting up to three hours for select segments.

### 3.2.1. Freeway Operations

Detailed freeway operations were analyzed for the entire four-hour AM and PM peak periods. The AM (7:30 to $8: 30$ ) and PM (4:30 to $5: 30$ ) peak hour results are reported in this section and reflect conditions based on estimates of peak hour freeway mainline and ramp traffic volumes for 2012 conditions shown in Figure 6. The existing conditions analysis confirmed field observations and provided some insight as to specific bottleneck locations, causes, and duration. Figure 7 and 8 below show the PM peak hour queue extending back from the eastbound I-80 on-ramp junction with the northbound SR 65 connector.

The existing (2012) conditions analysis of freeway and arterial performance matched observed conditions such as those shown in the photos above. Specific examples are listed below.

- Bottleneck areas have poor LOS results as highlighted in Table 7, which contains select LOS results for freeway operations. See the Appendix for all study location results.

The speed contour maps of the SR 65 and I-80 corridors produced from the Vissim models show reduced speeds in bottleneck areas (see Figures 9 through 12 below).


Figure 6
Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Lane Configurations Existing Conditions


Figure 7 - Eastbound I-80 from Taylor Road Overcrossing (PM Peak Hour)


Figure 8 - Eastbound I-80 from Roseville Pkwy Overcrossing (PM Peak Hour)

| Freeway | Location | Type | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NB SR 65 | I-80 WB On-ramp | Merge | F/53 | F/95 |
|  | I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Basic | D / 32 | F/77 |
|  | Stanford Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | D / 33 | F/62 |
| SB SR 65 | Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | F/60 | B / 20 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | F/75 | C / 21 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | F/89 | C / 25 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | F/72 | D / 31 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | F/53 | E/ 39 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | E/ 36 | D / 32 |
|  | Galleria Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | E/ 35 | D / 32 |
| EB I-80 | Eureka Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | C / 26 | F/46 |
|  | Eureka Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | C / 21 | C / 23 |
|  | Eureka Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | B / 19 | B / 20 |
|  | Eureka Rd to Taylor Rd | Weave | C / 23 | E/ 42 |
|  | Taylor Rd to SR 65 | Basic | D / 28 | E/ 42 |
|  | SR 65 Off-ramp | Diverge | C / 28 | F/52 |
| WB I-80 | SR 65 Off-ramp | Diverge | B / 18 | E/35 |
|  | Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | D / 32 | C / 26 |
|  | Douglas Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | E/ 36 | D / 34 |
|  | Douglas Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | E/ 42 | E/ 37 |
|  | Douglas Blvd to Riverside Ave | Basic | D / 33 | D / 31 |
|  | Riverside Ave Off-ramp | Diverge | E/ 40 | E/ 36 |
| Note: Bold and underline font indicate LOS F conditions. The level of service and average density for the study segment are reported. |  |  |  |  |

During the AM peak hour, congested LOS F conditions occur on northbound SR 65 at the I-80 on-ramp and southbound SR 65 between Blue Oaks Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Boulevard. On northbound SR 65 , the merging of the westbound I-80 on-ramp causes congestion. For southbound SR 65, the constraint is the high demand from the mainline combined with the Pleasant Grove Boulevard on-ramp volume.

## AM PEAK PERIOD



PM PEAK PERIOD


Figure 9 - Northbound SR 65 Existing Conditions Speed Contour Maps

## AM PEAK PERIOD



PM PEAK PERIOD


Figure 10 - Southbound SR 65 Existing Conditions Speed Contour Maps

## AM PEAK PERIOD

| ${ }^{64}$ | 6463 | 64 | ${ }^{64}$ | ${ }^{64}$ | ${ }^{64}$ | 63 | 63 |  | 46464 | 64 | 64 | 64 | ${ }^{64}$ | 63 | 64 | 63 | 63 | ${ }^{63}$ | 64 | 64 | 62 | 6464 | 64 | 64 | 64 |  |  | 6462 | 9:45 AM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64 | 6463 | ${ }_{64}$ | 64 | 64 | 64 | 63 | 63 |  | 46464 | 64 | 63 | 64 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 63 | ${ }_{64}$ | 63 | 64 | 64 | 63 | 6464 | 64 | 64 | 64 |  |  | 6461 | 9:30 AM |
| 63 | 6363 | 63 | 64 | 64 | ${ }^{63}$ | 63 | 63 |  | 4 46464 | 64 | ${ }_{64}$ | 64 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 64 | 62 | 6463 | 64 | 64 | 64 |  |  | 6461 | 9:15 AM |
| 63 | 6363 | 63 | 64 | 64 | ${ }^{3}$ | 62 | 63 |  | ${ }_{4} 6464$ | 64 | 63 | 64 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 63 | 63 | 62 | 63 | 64 | 63 | 6464 | 4 | 64 | 64 |  |  | 6461 | 9:00 AM |
| 63 | 6363 | 63 | 64 | ${ }_{64}$ | 63 | 61 | 61 |  | ${ }_{4} 6464$ | ${ }_{6}$ | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 64 | ${ }_{64}$ | 62 | 6463 | ${ }_{64}$ | 64 | ${ }^{64}$ |  |  | 6462 | 8:45 AM |
| 63 | 6363 | 63 | 64 | 64 | 63 | 62 | 63 |  | 46464 | 64 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 63 | 63 | 62 | 63 | 64 | 63 | 6463 | 64 | 64 | 64 |  |  | 6462 | 8:30 AM |
| 63 | 6362 | 63 | 63 | 64 | ${ }^{3}$ | 61 | 60 |  | ${ }_{4} 4664$ | 64 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 62 | 63 | 62 | 63 | 64 | 62 | 6463 | ${ }^{64}$ | 64 | 64 |  |  | 6462 | 8:15 AM |
| 62 | 6262 | 62 | 63 | 64 | ${ }^{3}$ | 61 | 61 |  | 364 64 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 62 | 62 | 64 | 61 | 62 | 62 | 63 | 63 | 60 | 6462 | ${ }^{3}$ | 64 | 63 |  |  | ${ }^{64} 60$ | 8:00 AM |
| 61 | 6262 | 62 | 63 | 64 | 63 | 61 | 61 |  | 36363 | 63 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 61 | 64 | 61 | 62 | 59 | 62 | 63 | 59 | 6362 | 63 | 64 | 63 |  |  | 6359 | 7:45 AM |
| 62 | 6363 | 63 | 63 | ${ }_{64}$ | 63 | 62 | 62 |  | 46364 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 62 | 64 | 61 | 63 | 61 | 63 | 63 | 59 | 6362 | 63 | 64 | 63 |  |  | ${ }^{63} 58$ | 7:30 AM |
| 63 | 6363 | ${ }_{64}$ | 64 | 64 | ${ }^{3}$ | 63 | 63 |  | 4 46464 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 62 | 63 | 62 | 63 | 63 | 62 | 6463 | 54 | 64 | ${ }^{64}$ |  |  | 6461 | 7:15 AM |
| 64 | 6464 | ${ }_{64}$ | 64 | 64 | ${ }^{6} 4$ | 63 | 64 |  | ${ }_{4} 6464$ | 64 | ${ }_{64}$ | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 63 | 64 | 63 | 64 | ${ }_{4}$ | 63 | 6463 | 4 | 64 | 64 |  |  | 6462 | 7:00 AM |
| ${ }^{64}$ | 5454 | ${ }^{64}$ | ${ }^{64}$ | ${ }^{54}$ | 64 | 63 | 63 |  | 45464 | ${ }^{64}$ | ${ }_{54}$ | 54 | ${ }^{64}$ | ${ }^{54}$ | 64 | 53 | ${ }^{64}$ | 63 | ${ }^{4}$ | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }^{64}$ | ${ }_{54} 63$ | 54 | 64 | ${ }^{64}$ |  |  | 6462 | 6:45 AM |
| ${ }^{64}$ | 6454 | ${ }^{64}$ | 64 | ${ }^{64}$ | ${ }_{64}$ | ${ }_{64}$ | 64 |  | 46465 | 64 | ${ }_{64}$ | 64 | ${ }_{64}$ | ${ }^{64}$ | 64 | ${ }_{64}$ | 64 | ${ }^{64}$ | 64 | ${ }^{64}$ | ${ }^{64}$ | 6464 | 64 | 64 | 64 |  |  | 6462 | 6:30 AM |
| 64 | 6464 | 64 | 64 | 64 | ${ }_{64}$ | 64 | 64 |  | 46565 | 64 | 64 | 64 | ${ }_{64}$ | 64 | 65 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 6564 | 64 | 65 | 64 |  |  | 6562 | 6:15 AM |
| 64 | 6565 |  |  | 65 | ${ }_{64}$ | 64 | ${ }^{64}$ |  | 5656 |  | 65 | 65 | ${ }^{64}$ | 65 | 65 | ${ }_{64}$ | 65 | 64 | 64 | ${ }^{64}$ | 64 | 65.64 | 65 | 65 | 65 |  |  | 6563 | 6:00 AM |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{2}{2} \\ & \frac{4}{4} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & \frac{4}{2} \\ & \frac{2}{2} \\ & \frac{0}{3} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{3} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\left.\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned} \right\rvert\,$ | $\left.\begin{aligned} & \delta \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & i \end{aligned} \right\rvert\,$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

PM PEAK PERIOD


Figure 11 - Eastbound I-80 Existing Conditions Speed Contour Maps

AM PEAK PERIOD


PM PEAK PERIOD


Figure 12 - Westbound I-80 Existing Conditions Speed Contour Maps

During the PM peak hour, the primary bottleneck is northbound SR 65 at the on-ramp from westbound I-80. This bottleneck results in LOS F conditions on eastbound I-80 at the SR 65 off-ramp. LOS E conditions exist from Taylor Road to Eureka Road, with the rightmost lanes mostly congested (queued from the SR 65 off-ramp) while the left lanes operate with higher speeds. The Eureka Road off-ramp has LOS F conditions due to queues spilling back from the ramp terminal intersection. (During summer 2012, queues regularly extended to the mainline occurred due to recreational trips generated by the water park on Taylor Road. After the Eureka Road widening project was completed in 2013, the peak hour off-ramp queues no longer extend to the mainline.) Westbound I-80 has LOS E conditions at the SR 65 off-ramp due to the same bottleneck. LOS D/E conditions occur further north on northbound SR 65 between Stanford Ranch Road and Pleasant Grove Boulevard. If the bottleneck at I-80 were relieved, this downstream will likely become congested.

### 3.2.2. Arterial Intersection Operations

In general, arterial intersections operate better than freeway locations during the peak hours. Table 8 shows the LOS and average delay at key study intersections under existing (2012) conditions. Based on the evaluation criteria for this study, all of the study intersections operate acceptably. See the Technical Appendix for all study intersection results.

The AM peak hour intersection LOS results indicate all intersections operate at LOS C or better, except for the Roseville Parkway/Sunrise Avenue and Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard intersections which operate at LOS D. The Roseville Parkway/Sunrise Avenue intersection operates with split phasing to accommodate the hospital driveway, which leads to less efficient operations. The Blue Oaks Boulevard intersection (which has a LOS C threshold) experiences high peak period peak direction traffic flows because it serves both inbound (employees) and outbound (residents) commuters for west Roseville.

During the PM peak hour, five intersections operate at LOS D or E:

- Galleria Boulevard/Roseville Parkway
- Roseville Parkway/Sunrise Avenue
- Eureka Road/Taylor Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps
- Douglas Blvd/Sunrise Avenue
- Rocklin Road/Granite Drive

Like the Blue Oaks Boulevard intersection in the AM peak hour, the Roseville Parkway and Eureka Road corridors serve both inbound (residents and shoppers) and outbound (employees) commuters. Additionally, reduced speeds occur on eastbound Eureka Road approaching the I-80 interchange. A
project that widened eastbound Eureka Road at Taylor Road was completed in 2013 (after the existing conditions analysis). All other intersections operate at LOS C or better during the PM peak hour.

| Intersection | Threshold | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6. Blue Oaks Blvd / Washington Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | D / 43 | C / 33 |
| 10. Stanford Ranch Rd / Five Star Blvd | C | B / 19 | C / 32 |
| 11. Stanford Ranch Rd / SR 65 NB Ramps | D | A / 9 | B / 15 |
| 12. Galleria Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | D | B / 13 | B / 19 |
| 13. Galleria Blvd / Antelope Creek Dr | C | B / 10 | C / 24 |
| 14. Galleria Blvd / Roseville Pkwy | E | C / 30 | D / 36 |
| 15. Roseville Pkwy / Creekside Ridge Dr | C | A/ 6 | B / 17 |
| 16. Roseville Pkwy / Taylor Rd | D | C / 30 | C / 28 |
| 17. Roseville Pkwy / Sunrise Ave | E | D / 37 | D / 37 |
| 18. Atlantic St / Wills Rd | C | B / 10 | B / 12 |
| 19. Atlantic St / I-80 WB Ramps | C | A / 7 | B / 11 |
| 20. Eureka Rd / Taylor Rd / I-80 EB Ramps | E | C / 26 | E/ 61 |
| 21. Eureka Rd/ Sunrise Ave | C | C / 24 | C / 30 |
| 26. Douglas Blvd / Sunrise Ave | D | C / 26 | D / 35 |
| 28. Pacific St / Sunset Blvd | C | B / 18 | C / 29 |
| 29. Rocklin Rd/Granite Dr | C | B / 15 | D / 37 |
| 30. Rocklin Rd/I-80 WB Ramps | C | C / 21 | B / 17 |
| 31. Rocklin Rd / I-80 EB Ramps | C | B / 17 | B / 20 |
| 32. Rocklin Rd / Aguilar Rd | C | A / 8 | B / 13 |
| Note: Bold and underline font indicate unacceptable operations. The LOS and average delay in seconds per vehicle are reported. <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |

### 3.3. Traffic Safety

Traffic collision data was compiled from Caltrans' Traffic Accident Surveillance and Analysis System (TASAS) for SR 65 from Stanford Ranch Road/Galleria Boulevard to Ferrari Ranch Road (post mile R6. 2 to T12.9). The data shown are for the three-year period between October 1, 2009 and September 30, 2012. During this period, Sunset Boulevard was converted from an at-grade intersection to an interchange. Also, the Lincoln Bypass was not yet open to traffic. So, the accident data includes 4 accidents at intersections. Within the study area, 247 collisions occurred in the three-year period. Table 9 summarizes collisions on SR 65 by direction.

| TABLE 9: ACCIDENT HISTORY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Direction | Total Accidents | Total Fatalities | Actual Collision Rate ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Average Collision Rate ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  | F | F\&I | Total | F | F\&I | Total |
| Northbound | 116 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.14 | 0.36 | 0.007 | 0.23 | 0.66 |
| Southbound | 131 | 3 | 0.008 | 0.14 | 0.38 | 0.007 | 0.23 | 0.66 |
| Total | 247 | 3 | 0.004 | 0.14 | 0.37 | 0.007 | 0.23 | 0.66 |

Notes: 1. The accident rate is accidents per million vehicle-miles. " $F$ " refers to the fatality rate, and "F\&I" refers to the fatality and injury rate. Total number of accidents includes non-injury accidents, which are not listed separately.
Source: Caltrans District 3 TASAS Table B, October 1, 2009 to September 30, 2012

The actual collision rate for fatalities was higher than statewide average for southbound SR 65. The three fatalities occurred in three separate collisions located on freeway sections, not at an intersection, and all had different locations. The remaining collision rates were lower than the statewide averages.

Table 10 categorizes the collisions by type. The most frequent collision type ( 50 percent) is a rear end collision, which is typical of congested conditions. The next most frequent collision types are side-swipe and hit object. The other collision types are collectively less than 15 percent of all collisions. The southbound direction has both a higher number of collisions and a higher number of rear end collisions.

| TABLE 10: MAINLINE COLLISIONS BY TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Direction | Head On | Side <br> Swipe | Rear End | Broadside | Hit <br> Object | Over- <br> turn | AutoPed | Other |
| Northbound | 0 | 20 | 53 | 2 | 31 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| Southbound | 1 | 17 | 71 | 6 | 26 | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| Total | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 37 \\ (15 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 124 \\ (50 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 57 \\ (23 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (1 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Source: Caltrans District 3 TASAS - Table B, October 1, 2009 to September 31, 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Chapter 4. Travel Demand Forecasts

The travel demand forecasts were developed using a validated sub-area model derived from the SACMET regional travel demand forecasting (TDF) model developed by SACOG ${ }^{5}$. The approach to developing travel demand forecasts started with the recognition that regional travel demand models do not contain sufficient detail or sensitivity for local applications like developing directional freeway mainline and ramp volume forecasts. Instead, the regional model provides a starting point for creating a more detailed subarea model along the freeway corridor. Having a valid sub-area model is a critical step in ensuring a high level of confidence in the traffic volume forecasts that will be used to evaluate the effects of improving the SR 65 corridor.

### 4.1. Sub-Area Model Development and Model Validation

The forecast modeling for the SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements project used the same subarea model developed for the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements project. Please refer to Chapter 4 of the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Transportation Analysis Report (August 2014).

### 4.2. Future Year Forecasts

Traffic forecasts for design and construction year analysis were developed for the following project alternatives.

1. Carpool Lane
2. General Purpose Lane
3. No Build

### 4.2.1. Design Year Forecasts

From a macro perspective, the proposed project alternatives - freeway corridor widening - are not expected to change regional travel demand. A sensitivity test of the SACMET model showed almost no change in travel demand with a change in capacity at the I-80/SR 65 interchange. Instead, the most significant effects on future traffic volumes will occur in terms of trip routing within the meso-scale study area due to travel time differences caused by the alternatives. Therefore, the same set of trip tables is used for the project alternatives, which means that volumes at the sub-area boundaries are the same across all alternatives.

[^3]The volume forecast process began with isolating the incremental peak period volume growth (2008 to 2035) between traffic analysis zones (TAZs) in the sub-area using the modified SACMET model (macro level). This incremental growth was then added to the base year Visum trip table (meso level) that was derived from the Airsage cell phone data. The incremental SACMET growth was inspected to verify that the changes in origin-destination trips were commensurate with the location of socioeconomic growth. Individual origin-destination pair volumes were not allowed to decrease between base and cumulative years.

In the next step, the four-hour peak period trip tables were divided into hourly trip tables by mode: SOV, HOV, and truck. The conversion from peak period to hourly trip tables used the existing ratio of hourly traffic volume to peak period volume. The mode share for HOVs was based on the relative peak period mode share in the 2035 SACMET model. For the entire meso study area, the overall forecast HOV shares are 18 and 19 percent during the AM and PM peak periods, respectively. The truck share is assumed to increase from 2.7 and 1.4 percent under existing conditions to 3.0 and 2.0 percent under the design year for the AM and PM peak periods, respectively.

Some adjustments were made to the HOV shares for select locations based on previous comments from Caltrans about HOV forecasts being lower than observed conditions on I-80. Table 11 shows the AM and PM peak hour HOV percentages for the I-80 western gateway from the 2035 SACMET model, the 2012 traffic counts, and the proposed 2040 forecast values. The 2008 and 2035 SACMET model forecasts show similar values of 11 to 13 percent at this gateway. These values are lower than the traffic counts that were collected in 2012. The proposed 2040 HOV percentages use the 2012 traffic count percentages for the off-peak directions. In the peak direction, a five percentage point increase was assumed to compensate for the difference between model estimates and counts. Additionally, traffic congestion is expected to be more severe in the design year, which would encourage the formation of carpools.

| TABLE 11: PEAK PERIOD HOV PERCENTAGE FOR I-80 WESTERN GATEWAY |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Direction | 2035 SACMET |  | 2012 Counts |  | 2040 Forecast |  |
|  | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM |
| Eastbound | 11\% | 13\% | 15\% | 17\% | 15\% | 22\% |
| Westbound ${ }^{1}$ | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 18\% | 19\% | 18\% |
| Note: 1. The count location was at the Riverside Ave/Auburn Blvd overcrossing, but the westbound study area gateway is between Elkhorn Blvd and Madison Ave. <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The five percentage point increase was also validated based on a June 2012 sampling of traffic volumes at the I-80/Douglas Boulevard, I-80/Eureka Road, and SR 65/Galleria Boulevard on-ramps, which found HOV percentages ranging from 9 to 25 percent for the AM peak hour and 14 to 36 percent for the PM peak hour. The AM and PM peak hour averages of 16 and 24 percent from these samples are generally similar
to the 2035 SACMET forecasts of 18 and 19 percent, respectively. However, peak direction HOV percentages were some of the largest values observed. The adjustments noted in Table 13 result in HOV volume forecasts that are at or near the carpool lane operating capacity under design year conditions, so they were considered reasonable for purposes of this study.

The future year Visum trip tables were then assigned to each project alternative network. These networks included all the planned transportation improvements shown in Figures 2 and 3 plus unique features of each alternative ${ }^{6}$. The preliminary forecasts from this step were reviewed and adjusted for anomalies such as unexpected decreases in traffic volumes when compared to existing conditions. The expected decreases that occurred are noted below.

- Riverside Avenue slip on-ramp to westbound I-80 - This ramp shows a decrease over existing volumes. This decrease is allowed since the cumulative roadway network includes several projects that increase parallel capacity between west Roseville and Sacramento County (widening Baseline Road/Riego Road between SR 99 and Foothills Boulevard, widening Watt Avenue, etc.). These capacity enhancements redistribute some existing long-distance trips from Placer County to Sacramento County to alternative routes.
- Sunset Boulevard loop on-ramp to southbound SR 65 - The construction of the SR 65/Whitney Ranch Parkway/Placer Parkway interchange provides an alternate route so that the demand at SR 65/Sunset Boulevard is lower.
- Taylor Road off-ramp from eastbound I-80 - With the widening of the eastbound to northbound freeway connector, traffic destined to Rocklin can use SR 65 to Stanford Ranch Road rather than the more indirect route of Taylor Road and Pacific Street to Sunset Boulevard.

Although the decrease in traffic volume was allowed, the actual future volume may be subject to the induced travel effect (discussed below in section 4.2.6) that could result in a volume that is higher than predicted. The final trip tables and the associated travel paths from the Visum assignment were transferred to Vissim for final assignment and analysis.

A final volume adjustment was made in the northern end of the study area to account for recent land use planning decisions in the City of Lincoln. With the opening of the Lincoln Bypass, development is now planned to occur in the western portion of the city rather than the central and eastern areas. The forecast model prepared for the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA) fee study used the new land use values. By comparing the initial model volumes between the I-80/SR 65 Interchange and SPRTA fee study versions of the SACMET model, an adjustment process was developed to shift a portion of the volume from Lincoln Boulevard north of Sterling Parkway to SR 65 north of Ferrari Ranch Road. For further details, please see the technical memorandum on this topic in the Appendix.

[^4]Figures 13 through 15 display the SR 65 freeway lane configurations associated with each alternative, along with the AM and PM peak hour traffic volume forecasts. These volumes represent traffic demand that may not be fully accommodated during the peak hour, which is determined as part of the Vissim analysis. The traffic forecasts for the I-80 corridor and the study intersections are provided in the Appendix.

Figures 16 and 17 show design year volume comparison plots between project alternatives. The orange and red colors indicate a volume decrease for the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. The blue and green colors indicate a volume increase for the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. For these bandwidth plots, the freeway carpool lane links have been turned off so that the changes to the regular mainline lanes can be shown.

Figure 16 shows a comparison of Alternative 2 (General Purpose Lane) and 3 (No Build). With the additional capacity on SR 65, volumes are higher from I-80 to Lincoln Boulevard. Volume increases also occur on arterials that access SR 65. Routes parallel to the freeway segment show decreases: Sunset Boulevard, Wildcat Boulevard, Industrial Avenue, Fairway Drive, and Roseville Parkway. The differences between Alternatives 1 (Carpool Lane) and 3 (No Build) are similar.

Figure 17 shows the volume differences between Alternatives 1 (Carpool Lane) and 2 (General Purpose Lane). Although both alternatives would widen the SR 65 corridor, the first alternative restricts one of the added lanes between Stanford Ranch Road/Galleria Boulevard and Blue Oaks Boulevard to HOVs. Due to this restriction, the northbound peak hour volume is higher on SR 65 for Alternative 2 (shown as blue and green colors in the figure). In the southbound direction, Alternative 1 has higher volumes between Blue Oaks Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Boulevard because this alternative has an additional lane (the carpool lane) compared to Alternative 2. Alternative 2 has higher volumes on SR 65 south of Pleasant Grove Boulevard. Importantly, the Alternative 1 and 2 peak hour volumes are more similar than the Alternative 2 and 3 volumes. The largest difference shown in Figure 17 is about 300 vehicles per hour (vph), but the largest difference in Figure 16 is about 1,600 vph, or about a 40 percent increase.


Figure 13


Figure 14
Design Year Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Lane Configurations -
General Purpose Lane (Alternative 2)


Figure 15
Design Year Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Lane Configurations No Build (Alternative 3)


Figure 16 - Volume Comparison of Alternatives 2 and 3


Figure 17 - Volume Comparison of Alternatives 1 and 2

### 4.2.2. HOV Volume Forecasts

The Visum model includes carpool lanes as separate roadway links to account for the additional HOV-only capacity. The resulting carpool lane projections for the project alternatives are listed in Table 12. The volumes for the section between I-80 and Stanford Ranch Road/Galleria Boulevard are for the median carpool ramps. The future configuration of the I-80/SR 65 interchange will restrict movement into and out of the carpool lane south of Stanford Ranch Road/Galleria Boulevard.

| Direction | Location | Alternative 1 |  | Alternative 2 |  | Alternative 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM |
| Northbound | I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | 545 | 1,105 | 535 | 1,100 | 495 | 1,000 |
|  | Stanford Ranch Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | 750 | 1,530 | 730 | 1,500 | 500 | 1,000 |
| Southbound | Blue Oaks Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | 1,150 | 1,150 | - | - | - | - |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | 1,165 | 1,075 | 1,100 | 1,030 | 700 | 540 |
|  | Galleria Blvd to I-80 | 730 | 555 | 715 | 535 | 700 | 540 |
| Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

With the addition of the mainline carpool lane in Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane), the carpool direct connector ramp volume would increase compared to Alternatives 2 (General Purpose Lane) and 3 (No Build). The carpool lane peak hour volume is projected to be as high as 1,530 vph northbound and 1,165 vph southbound. The additional mainline capacity for Alternative 2 results in a carpool lane volume at the $\mathrm{I}-80$ interchange that is higher (between 5 and 100 vph ) than in Alternative 3.

### 4.2.3. Meso-Scale Network Performance for Design Year

In addition to generating traffic volume forecasts for input to the Vissim microsimulation traffic operations model, the Visum model was used to produce the same meso-scale network performance measures reported for existing conditions. Figures 18 through 22 compare network performance across the project alternatives for design year conditions during the AM, the PM, and both the AM and PM peak periods. The reported performance measures are VMT, VHT, VHD, freeway VHD, and project-area freeway VHD, where the project area is SR 65 between Stanford Ranch Road/Galleria Boulevard and Ferrari Ranch Road.

The build alternatives increase VMT although the change is only about 0.5 percent (VMT is reported by 5mph speed bin in the appendix). The results generally show that the build alternatives improve network efficiency by lowering VHT and VHD compared to the No Build Alternative. Alternative 2 (General Purpose Lane) has more VMT, but lower VHT and VHD, than Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane). Figure 22 shows that the build alternatives would reduce freeway delay by at least 85 percent in the project area.


Figure 18 - Design Year Meso-Scale VMT Comparison


Figure 19 - Design Year Meso-Scale VHT Comparison


Figure 20 - Design Year Meso-Scale VHD Comparison


* Freeway VHD is measured only for freeway mainline links with an average speed less than 35 mph .

Figure 21 - Design Year Meso-Scale Freeway VHD Comparison


* Freeway VHD is measured only for freeway mainline links with an average speed less than 35 mph .

Figure 22 - Design Year Meso-Scale Project-Area Freeway VHD Comparison

### 4.2.4. Construction Year Forecasts

The construction year (2020) forecasts shown in Figures 23 through 25 were developed by interpolating between the hourly matrices for the baseline (2012) traffic volume estimates and the design year (2040) forecasts. Using Visum, the resulting matrices were assigned to the roadway network that corresponds to the planned projects expected to be completed by 2020 (as shown in Figure 2) ${ }^{7}$. Due to these changes, construction year demand volumes at any particular location may not be the exact linearly interpolated value between the existing and design year volumes.

This process presumes a linear growth relationship and captures some of the influence of project alternatives on trip assignment. One of the potential limitations of this approach is that recent growth has not kept pace with the projected linear growth rate. The sluggish economic recovery from the 2008/09 recession may result in actual construction year volumes that are lower than the projections, but this outcome is acceptable for the purpose of designing and evaluating project alternatives.

### 4.2.5. Meso-Scale Network Performance for Construction Year

In addition to generating traffic volume forecasts for input to the Vissim microsimulation traffic operations model, the Visum model was used to produce the same meso-scale network performance measures reported for existing conditions. Figures 26 through 31 compare network performance across the project alternatives for construction year conditions during the AM, the PM, and both the AM and PM peak periods. The reported performance measures are VMT, VHT, VHD, freeway VHD, and project-area freeway VHD, where the project area is SR 65 between Stanford Ranch Road/Galleria Boulevard and Ferrari Ranch Road (VMT by 5-mph speed bin is reported in the appendix).

The results show that the build alternatives increase VMT and reduce VHT and VHD compared to the no build alternative. Alternative 2 (General Purpose Lane) has lower network-wide VHT and VHD, but Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane) has lower VMT and freeway VHD, for both the study and project areas.

[^5]

## Construction Year Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Lane Configurations Carpool Lane (Alternative 1)



Figure 24

## Construction Year Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Lane Configurations - <br> General Purpose Lane (Alternative 2)



Figure 25
Construction Year Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Lane Configurations No Build (Alternative 3)


Figure 26 - Construction Year Meso-Scale VMT Comparison


Figure 27 - Construction Year Meso-Scale VHT Comparison


Figure 28 - Construction Year Meso-Scale VHD Comparison


Figure 29 - Construction Year Meso-Scale Freeway VHD Comparison


* Freeway VHD is measured only for freeway mainline links with an average speed less than 35 mph .

Figure 30 - Construction Year Meso-Scale Project-Area Freeway VHD Comparison

### 4.2.6. Induced Travel

The phenomenon where additional capacity leads to additional demand for travel is known as "induced travel." Induced travel occurs when the cost of travel is reduced (i.e., travel time reduction due to additional capacity) causing an increase in demand (more travelers using the improved facility). The reduction in travel time causes various responses by travelers, including diversion from other routes, changes in destinations, changes in mode, departure time shifts, and possibly the creation of new trips all together. As described previously, the SACMET and Visum models have limitations, but they do account for most of the factors that influence induced travel (e.g., changes in route, mode, and destination). The main factors they do not fully account for is the potential generation of new trips and long-term induced land use growth.

Since the SACMET trip generation model was calibrated to 2008 base year conditions when vehicle trip making in the region was not constrained by congestion, pricing, or some other means, the model represents a full level of travel demand being generated by households and employment. This means that new trips being created as a result of a network change are very unlikely because there is no constraint preventing these trips from occurring.

Long-term induced land use growth is the one factor that may not be fully represented because there is no direct feedback process to the land use growth forecasts. However, as part of this project, land use growth was assessed by the PDT. The PDT increased the growth of households and employment in the study area recognizing this area has been planned for additional growth and the transportation improvements associated with this project are intended to help accommodate that growth.

### 4.2.7. Daily Forecasts

Using the SACMET model files that were the starting point for the peak period forecasts, daily forecasts were prepared for the project alternatives under design year conditions. Table 13 provides the daily mainline volume SR 65 for all vehicles and for trucks in the project area.

| TABLE 13: AVERAGE ANNUAL DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Segment | Existing Conditions ${ }^{1}$ |  | Design Year Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane) |  | Alternative 2 (GP Lane) |  | Alternative 3 (No Build) |  |
|  | Total | Trucks | Total | Trucks | Total | Trucks | Total | Trucks |
| I-80 to Galleria Blvd | 106,100 | 3,500 | 168,100 | 6,300 | 169,000 | 6,400 | 158,000 | 6,200 |
| Stanford Ranch Rd/ <br> Galleria Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | 104,400 | 3,500 | 169,200 | 6,600 | 170,900 | 6,700 | 152,400 | 6,300 |
| Pleasant Grove Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | 83,400 | 3,100 | 159,800 | 6,300 | 162,300 | 6,400 | 140,800 | 6,000 |
| Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | 65,300 | 2,400 | 134,600 | 4,900 | 135,700 | 4,900 | 112,100 | 4,600 |
| Sunset Blvd to Whitney Ranch Pkwy/ Placer Pkwy | 54,000 | 1,900 | 114,000 | 3,700 | 114,600 | 3,700 | 96,900 | 3,300 |
| Whitney Ranch Pkwy/Placer Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr |  |  | 126,500 | 3,500 | 127,000 | 3,500 | 112,700 | 3,400 |
| Twelve Bridges Dr to Lincoln Blvd ${ }^{2}$ | 48,800 | 1,900 | 104,300 | 3,200 | 104,500 | 3,200 | 93,600 | 3,000 |
| Lincoln Blvd to Ferrari Ranch Rd | - | - | 61,100 | 2,700 | 61,400 | 2,700 | 56,300 | 2,600 |
| Notes: $\quad{ }^{1}$ The existing conditions total volume data is from 2009 as reported in the PeMS database. The existing truck volumes are estimated from the base year SACMET model. <br> ${ }^{2}$ The existing condition total volume data from Twelve Bridges Dr to Lincoln Blvd is estimated based on 2009 PeMS data at Sunset Blvd and the base year SACMET model. <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Chapter 5. Traffic Operations Analysis

This section summarizes the traffic operations analysis results based on the Vissim microsimulation traffic operations model (refer to Figure 4 for the Vissim network limits). This analysis provides more detailed insights about peak period and peak hour traffic operations under each alternative. Technical calculations supporting the results can be found in the separately bound Appendix. Design year analysis results are presented first followed by the construction year. All analysis was conducted with the same methodology described in Chapter 2. Further, the evaluation criteria from Chapter 2 were used to identify locations with deficient operations. For these locations, improvements are proposed that may be considered as project refinements or mitigation.

### 5.1. Design Year Conditions

Overall network performance statistics for AM and PM peak period operations are summarized for each alternative in Tables 14 and 15 below, respectively.

| TABLE 14: COMPARISON OF OVERALL NETWORK PERFORMANCE DESIGN YEAR AM PEAK PERIOD |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure |  | Existing Conditions | Design Year Conditions |  |  |
|  |  | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 |
| Volume Served (\% of total demand) |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 143,450 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 208,160 \\ (99 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 207,470 \\ (99 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 208,800 \\ (99 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) |  | 645,270 | 940,220 | 950,660 | 917,290 |
| Person Miles of Travel |  | 786,260 | 1,113,340 | 1,133,470 | 1,094,920 |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel (VHT) |  | 13,760 | 21,710 | 21,960 | 22,140 |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD) (\% of VHT) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2,670 \\ & (19 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5,540 \\ & (26 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5,620 \\ & (26 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6,330 \\ & (29 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| Average Delay per Vehicle (min) |  | 1.12 | 1.60 | 1.63 | 1.82 |
| Person Hours of Delay |  | 3,240 | 6,320 | 6,490 | 7,320 |
| Average Speed |  | 46.9 | 43.3 | 43.3 | 41.4 |
| Average Speed for HOVs |  | 47.0 | 46.4 | 45.9 | 44.2 |
| Travel Time: <br> Ferrari Ranch Rd to I-80 | SOV | - | 7:49 | 7:53 | 11:11 |
|  | HOV | - | 7:43 | 7:50 | 11:02 |
| Travel Time: <br> Blue Oaks Blvd to <br> Antelope Rd | SOV | 9:44 | 8:35 | 8:37 | 9:41 |
|  | HOV | 9:27 | 8:23 | 8:29 | 9:37 |
| Notes: PMT $=$ person miles of travel, PHD $=$ person hours of delay <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |

The results presented in Tables 14 and 15 are summarized below.

- Overall, the build alternatives improve network performance compared to the no build alternative.
- The volume served in the network is about the same across alternatives, but the freeway peak hour volumes are lower for Alternative 3 (No Build). This means that Alternative 1 and 2 will have lower local street volume and congestion.
- Alternative 2 (General Purpose Lane) has higher VMT compared to Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane). For the AM peak period, the overall travel time and delay is lower for Alternative 1, but the reverse is true for the PM peak period.
- SOV travel time in the peak direction on SR 65 improves by more than three minutes with the build alternatives (both Alternatives 1 and 2 have similar travel times).
- In general, design year travel time through the I-80/SR 65 interchange would be better than existing conditions for all alternatives due to the separate I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements project.

| TABLE 15: COMPARISON OF OVERALL NETWORK PERFORMANCE DESIGN YEAR PM PEAK PERIOD |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure |  | Existing Conditions | Design Year Conditions |  |  |
|  |  | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 |
| Volume Served (\% of total demand) |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 198,170 \\ (101 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 300,780 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 300,820 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 302,580 \\ (99 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) |  | 730,100 | 1,160,700 | 1,166,400 | 1,106,390 |
| Person Miles of Travel |  | 880,180 | 1,402,510 | 1,402,330 | 1,328,540 |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel (VHT) |  | 16,850 | 30,890 | 30,920 | 32,920 |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD) (\% of VHT) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3,950 \\ & (23 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10,470 \\ (34 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10,430 \\ (34 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13,380 \\ (41 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Delay per Vehicle (min) |  | 1.20 | 2.09 | 2.08 | 2.65 |
| Person Hours of Delay |  | 4,670 | 12,230 | 12,160 | 15,450 |
| Average Speed |  | 43.3 | 37.6 | 37.7 | 33.6 |
| Average Speed for HOVs |  | 44.7 | 40.5 | 40.4 | 37.3 |
| Travel Time: <br> I-80 to Ferrari <br> Ranch Rd | SOV | - | 7:52 | 7:53 | 11:07 |
|  | HOV | - | 7:51 | 7:51 | 9:34 |
| Travel Time: <br> Auburn Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | SOV | 9:16 | 6:31 | 6:32 | 11:47 |
|  | HOV | 9:11 | 6:20 | 6:20 | 6:34 |
| Notes: $\quad$ PMT $=$ person miles of travel, PHD $=$ person hours of delay <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |

Specific details about design year freeway and arterial intersection operations are discussed in more detail in the following sections.

### 5.1.1. Freeway Operations

Detailed freeway operations analysis was completed for the peak hour (7:30 to 8:30 AM and 4:30 to 5:30 PM) of the four hour AM and PM peak periods. The AM and PM peak-hour served volume are listed in Figure 31. The AM and PM peak hour results for select locations are reported in Tables 16 and 17, respectively. The full set of results is available in the Appendix. Figures 32 through 39 display the average speed in the mixed-flow lanes throughout the network during the peak periods for each alternative.

## Northbound SR 65

During the AM peak hour, Alternative 3 (No Build) would have LOS E conditions between Stanford Ranch Road and Pleasant Grove Boulevard. The lane drop at the Pleasant Grove Boulevard off-ramp would be the bottleneck resulting in an average speed between 40 and 50 mph for the peak 15 minutes (see Figure 32). The widening under the build alternatives would provide LOS D or better conditions for the entire corridor.

The PM peak hour would have a significant bottleneck at Pleasant Grove Boulevard under Alternative 3. The resulting congestion would last for longer than three hours and the queue would extend back onto eastbound I-80. The remaining corridor would operate at free-flow speeds. For the build alternatives, northbound SR 65 would have no congestion during the PM peak period.

During both the AM and PM peak hours, northbound SR 65 would operate with LOS E or better conditions under the build alternatives. As a result, the proposed project would not have any impacts.

## Southbound SR 65

During the AM peak hour, Alternative 3 would have two major bottlenecks. First, the weave segment between Blue Oaks Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Boulevard would be over capacity for about two hours, resulting in peak-hour LOS F conditions extending upstream to the Sunset Boulevard interchange. Second, the segment between Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Galleria Boulevard would be congested for more than two hours causing slow speeds that would extend into the upstream bottleneck at Blue Oaks Boulevard. As shown in Figure 16, the traffic assignment model is sensitive to the freeway congestion, so more traffic would use local streets than the freeway in Alternative 3.


Figure 31 - Freeway Served Volume for Design Year Conditions

| TABLE 16: SELECTED FREEWAY OPERATIONS RESULTS DESIGN YEAR AM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Freeway | Location | Type ${ }^{1}$ | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 |
| NB SR 65 | I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Weave | C / 28 | C / 28 | C / 26 |
|  | Stanford Ranch Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | D / 30 | D / 30 | E/ 40 |
|  |  |  |  |  | E/ 40 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd On-ramp | Merge | D / 31 | D / 31 | C / 23 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | C / 27 | C / 28 |  |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | C / 19 | C / 19 | C / 21 |
|  | Whitney Ranch Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | B / 15 | B / 16 | C / 19 |
| SB SR 65 | Lincoln Blvd to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | D / 34 | D / 33 | D / 28 |
|  | Twelve Bridges Dr to Placer Pkwy | Weave | D / 30 | D / 29 | D / 30 |
|  | Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Weave | D / 34 | D / 34 | F/102 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | D /32 | D / 32 | F/107 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | D / 33 | D / 32 | F/79 |
|  |  |  |  | D / 32 |  |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | D / 33 | F/46 | F/82 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | E/ 35 | E/ 36 | E/ 37 |
| EB I-80 | Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | Basic | E/ 39 | D / 32 | E/ 42 |
|  | Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd | Weave | C / 27 | C / 23 | C / 27 |
|  | SR 65 Off-ramp | Diverge | C / 24 | C / 22 | C / 24 |
|  | SR 65 to Rocklin Rd | Basic | C / 26 | C / 24 | C / 24 |
| WB I-80 | Rocklin Rd to Carpool Lane Start | Basic | D / 31 | D / 27 | D / 30 |
|  | SR 65 to Atlantic St | Weave | C / 27 | C / 24 | C / 25 |
|  | Atlantic St On-ramp | Merge | E / 41 | E/ 36 | E/ 38 |
|  | Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | E/ 36 | D / 32 | D / 34 |
|  | Douglas Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | E / 39 | D / 31 | E/ 35 |
|  | Riverside Ave Off-ramp | Diverge | D / 35 | D / 33 | D / 34 |
|  | Antelope Rd to Truck Scales | Weave | F/ 48 | F/59 | F/70 |
|  | Truck Scales On-ramp | Merge | F/79 | F/88 | F/87 |
|  | Elkhorn Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | F/91 | F/54 | F/61 |
| Notes: Bold and underline font indicate LOS F conditions. Shaded cells indicate a project impact. The level of service and average density for the study segment are reported. <br> ${ }^{1}$ The facility type reported is for Alternative 1. The other results are contained in the Technical Appendix. <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |


| TABLE 17: SELECTED FREEWAY OPERATIONS RESULTS DESIGN YEAR PM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Freeway | Location | Type ${ }^{1}$ | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 |
| NB SR 65 | I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Weave | D / 33 | D / 32 | F/79 |
|  | Stanford Ranch Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | D / 33 | D / 34 | F/67 |
|  |  |  |  |  | E/ 40 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd On-ramp | Merge | D / 33 | D / 35 | C / 22 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | D / 31 | D / 32 |  |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | C / 26 | C / 26 | C / 21 |
|  | Whitney Ranch Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | C / 24 | C / 24 | C / 24 |
| SB SR 65 | Lincoln Blvd to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | B / 17 | B / 17 | B / 17 |
|  | Twelve Bridges Dr to Placer Pkwy | Weave | B / 17 | C / 22 | C / 19 |
|  | Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Weave | C / 24 | C / 24 | D / 29 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | C / 27 | C / 27 | F/48 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | C / 28 | D / 28 | F/48 |
|  |  |  |  | D / 29 |  |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | D / 30 | D / 34 | F/89 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | D / 34 | D / 33 | E / 37 |
| EB I-80 | Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | Basic | D / 32 | E/ 36 | E/ 35 |
|  | Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd | Weave | C / 27 | C / 27 | E/ 41 |
|  | SR 65 Off-ramp | Diverge | C / 24 | C / 25 | F/58 |
|  | SR 65 to Rocklin Rd | Basic | C / 26 | D / 27 | D / 26 |
| WB I-80 | Rocklin Rd to Carpool Lane Start | Basic | D / 30 | D / 33 | D / 30 |
|  | SR 65 to Atlantic St | Weave | C / 23 | C / 24 | C / 24 |
|  | Atlantic St On-ramp | Merge | E/ 37 | E/ 38 | E/ 39 |
|  | Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | D / 34 | D / 32 | D / 32 |
|  | Douglas Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | D / 33 | E / 35 | E/ 36 |
|  | Riverside Ave Off-ramp | Diverge | D / 33 | D / 34 | D / 35 |
|  | Antelope Rd to Truck Scales | Weave | C / 26 | C / 26 | C / 28 |
|  | Truck Scales On-ramp | Merge | C / 27 | D / 29 | D / 29 |
|  | Elkhorn Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | C / 27 | C / 28 | C / 28 |
| Notes: Bold and underline font indicate LOS F conditions. Shaded cells indicate a project impact. The level of service and average density for the study segment are reported. <br> ${ }^{1}$ The facility type reported is for Alternative 1. The other results are contained in the Technical Appendix. <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |

## CARPOOL LANE (ALTERNATIVE 1)



GENERAL PURPOSE LANE (ALTERNATIVE 2)


NO BUILD (ALTERNATIVE 3)


Figure 32 - Northbound SR 65 Design Year AM Peak Period Speed Contour Map

## CARPOOL LANE (ALTERNATIVE 1)



GENERAL PURPOSE LANE (ALTERNATIVE 2)


NO BUILD (ALTERNATIVE 3)


Figure 33 - Northbound SR 65 Design Year PM Peak Period Speed Contour Map

CARPOOL LANE (ALTERNATIVE 1)


GENERAL PURPOSE LANE (ALTERNATIVE 2)


NO BUILD (ALTERNATIVE 3)


Figure 34 - Southbound SR 65 Design Year AM Peak Period Speed Contour Map

## CARPOOL LANE (ALTERNATIVE 1)



## GENERAL PURPOSE LANE (ALTERNATIVE 2)



NO BUILD (ALTERNATIVE 3)


Figure 35 - Southbound SR 65 Design Year PM Peak Period Speed Contour Map

CARPOOL LANE (ALTERNATIVE 1)


GENERAL PURPOSE LANE (ALTERNATIVE 2)


NO BUILD (ALTERNATIVE 3)


Figure 36 - Eastbound I-80 Design Year AM Peak Period Speed Contour Map

CARPOOL LANE (ALTERNATIVE 1)


GENERAL PURPOSE LANE (ALTERNATIVE 2)


NO BUILD (ALTERNATIVE 3)


Figure 37 - Eastbound I-80 Design Year PM Peak Period Speed Contour Map

CARPOOL LANE (ALTERNATIVE 1)


GENERAL PURPOSE LANE (ALTERNATIVE 2)


NO BUILD (ALTERNATIVE 3)


Figure 38 - Westbound I-80 Design Year AM Peak Period Speed Contour Map

CARPOOL LANE (ALTERNATIVE 1)


GENERAL PURPOSE LANE (ALTERNATIVE 2)


NO BUILD (ALTERNATIVE 3)


Figure 39 - Westbound I-80 Design Year PM Peak Period Speed Contour Map

For Alternative 2 (General Purpose Lane), LOS F conditions would also occur between Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Galleria Boulevard although the congestion duration would only be about 30 minutes. In the same location, Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane) would operate with LOS E or better conditions. At the bottleneck location between Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Galleria Boulevard, Alternative 1 would have one additional lane - the carpool lane - compared to Alternative 2.

During the PM peak hour, Alternative 3 (No Build) would have only the one bottleneck between Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Galleria Boulevard. The congestion would last for more than three hours and extend upstream to Blue Oaks Boulevard. In this segment, the carpool lane that connects to the median connector ramp at I-80 begins, so the added capacity prevents further congestion. The build alternatives would have LOS E or better conditions with free-flow speeds for southbound SR 65.

Alternative 2 would have deficient LOS F conditions during the PM peak hour between Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Galleria Boulevard. However, Alternative 3 would have worse conditions, so no impact would occur. The deficient operations could be improved by adding mainline capacity such as extending the carpool lane upstream to Blue Oaks Boulevard (as in Alternative 1).

## Eastbound I-80

The freeway operations results indicate that all alternatives would operate with LOS E or better conditions during the AM peak hour. During the PM peak period, the No Build alternative would have LOS F operations from the Eureka Road off-ramp to the SR 65 off-ramp. Although the separate I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvement project would provide sufficient capacity on I-80, the downstream bottleneck on northbound SR 65 at Pleasant Grove Boulevard (discussed above) would cause congestion to extend onto I-80 that would last for about two hours. The average speed in the mixed flow lanes would be less than 40 mph for most of this section.

Both build alternatives would provide significant congestion relief in the PM peak period; therefore, no deficiencies would occur on eastbound I-80. Most segments would operate with LOS D or better conditions during both peak periods.

## Westbound I-80

During the AM peak period, congestion would occur between Antelope Road and Elkhorn Boulevard under all three alternatives. However, Alternative 3 (No Build) would have the lowest level of congestion due to upstream bottlenecks on southbound SR 65 that would constrain the demand from reaching the westbound I-80 bottleneck. The proposed project (Alternatives 1 and 2 ) would result in impacts at the following locations on westbound I-80 in the AM peak hour.

- Truck Scales on-ramp (Alternative 2 only)
- From the Truck Scales on-ramp to the eastbound Elkhorn Boulevard on-ramp (Alternative 1 only)

The impact to the section from the truck scales to Elkhorn Boulevard could be mitigated by providing additional mainline capacity such as a continuous auxiliary lane between the truck scales on-ramp and Elkhorn Boulevard off-ramp or more restrictive metering on-ramps. More restrictive metering for ramps at Elkhorn Boulevard, Antelope Road, and Riverside Avenue could cause queuing that would extend onto the local street network.

During both the AM and PM peak hours, LOS E conditions would occur at isolated locations between Atlantic Street and Douglas Boulevard under all alternatives. However, slow speeds would not last for more than 15 minutes at these locations. As a result, the proposed project would not have impacts during the PM peak hour.

### 5.1.2. Arterial Intersection Operations

Tables 18 and 19 show the LOS and average delay at key study intersections under design year conditions during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. Tables 20 and 21 show the average maximum queue length at off-ramps under design year conditions during the AM and PM peak hours. Based on the evaluation criteria for this study, both Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane) Alternative 2 (General Purpose Lane) have four impacts. See the Appendix for all study intersection results.

The following intersections would operate with an unacceptable peak hour LOS based on the evaluation criteria under all project alternatives.

- Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard/SR 65 Southbound Ramps
- Blue Oaks Boulevard/SR 65 Northbound Ramps (PM only)
- Stanford Ranch Road/Five Star Boulevard (PM only)
- Galleria Boulevard/Roseville Parkway (PM only)
- Roseville Parkway/Creekside Ridge Drive (PM only)
- Roseville Parkway/Taylor Road (AM only)
- Eureka Road/Sunrise Avenue
- Douglas Boulevard/I-80 Eastbound Ramps (PM only)
- Douglas Boulevard/Sunrise Avenue (PM only)
- Rocklin Road/Granite Drive (PM only)
- Rocklin Road/I-80 Westbound Ramps (PM only)

| TABLE 18: INTERSECTION OPERATIONS RESULTS DESIGN YEAR AM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 |
| 6. Blue Oaks Blvd / Washington Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | E/57 | E/59 | F/90 |
| 7. Blue Oaks Blvd / SR 65 NB Ramps | C | B / 17 | B / 16 | B / 17 |
| 10. Stanford Ranch Rd / Five Star Blvd | C | C / 27 | C / 26 | C / 26 |
| 11. Stanford Ranch Rd / SR 65 NB Ramps | D | B / 11 | B / 12 | B / 19 |
| 12. Galleria Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | D | B / 19 | B / 17 | D / 55 |
| 13. Galleria Blvd / Antelope Creek Dr | C | A / 10 | A / 10 | A / 8 |
| 14. Galleria Blvd / Roseville Pkwy | E | D / 47 | D / 45 | D / 41 |
| 15. Roseville Pkwy / Creekside Ridge Dr | C | A / 8 | A / 8 | A / 8 |
| 16. Roseville Pkwy / Taylor Rd | D | E/70 | E/66 | E/60 |
| 17. Roseville Pkwy / Sunrise Ave | E | C / 33 | C / 35 | C / 33 |
| 20. Eureka Rd / Taylor Rd / I-80 EB Ramps | E | C / 30 | C / 30 | C / 30 |
| 21. Eureka Rd / Sunrise Ave | C | D / 41 | D / 41 | D / 41 |
| 23. Douglas Blvd / Harding Blvd | E | C / 26 | C / 28 | C / 26 |
| 24. Douglas Blvd / I-80 WB Ramps | C | C / 21 | B / 19 | C / 22 |
| 25. Douglas Blvd / I-80 EB Ramps | C | C / 28 | C / 24 | C / 29 |
| 26. Douglas Blvd / Sunrise Ave | D | D / 54 | D / 44 | D / 43 |
| 29. Rocklin Rd/Granite Dr | C | C / 29 | C / 28 | C / 26 |
| 30. Rocklin Rd/ I-80 WB Ramps | C | C / 23 | C / 24 | C / 22 |
| 31. Rocklin Rd / I-80 EB Ramps | C | C / 30 | C / 26 | D / 41 |
| Note: Bold and underline font indicate unacceptable operations. Shaded cells indicate a project impact. The LOS and average delay in seconds per vehicle are reported. <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |


| TABLE 19: INTERSECTION OPERATIONS RESULTS DESIGN YEAR PM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 |
| 6. Blue Oaks Blvd / Washington Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | F/140 | F/153 | F/214 |
| 7. Blue Oaks Blvd / SR 65 NB Ramps | C | D/45 | D/49 | F/94 |
| 10. Stanford Ranch Rd / Five Star Blvd | C | F/82 | E/57 | F/85 |
| 11. Stanford Ranch Rd / SR 65 NB Ramps | D | D / 36 | B / 19 | C / 21 |
| 12. Galleria Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | D | C / 25 | B / 19 | C/ 27 |
| 13. Galleria Blvd / Antelope Creek Dr | C | C / 28 | C / 29 | C/28 |
| 14. Galleria Blvd / Roseville Pkwy | E | F/93 | F/82 | F/93 |
| 15. Roseville Pkwy / Creekside Ridge Dr | C | D/50 | D/47 | D/50 |
| 16. Roseville Pkwy / Taylor Rd | D | D / 52 | D / 52 | E/55 |
| 17. Roseville Pkwy / Sunrise Ave | E | E/70 | E/ 57 | F/89 |
| 20. Eureka Rd / Taylor Rd / I-80 EB Ramps | E | E/75 | F/ 81 | F/99 |
| 21. Eureka Rd / Sunrise Ave | C | F/94 | F/103 | F/104 |
| 23. Douglas Blvd / Harding Blvd | E | F/91 | F/96 | E/ 69 |
| 24. Douglas Blvd / I-80 WB Ramps | C | C / 28 | C / 33 | C / 20 |
| 25. Douglas Blvd / I-80 EB Ramps | C | D/37 | D/37 | D/39 |
| 26. Douglas Blvd / Sunrise Ave | D | F/254 | F/241 | F/239 |
| 29. Rocklin Rd / Granite Dr | C | F/95 | F/84 | F/101 |
| 30. Rocklin Rd / I-80 WB Ramps | C | E/68 | E/63 | D/54 |
| 31. Rocklin Rd / I-80 EB Ramps | C | C / 21 | B / 20 | C / 21 |
| Note: Bold and underline font indicate unacceptable operations. Shaded cells indicate a project impact. The LOS and average delay in seconds per vehicle are reported. <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |


| TABLE 20: SELECTED MAXIMUM QUEUE LENGTH RESULTS DESIGN YEAR AM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Off-ramp | Storage | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 |
| Eastbound I-80 at Eureka Rd | 1,700 | 700 | 500 |
| Eastbound I-80 at Rocklin Rd | 1,080 | 325 | 300 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Northbound Stanford Ranch Rd | 1,170 | 200 | 200 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Southbound Stanford Ranch Rd | 1,800 | 25 | 25 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Pleasant Grove Blvd | 1,170 | 200 | 200 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Blue Oaks Blvd | 1,100 | 325 | 300 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Sunset Blvd | 1,400 | 225 | 250 |
| Southbound at Blue Oaks Blvd | 2,260 | 1,425 | 975 |
| Southbound at Pleasant Grove Blvd | 1,130 | 200 | 175 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Southbound Galleria Blvd | 1,130 | 375 | 400 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Northbound Galleria Blvd | 1,780 | 50 | 50 |
| Note: Bold and underline font indicate queues that exceed the ramp length. Shaded cells indicate a project impact. The reported value is the average maximum peak-hour queue length in feet. <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |

## TABLE 21: SELECTED MAXIMUM QUEUE LENGTH RESULTS DESIGN YEAR PM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS

| Off-ramp | Storage | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eastbound I-80 at Eureka Rd | 1,700 | 350 | 400 |
| Eastbound I-80 at Rocklin Rd | 1,080 | 325 | 300 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Northbound Stanford Ranch Rd | 1,170 | 475 | 325 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Southbound Stanford Ranch Rd | 1,800 | 25 | 25 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Pleasant Grove Blvd | 1,170 | 225 | 200 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Blue Oaks Blvd | 1,100 | 250 | 275 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Sunset Blvd | 1,400 | 250 | 250 |
| Southbound at Blue Oaks Blvd | 2,260 | 900 | 850 |
| Southbound at Pleasant Grove Blvd | 1,130 | 150 | 150 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Southbound Galleria Blvd | 1,130 | 400 | 400 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Northbound Galleria Blvd | 1,780 | 325 | 175 |
| Noter\| |  |  |  |

Note: Bold and underline font indicate queues that exceed the ramp length. Shaded cells indicate a project impact. The reported value is the average maximum peak-hour queue length in feet.
Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015

To operate within the established LOS thresholds for these locations, capacity enhancements or peak period travel demand management strategies would need to be employed in the study area with and without the proposed project. Before any improvements are proposed though, the interaction between these locations and the rest of the network should be considered. In some cases, the operation of these intersections meters traffic accessing the freeway. This may be desirable in certain locations, such as at Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard. In other locations, improvements to the freeway system, such as an auxiliary lane, may reduce demand and/or queuing that would improve intersection operations.

During the AM peak hour, the proposed project (Alternatives 1 and 2) would have impacts at Roseville Parkway/Taylor Road. The impact may be mitigated by adjusting signal timing. Since the intersection already has right-turn overlap phases and dual left-turn lanes, further improvements could include a fourth east or westbound through lane or a third southbound left-turn lane.

During the PM peak hour, the proposed project (Alternatives 1 and 2) would have impacts at the following study intersections.

- Douglas Boulevard/Harding Boulevard
- Douglas Boulevard/Sunrise Avenue
- Rocklin Road / I-80 Westbound Ramps

Potential improvements for the Douglas Boulevard corridor include an additional eastbound lane at Harding Boulevard and a second southbound right turn lane at Sunrise Avenue to provide additional capacity. At Rocklin Road, extending the eastbound right-turn movement storage further upstream would reduce overall intersection delay. Providing additional storage on the westbound on-ramp would also help to reduce queuing from the ramp meter onto Rocklin Road.

During the peak hours, the average maximum queue lengths for freeway off-ramps at all study intersections are less than the ramp storage length under both build alternatives. Due to congested conditions at the ramp terminal intersection, the southbound off-ramp queue at Blue Oaks Boulevard may be 1,000 feet or more during the PM peak hour. However, the off-ramp provides more than 2,000 feet of storage, so mainline operations would not be affected.

### 5.1.3. Ramp Meter Operations

The proposed project will install or reconstruct ramp meters for on-ramps in the project area. An analysis of the ramp meter storage for these ramps was conducted to determine the appropriate number of general purpose lanes and whether a HOV preferential should be provided.

Table 22 shows the existing and proposed ramp configuration. The existing configuration refers to the number of ramp lanes and striping/striping for HOV lane restrictions. Ramp meters are active during the AM and PM peak periods only in the southbound direction at the Blue Oaks Boulevard eastbound onramp and at the Pleasant Grove Boulevard westbound and eastbound on-ramps. Technical calculations for determining ramp meter storage based on the 15-minute arrival rates during the peak periods are provided in the appendix.

| TABLE 22: SR 65 RAMP CONFIGURATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ramp |  | Existing |  | Proposed |  |
|  |  | Lanes | HOV | Lanes | HOV |
| Northbound | Stanford Ranch Rd ${ }^{1}$ | 1 | No | 3 | Yes |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd | 2 | No | 2 | No |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd | 1 | No | 2 | No |
|  | Sunset Blvd Eastbound | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes |
|  | Sunset Blvd Westbound | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes |
|  | Whitney Ranch Pkwy Eastbound ${ }^{2}$ | n/a |  | 2 | Yes |
|  | Whitney Ranch Pkwy Westbound ${ }^{3}$ | n/a |  | 2 | Yes |
|  | Twelve Bridges Dr ${ }^{4}$ | 2 | No | 3 | Yes |
| Southbound | Lincoln Blvd | 2 | No | 3 | Yes |
|  | Twelve Bridges Dr | 2 | No | 2 | No |
|  | Placer Pkwy Westbound ${ }^{3}$ | n/a |  | 2 | Yes |
|  | Placer Pkwy Eastbound ${ }^{2}$ | n/a |  | 2 | Yes |
|  | Sunset Blvd Westbound | 2 | Yes | 2 | No |
|  | Sunset Blvd Eastbound | 3 | Yes | 3 | Yes |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd Westbound | 1 | No | 2 | Yes |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd Eastbound | 2 | Yes | 3 | Yes |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd Westbound | 2 | Yes | 2 | Yes |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd Eastbound | 2 | No | 3 | Yes |
|  | Galleria Blvd ${ }^{5}$ | 1 | No | 3 | Yes |
| Notes: Shading indicates a change from the existing configuration. <br> 1. To be constructed under the Stanford Ranch Road/SR 65 NB Ramps project <br> 2. To be constructed under the Placer Parkway project <br> 3. To be constructed under the SR 65/Whitney Ranch Parkway Interchange project <br> 4. To be constructed under the $S R 65 /$ Twelve Bridges Drive Interchange project <br> 5. To be constructed under the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Phase 1 project <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |

Ramp meter installation will be provided under separate projects for the Stanford Ranch Road/Galleria Boulevard, Whitney Ranch Parkway/Placer Parkway, and Twelve Bridges Drive interchanges. In the northbound direction, the Blue Oaks Boulevard on-ramp would be widened to provide an additional lane for storage. In the southbound direction, widening for an HOV preferential lane would also be provided at Lincoln Boulevard, Blue Oaks Boulevard westbound, and Pleasant Grove Boulevard eastbound on-ramps. At the Sunset Boulevard westbound on-ramp, design year demand volume would increase such that a second lane of storage would be needed to prevent ramp meter queues from extending onto the local street. As a result, the existing HOV preferential lane would be converted to a general purpose lane. Widening for a third lane to maintain the HOV preferential lane is not feasible due to the geometry of the loop ramp. At the Blue Oaks Boulevard eastbound on-ramp, the ramp would be widened to provide a second general purpose lane for storage.

### 5.2. Construction Year Conditions

Overall network performance statistics for AM and PM peak period operations are summarized for each alternative in Tables 23 and 24 below, respectively.

| TABLE 23: COMPARISON OF OVERALL NETWORK PERFORMANCE CONSTRUCTION YEAR AM PEAK PERIOD |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure |  | Existing <br> Conditions | Construction Year Conditions |  |  |
|  |  | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 |
| Volume Served (\% of total demand) |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 143,450 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 167,490 \\ (99 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 167,510 \\ (99 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 168,620 \\ (99 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) |  | 645,270 | 799,520 | 797,360 | 788,490 |
| Person Miles of Travel |  | 786,260 | 982,670 | 979,180 | 965,810 |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel (VHT) |  | 13,760 | 18,060 | 18,000 | 18,270 |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD) (\% of VHT) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2,670 \\ & (19 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,350 \\ & (24 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,330 \\ & (24 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,730 \\ & (26 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| Average Delay per Vehicle (min) |  | 1.12 | 1.56 | 1.55 | 1.68 |
| Person Hours of Delay |  | 3,240 | 5,160 | 5,140 | 5,600 |
| Average Speed |  | 46.9 | 44.3 | 44.3 | 43.2 |
| Average Speed for HOVs |  | 47.0 | 46.7 | 46.6 | 45.7 |
| Travel Time: Ferrari Ranch Rd to I-80 | SOV | - | 8:09 | 8:09 | 8:47 |
|  | HOV | - | 8:04 | 8:08 | 8:46 |
| Travel Time: <br> Blue Oaks Blvd to <br> Antelope Rd | SOV | 9:44 | 8:51 | 8:50 | 9:16 |
|  | HOV | 9:27 | 8:33 | 8:33 | 8:54 |
| Notes: $\quad$ PMT $=$ person miles of travel, PHD $=$ person hours of delay <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |

The results presented in Tables 23 and 24 are summarized below.

- The build alternatives improve network performance compared to the no build alternative during the AM peak period.
- Also during the AM peak period, Alternative 2 (General Purpose Lane) has the lowest delay and highest average speed. However, all three alternatives have about the same results.
- During the PM peak period, Alternative 2 (General Purpose Lane) has the lowest delay and highest average speed. The worst performing alternative is Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane). The bottleneck at the eastbound I-80 connector ramp to northbound SR 65 operates worst under Alternative 1 although all three alternatives have the same lane configuration at this location.

| TABLE 24: COMPARISON OF OVERALL NETWORK PERFORMANCE CONSTRUCTION YEAR PM PEAK PERIOD |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure |  | Existing Conditions | Construction Year Conditions |  |  |
|  |  | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 |
| Volume Served <br> (\% of total demand) |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 198,170 \\ (101 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 231,400 \\ (99 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 232,110 \\ (99 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 233,870 \\ (99 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) |  | 730,100 | 924,670 | 930,140 | 909,560 |
| Person Miles of Travel |  | 880,180 | 1,146,120 | 1,150,200 | 1,123,280 |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel (VHT) |  | 16,850 | 27,210 | 25,890 | 25,870 |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD) (\% of VHT) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3,950 \\ & (23 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10,940 \\ (40 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9,520 \\ & (37 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9,840 \\ & (38 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| Average Delay per Vehicle (min) |  | 1.20 | 2.84 | 2.46 | 2.52 |
| Person Hours of Delay |  | 4,670 | 12,770 | 11,220 | 11,520 |
| Average Travel Speed |  | 43.3 | 34.0 | 35.9 | 35.2 |
| Average HOV Speed |  | 44.7 | 39.1 | 39.8 | 39.5 |
| Travel Time: <br> I-80 to Ferrari Ranch Rd | SOV | - | 7:56 | 7:59 | 7:56 |
|  | HOV | - | 7:56 | 7:59 | 7:55 |
| Travel Time: <br> Auburn Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | SOV | 9:16 | 20:03 | 14:05 | 17:23 |
|  | HOV | 9:11 | 9:23 | 9:09 | 9:38 |

- The PM peak-hour travel time for northbound SR 65 is about the same for all alternatives. The Auburn Boulevard to Blue Oaks Boulevard travel time is lowest for Alternative 2 and highest for Alternative 1.
- The AM peak hour travel times through the I-80/SR 65 Interchange are better than existing conditions for all alternatives due to the separate I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Phase 1 project.

Specific details about construction year freeway and arterial intersection operations are discussed in more detail in the following sections.

### 5.2.1. Freeway Operations

Detailed freeway operations analysis was completed for the peak hour (7:30 to 8:30 AM and 4:30 to 5:30 PM) of the four hour AM and PM peak periods. The AM and PM peak-hour served volume are percentage of the demand volume are listed in Figure 41. The AM and PM peak hour results for selected locations are reported in Tables 25 and 26, respectively. The remaining results are available in the Technical Appendix. Figures 42 through 48 display the average speed in the mixed-flow lanes throughout the network during the peak periods for each alternative.

## Northbound SR 65

During the AM and PM peak hours, all alternatives would have a bottleneck on the loop ramp connector from eastbound I-80. Alternative 3 (No Build) would have LOS E conditions at Pleasant Grove Boulevard in both peak hours, but the build alternatives would have LOS E only during the PM peak hour due to the additional lane.

The proposed project would have an impact at the loop ramp connector from eastbound I-80 to northbound SR 65. The impact would occur during the AM peak hour for Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane) and during both peak hours for Alternative 2 (General Purpose Lane). This impact could be mitigated by constructing the ultimate phase of the planned I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvement project that will realign and widen the connector to three lanes.

## Southbound SR 65

During the AM peak hour, the build alternatives would have LOS F conditions at the Sunset Boulevard westbound on-ramp. The congestion would last for about 45 minutes. The lower demand volume for the no build alternative would result in acceptable LOS D conditions.

Alternative 3 would have LOS F operations downstream between Sunset Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Boulevard. The congestion would last for about an hour. The widening under Alternatives 1 and 2 would improve conditions to LOS D or better at the Pleasant Grove Boulevard bottleneck. However, Alternative 1 would have LOS F at the Galleria Boulevard on-ramp. Despite the LOS F conditions at Galleria Boulevard, the congestion would be localized and last for only about 15 minutes.


Figure 40 - Freeway Served Volume for Construction Year Conditions

| TABLE 25: SELECTED FREEWAY OPERATIONS RESULTS CONSTRUCTION YEAR AM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Freeway | Location | Type ${ }^{1}$ | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 |
| NB SR 65 | I-80 Eastbound Connector Ramp | Basic | F/45 | F/47 | E / 44 |
|  | Stanford Ranch Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | C / 24 | C / 24 | D / 31 |
|  |  |  |  |  | E / 36 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd On-ramp | Merge | D / 33 | D / 33 | C / 27 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | C / 27 | C / 27 |  |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | C / 19 | C / 19 | C / 25 |
|  | Whitney Ranch Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | B / 13 | B / 13 | B / 16 |
|  |  |  |  |  | B / 17 |
| SB SR 65 | Twelve Bridges Dr to Placer Pkwy | Weave | C / 28 | D / 28 | D / 33 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D / 31 |
|  | Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | F/68 | F/75 | D / 29 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | D / 30 | C / 24 | F/56 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | D / 29 | C / 27 | D / 31 |
|  | Galleria Blvd On-ramp | Merge | F/54 | E/ 42 | E/ 39 |
|  | I-80 Westbound Connector Ramp | Basic | E/ 41 | E/ 40 | E/ 38 |
| EB I-80 | Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | Basic | D / 34 | E / 35 | E / 39 |
|  | Eureka Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | D / 30 | D / 30 | D / 29 |
|  | SR 65 Off-ramp | Diverge | D / 33 | D / 32 | D / 31 |
|  | SR 65 to Rocklin Rd | Basic | C / 22 | C / 22 | C / 21 |
| WB I-80 | Rocklin Rd to Carpool Lane Start | Basic | D / 29 | D / 28 | D / 29 |
|  | Atlantic St On-ramp | Merge | E / 37 | E/ 37 | E/ 38 |
|  | Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | D / 33 | D / 33 | D / 33 |
|  | Douglas Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | E/ 35 | E/ 37 | E/ 39 |
|  | Riverside Ave Off-ramp | Diverge | D / 34 | D / 33 | D / 33 |
|  | Antelope Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | F/53 | F/53 | F/61 |
|  | Truck Scales On-ramp | Merge | F/92 | F/94 | F/95 |
|  | Elkhorn Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | F/77 | F/77 | F/77 |
| Notes: | Bold and underline font indicate LOS F conditions. Shaded cells indicate a project impact. The level of service and average density for the study segment are reported. <br> ${ }^{1}$ The facility type reported is for Alternative 1. The other results are contained in the Technical Appendix. <br> Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |


| TABLE 26: SELECTED FREEWAY OPERATIONS RESULTS CONSTRUCTION YEAR PM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Freeway | Location | Type ${ }^{1}$ | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 |
| NB SR 65 | I-80 Eastbound Connector Ramp | Basic | F/61 | F/63 | F/61 |
|  | Stanford Ranch Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | C / 26 | C / 26 | D / 32 |
|  |  |  |  |  | E / 36 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd On-ramp | Merge | E / 39 | E/ 40 | D / 29 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | D / 32 | D / 32 |  |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | D / 26 | D / 27 | D / 29 |
|  | Whitney Ranch Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | C / 23 | C / 23 | D / 29 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D / 30 |
| SB SR 65 | Twelve Bridges Dr to Placer Pkwy | Weave | B / 16 | B / 16 | B / 19 |
|  |  |  |  |  | B / 19 |
|  | Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | C / 25 | C / 25 | C / 21 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | C / 26 | C / 21 | C / 26 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | C / 25 | C / 24 | D / 27 |
|  | Galleria Blvd On-ramp | Merge | D / 34 | D / 33 | D / 33 |
|  | I-80 Westbound Connector Ramp | Basic | D / 32 | D / 32 | D / 32 |
| EB I-80 | Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | Basic | F/108 | D / 34 | F/81 |
|  | Eureka Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | F/118 | F/110 | F/106 |
|  | SR 65 Off-ramp | Diverge | F/91 | F/95 | F/92 |
|  | SR 65 to Rocklin Rd | Basic | C / 22 | C / 23 | C / 23 |
| WB I-80 | Rocklin Rd to Carpool Lane Start | Basic | C / 24 | C / 24 | C / 24 |
|  | Atlantic St On-ramp | Merge | D / 30 | D / 30 | D / 30 |
|  | Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | C / 27 | C / 28 | C / 27 |
|  | Douglas Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | D / 33 | D / 30 | D / 31 |
|  | Riverside Ave Off-ramp | Diverge | D / 31 | D / 31 | D / 31 |
|  | Antelope Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | D / 29 | D / 29 | D / 29 |
|  | Truck Scales On-ramp | Merge | C / 26 | C / 26 | C / 27 |
|  | Elkhorn Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | D / 28 | D / 28 | D / 28 |
| Notes: Bold and underline font indicate LOS F conditions. Shaded cells indicate a project impact. The level of service and average density for the study segment are reported. <br> ${ }^{1}$ The facility type reported is for Alternative 1. The other results are contained in the Technical Appendix. <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |

## CARPOOL LANE (ALTERNATIVE 1)



GENERAL PURPOSE LANE (ALTERNATIVE 2)


NO BUILD (ALTERNATIVE 3)


Figure 41 - Northbound SR 65 Construction Year AM Peak Period Speed Contour Map

CARPOOL LANE (ALTERNATIVE 1)


GENERAL PURPOSE LANE (ALTERNATIVE 2)


NO BUILD (ALTERNATIVE 3)


Figure 42 - Northbound SR 65 Construction Year PM Peak Period Speed Contour Map

## CARPOOL LANE (ALTERNATIVE 1)



GENERAL PURPOSE LANE (ALTERNATIVE 2)


NO BUILD (ALTERNATIVE 3)


Figure 43 - Southbound SR 65 Construction Year AM Peak Period Speed Contour Map

## CARPOOL LANE (ALTERNATIVE 1)



GENERAL PURPOSE LANE (ALTERNATIVE 2)


NO BUILD (ALTERNATIVE 3)


Figure 44 - Southbound SR 65 Construction Year PM Peak Period Speed Contour Map

CARPOOL LANE (ALTERNATIVE 1)


GENERAL PURPOSE LANE (ALTERNATIVE 2)


NO BUILD (ALTERNATIVE 3)


Figure 45 - Eastbound I-80 Construction Year AM Peak Period Speed Contour Map

## CARPOOL LANE (ALTERNATIVE 1)



GENERAL PURPOSE LANE (ALTERNATIVE 2)


NO BUILD (ALTERNATIVE 3)


Figure 46 - Eastbound I-80 Construction Year PM Peak Period Speed Contour Map

CARPOOL LANE (ALTERNATIVE 1)


GENERAL PURPOSE LANE (ALTERNATIVE 2)


NO BUILD (ALTERNATIVE 3)


Figure 47 - Westbound I-80 Construction Year AM Peak Period Speed Contour Map

CARPOOL LANE (ALTERNATIVE 1)


GENERAL PURPOSE LANE (ALTERNATIVE 2)


NO BUILD (ALTERNATIVE 3)


Figure 48 - Westbound I-80 Construction Year PM Peak Period Speed Contour Map

All three alternatives would operate with LOS D or better conditions during the PM peak hour. The planned I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Phase 1 project would eliminate the existing bottleneck during the PM peak hour.

During the AM peak hour, the proposed project (Alternatives 1 and 2) would have an impact at the Sunset Boulevard off-ramp to on-ramp segment and at the Sunset Boulevard westbound on-ramp. This impact could be mitigated by extending the planned auxiliary lane that starts at the eastbound on-ramp upstream to start and the westbound on-ramp. Alternately, more restrictive metering could be used at the upstream on-ramps. More restrictive metering for ramps at Sunset Boulevard, Placer Parkway, and Twelve Bridges Drive could cause queuing that would extend onto the local street network.

Additionally, the proposed project (Alternative 1) would have an impact at the Galleria Boulevard on-ramp during the AM peak hour. This impact could be mitigated by constructing the ultimate phase of the planned I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvement project that will widen the freeway at this location by two lanes (a carpool lane and an acceleration lane). Alternately, more restrictive metering could be used at the upstream on-ramps. More restrictive metering for ramps at Galleria Boulevard, Pleasant Grove Boulevard, and Blue Oaks Boulevard could cause queuing that would extend onto the local street network.

## Eastbound I-80

For all alternatives, the freeway operations results indicate that eastbound I-80 would have LOS D or better conditions during the AM peak hour. However, the freeway would have a bottleneck at the SR 65 off-ramp during the PM peak period. The PM peak period congestion would last for more than three and a half hours and extend upstream past Auburn Boulevard.

Although the total demand volumes are similar across alternatives and the lane configurations are the same, the results for Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane) show much worse congestion during the PM peak hour. One potential reason is that Alternative 1 has higher HOV demand volume, which causes more weaving conflicts at the SR 65 off-ramp than the other alternatives. With these results, Alternative 1 has project impacts during the PM peak hour on eastbound I-80 from Auburn Boulevard to SR 65. Alternative 2 also has project impacts at the Douglas Boulevard on-ramp, the Eureka Road off-ramp, and the SR 65 offramp. To mitigate these impacts, the ultimate phase of the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements project should be constructed.

## Westbound I-80

During the AM peak period, bottlenecks would exist under all alternatives at Elkhorn Boulevard as shown in Figure 47. Short-term slow speeds would also occur upstream at Douglas Boulevard prior to the peak hour. The downstream bottleneck at Elkhorn Boulevard would last for about two hours and extend upstream to Antelope Road. All three alternatives would have about the same operating conditions in this area. Westbound I-80 would operate with LOS D or better conditions during the PM peak hour.

Although Alternatives 1 and 2 would have LOS F conditions during the AM peak hour, the proposed project would not have impacts because the no build alternative would operate worse.

### 5.2.2. Arterial Intersection Operations

Tables 27 and 28 show the LOS and average delay at key study intersections under construction year conditions during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. Tables 29 and 30 show the average maximum queue length at off-ramps under construction year conditions during the AM and PM peak hours. Based on the evaluation criteria for this study, Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane) has six impacts, and Alternative 2 (General Purpose Lane) has eight impacts. See the Appendix for all study intersection results.


The following intersections would operate at an unacceptable LOS based on the evaluation criteria under all project alternatives.

- Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard/SR 65 Southbound Ramps (PM only)
- Stanford Ranch Road/Five Star Boulevard (PM only)
- Eureka Road/Sunrise Avenue (PM only)
- Rocklin Road/Granite Drive (PM only)
- Rocklin Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps (AM only)

The analysis results indicate that these intersections would need capacity enhancements with and without the proposed project to operate within the established LOS thresholds for these locations or peak period travel demand management strategies would need to be employed in the study area. Before any improvements are proposed though, the interaction between these locations and the rest of the network should be considered. In some cases, the operation of these intersections meters traffic accessing the freeway. In other locations, improvements to the freeway system, such as an auxiliary lane, may reduce demand and/or queuing that would improve intersection operations.


| TABLE 29: SELECTED MAXIMUM QUEUE LENGTH RESULTS CONSTRUCTION YEAR AM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Off-ramp | Storage | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 |
| Eastbound I-80 at Eureka Rd | 1,700 | 500 | 400 |
| Eastbound I-80 at Rocklin Rd | 1,080 | 300 | 350 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Northbound Stanford Ranch Rd | 1,170 | 125 | 100 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Southbound Stanford Ranch Rd | 1,800 | 25 | 25 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Pleasant Grove Blvd | 1,170 | 150 | 150 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Blue Oaks Blvd | 1,100 | 600 | 650 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Sunset Blvd | 1,400 | 275 | 275 |
| Southbound at Blue Oaks Blvd | 2,260 | 350 | 350 |
| Southbound at Pleasant Grove Blvd | 1,130 | 175 | 150 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Southbound Galleria Blvd | 1,130 | 275 | 275 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Northbound Galleria Blvd | 1,780 | 50 | 50 |
| Bold and underline font indicate queues that exceed the ramp length. Shaded cells indicate a project impact. The reported value is the average maximum peak-hour queue length in feet. <br> Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |

TABLE 30: SELECTED MAXIMUM QUEUE LENGTH RESULTS CONSTRUCTION YEAR PM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS

| Off-ramp | Storage | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eastbound I-80 at Eureka Rd | 1,700 | 1,125 | 1,675 |
| Eastbound I-80 at Rocklin Rd | 1,080 | 925 | 700 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Northbound Stanford Ranch Rd | 1,170 | 350 | 400 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Southbound Stanford Ranch Rd | 1,800 | 25 | 50 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Pleasant Grove Blvd | 1,170 | 200 | 250 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Blue Oaks Blvd | 1,100 | 525 | 925 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Sunset Blvd | 1,400 | 200 | 225 |
| Southbound at Blue Oaks Blvd | 2,260 | 250 | 250 |
| Southbound at Pleasant Grove Blvd | 1,130 | 150 | 125 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Southbound Galleria Blvd | 1,130 | 250 | 275 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Northbound Galleria Blvd | 1,780 | 150 | 175 |
| Noter |  |  |  |

Note: Bold and underline font indicate queues that exceed the ramp length. Shaded cells indicate a project impact. The reported value is the average maximum peak-hour queue length in feet.
Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015

During the AM peak hour, one intersection would have deficient operations under the build alternatives. Rocklin Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps would operate at LOS D conditions. Alternative 3 (No Build) would also have LOS D conditions at the intersection, but the delay under the build alternatives would be higher due to a higher demand volume. As a result, the deficiency is also an impact.

During the PM peak hour, the proposed project would have impacts at the following study intersections.

- Stanford Ranch Road/Five Star Boulevard
- Atlantic Street/Wills Road
- Douglas Boulevard/Harding Boulevard (Alternative 2 only)
- Douglas Boulevard/I-80 Eastbound Ramps
- Douglas Boulevard/Sunrise Avenue (Alternative 2 only)
- Rocklin Road/Granite Drive
- Rocklin Road/Aguilar Road

The impact at the Stanford Ranch Road intersection is caused by changes in demand volumes. With the additional northbound freeway capacity, more westbound Five Star Boulevard traffic turns left towards the freeway rather than right towards Sunset Boulevard, a parallel route. The impacts may be mitigated by adjusting signal timing. If further improvements are needed, allowing right turns from the middle lane on eastbound Five Star Boulevard may reduce intersection delay without affecting pedestrian safety since no conflicting crosswalk exists for this movement.

Signal timing adjustments are a potential mitigation for the Atlantic Street intersection. The build alternatives have a longer cycle length for the Atlantic Street/Eureka Road corridor compared with the no build alternative. The longer cycle length helps to serve different volumes at the eastbound I-80 off-ramp although the volumes at Wills Road are about the same among the alternatives. This intersection operates acceptably at LOS C under all alternatives under design year conditions, so the operations should be okay under construction year conditions.

The impacts at the Douglas Boulevard intersections could be caused by differences in intersection signal timing. The build alternatives have a shorter cycle length than the no build alternative. Although the shorter cycle length can be more efficient, the offsets are more important to prevent queues between the closely-spaced intersections. So, potential mitigation would include changes to the signal operation or widening of the intersections to provide additional turn lanes.

The impacts at the Rocklin Road intersections would be caused by the higher demand volumes under the build alternatives. The impacts can be mitigated by the planned improvements to the I-80 interchange.

During the peak hours, the average maximum queue lengths for freeway off-ramps at all study intersections are less than the ramp storage length under both build alternatives. However, the high PM peak hour demand volume at the eastbound I-80 off-ramp to Eureka Road would produce long queues that would use up most of the off-ramp storage. The off-ramp queue can be managed through signal timing adjustments although this will worsen delay for the local street approaches. A long-term mitigation is to construct the ultimate I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements.

## Chapter 6. Summary and Conclusions

### 6.1. Deficiencies

The study locations that do not meet the LOS threshold are summarized below by alternative. The LOS thresholds are provided in Section 2.5.

## Existing Conditions

- AM Peak Hour
o Westbound I-80: from the westbound Antelope Road on-ramp to the Elkhorn Boulevard off-ramp
o Northbound SR 65: westbound I-80 on-ramp
o Southbound SR 65: from the westbound Blue Oaks Boulevard on-ramp to the eastbound Pleasant Grove Boulevard on-ramp
o Intersections: Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard/SR 65 Southbound Ramps
- PM Peak Hour
o Eastbound I-80: Eureka Road off-ramp and SR 65 off-ramp
o Westbound I-80: SR 65 off-ramp
o Northbound SR 65: from the westbound I-80 on-ramp to the Stanford Ranch Road offramp
o Intersections: Eureka Road/Taylor Road/I-80 Westbound Ramps


## Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane)

- Design Year AM Peak Hour
o Westbound I-80: from the Antelope Road westbound on-ramp to the Elkhorn Boulevard eastbound on-ramp
o Intersections: Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard/SR 65 Southbound Ramps, Roseville Parkway/Taylor Road, and Eureka Road/Sunrise Avenue
- Design Year PM Peak Hour
o Intersections: Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard/SR 65 Southbound Ramps, Blue Oaks Boulevard/SR 65 Northbound Ramps, Stanford Ranch Road/Five Star Boulevard, Galleria Boulevard/Roseville Parkway, Roseville Parkway/Creekside Ridge Drive, Eureka Road/Sunrise Avenue, Douglas Boulevard/Harding Boulevard, Douglas

Boulevard/Sunrise Avenue, Rocklin Road/Granite Drive, and Rocklin Road/I-80 Westbound Ramps

- Construction Year AM Peak Hour
o Northbound SR 65: I-80 Eastbound Connector Ramp
o Southbound SR 65: Sunset Boulevard off-ramp to on-ramp, Sunset Boulevard westbound on-ramp, and Galleria Boulevard on-ramp
o Westbound I-80: from Antelope Road off-ramp to eastbound Elkhorn Boulevard on-ramp
o Intersections: Rocklin Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps
- Construction Year PM Peak Hour
o Northbound SR 65: I-80 Eastbound Connector Ramp
o Eastbound I-80: from Auburn Boulevard on-ramp to SR 65 off-ramp
o Intersections: Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard/SR 65 Southbound Ramps, Stanford Ranch Road/Five Star Boulevard, Atlantic Street/Wills Road, Eureka Road/Sunrise Avenue, Douglas Boulevard/I-80 Eastbound Ramps, Rocklin Road/Granite Drive, and Rocklin Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps


## Alternative 2 (General Purpose Lane)

- Design Year AM Peak Hour
o Southbound SR-65: Pleasant Grove Boulevard westbound on-ramp and Pleasant Grove Boulevard eastbound on-ramp
o Westbound I-80: from Antelope Road westbound on-ramp to Elkhorn Boulevard eastbound on-ramp except for Elkhorn Boulevard off-ramp
o Intersections: Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard/SR 65 Southbound Ramps, Roseville Parkway/Taylor Road, and Eureka Road/Sunrise Avenue
- Design Year PM Peak Hour
o Intersections: Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard/SR 65 Southbound Ramps, Blue Oaks Boulevard/SR 65 Northbound Ramps, Stanford Ranch Road/Five Star Boulevard, Galleria Boulevard/Roseville Parkway, Roseville Parkway/Creekside Ridge Drive, Eureka Road/Taylor Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps, Eureka Road/Sunrise Avenue, Douglas Boulevard/Harding Boulevard, Douglas Boulevard/I-80 Eastbound Ramps, Douglas Boulevard/Sunrise Avenue, Pacific Street/Sunset Boulevard, Rocklin Road/Granite Drive, and Rocklin Road/I-80 Westbound Ramps
- Construction Year AM Peak Hour
o Northbound SR 65: I-80 Eastbound Connector Ramp
o Southbound SR 65: Sunset Boulevard off-ramp to on-ramp and Sunset Boulevard westbound on-ramp
o Westbound I-80: from Antelope Road off-ramp to eastbound Elkhorn Boulevard on-ramp
o Intersections: Rocklin Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps
- Construction Year PM Peak Hour
o Northbound SR 65: I-80 Eastbound Connector Ramp
o Eastbound I-80: from Douglas Boulevard eastbound off-ramp to SR 65 off-ramp
o Intersections: Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard/SR 65 Southbound Ramps, Stanford Ranch Road/Five Star Boulevard, Galleria Boulevard/SR 65 Southbound Ramps, Atlantic Street/Wills Road, Eureka Road/Sunrise Avenue, Douglas Boulevard/Harding Boulevard, Douglas Boulevard/I-80 Eastbound Ramps, Douglas Boulevard/Sunrise Avenue, Rocklin Road/Granite Drive, and Rocklin Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps

Alternative 3 (No Build)

- Design Year AM Peak Hour
o Southbound SR 65: from Sunset Boulevard westbound on-ramp to Pleasant Grove Boulevard eastbound on-ramp
o Westbound I-80: from the Antelope Road off-ramp to Elkhorn Boulevard eastbound onramp except for Elkhorn Boulevard off-ramp
o Intersections: Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard/SR 65 Southbound Ramps, Roseville Parkway/Taylor Road, Eureka Road/Sunrise Avenue, and Rocklin Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps
- Design Year PM Peak Hour
o Northbound SR 65: I-80 to Stanford Ranch Road on-ramp
o Southbound SR 65: Blue Oaks Boulevard westbound on-ramp to Pleasant Grove Boulevard eastbound on-ramp
o Eastbound I-80: from the Eureka Road off-ramp to SR 65 off-ramp and the collectordistributor roadway between Eureka Road and SR 65/Taylor Road
o Intersections: Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard/SR 65 Southbound Ramps, Blue Oaks Boulevard/SR 65 Northbound Ramps, Stanford Ranch Road/Five Star Boulevard, Galleria Boulevard/Roseville Parkway, Roseville Parkway/Creekside Ridge Drive,

Roseville Parkway/Taylor Road, Roseville Parkway/Sunrise Avenue, Eureka Road/Taylor Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps, Eureka Road/Sunrise Avenue, Douglas Boulevard/I-80 Eastbound Ramps, Douglas Boulevard/Sunrise Avenue, Pacific Street/Sunset Boulevard, Rocklin Road/Granite Drive, and Rocklin Road/I-80 Westbound Ramps

- Construction Year AM Peak Hour
o Southbound SR 65: from Sunset Boulevard to the Pleasant Grove Boulevard off-ramp
o Westbound I-80: from Riverside Avenue to Elkhorn Boulevard eastbound on-ramp
o Intersections: Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard/SR 65 Southbound Ramps, Roseville Parkway/Taylor Road, and Rocklin Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps
- Construction Year PM Peak Hour
o Northbound SR 65: I-80 Eastbound Connector Ramp
o Eastbound I-80: Auburn Boulevard on-ramp to SR 65 off-ramp
o Intersections: Blue Oaks Boulevard/Washington Boulevard/SR 65 Southbound Ramps, Blue Oaks Boulevard/SR 65 Northbound Ramps, Stanford Ranch Road/Five Star Boulevard, Eureka Road/Sunrise Avenue, Douglas Boulevard/Harding Boulevard, Pacific Street/Sunset Boulevard, Rocklin Road/Granite Drive, and Rocklin Road/I-80 Westbound Ramps


### 6.2. Project Impacts

The project impacts are summarized below by alternative. A project impact occurs where (1) the LOS threshold is exceeded and (2) the conditions are worse than the no build alternative (Alternative 3).

## Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane)

- Design Year AM Peak Hour
o Westbound I-80: from the Truck Scales to Elkhorn Boulevard eastbound on-ramp
o Intersections: Roseville Parkway/Taylor Road
- Design Year PM Peak Hour
o Intersections: Douglas Boulevard/Harding Boulevard, Douglas Boulevard/Sunrise Avenue, and Rocklin Road/I-80 Westbound Ramps
- Construction Year AM Peak Hour
o Northbound SR 65: I-80 Eastbound Connector Ramp
o Southbound SR 65: Sunset Boulevard off-ramp to on-ramp, Sunset Boulevard westbound on-ramp, and Galleria Boulevard on-ramp
o Intersections: Rocklin Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps
- Construction Year PM Peak Hour
o Eastbound I-80: from Auburn Boulevard on-ramp to SR 65
o Intersections: Stanford Ranch Road/Five Star Boulevard, Atlantic Street/Wills Road, Douglas Boulevard/I-80 Eastbound Ramps, Rocklin Road/Granite Drive, and Rocklin Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps


## Alternative 2 (General Purpose Lane)

- Design Year AM Peak Hour
o Westbound I-80: Truck Scales on-ramp
o Intersections: Roseville Parkway/Taylor Road
- Design Year PM Peak Hour
o Intersections: Douglas Boulevard/Harding Boulevard, Douglas Boulevard/Sunrise Avenue, and Rocklin Road/I-80 Westbound Ramps
- Construction Year AM Peak Hour
o Northbound SR 65: I-80 Eastbound Connector Ramp
o Southbound SR 65: Sunset Boulevard off-ramp to on-ramp and Sunset Boulevard westbound on-ramp
o Intersections: Rocklin Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps
- Construction Year PM Peak Hour
o Northbound SR 65: I-80 Eastbound Connector Ramp
o Eastbound I-80: Douglas Boulevard on-ramp and Eureka Road off-ramp
o Intersections: Stanford Ranch Road/Five Star Boulevard, Atlantic Street/Wills Road, Douglas Boulevard/Harding Boulevard, Douglas Boulevard/I-80 Eastbound Ramps, Douglas Boulevard/Sunrise Avenue, Rocklin Road/Granite Drive, and Rocklin Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps


### 6.3. Potential Mitigation Measures

The potential mitigation measures for the project impacts identified in the previous section are provided below.

## Northbound SR 65

- The impact to the I-80 eastbound connector ramp under construction year conditions can be mitigated by constructing the ultimate phase of the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements project.


## Southbound SR 65

- The impact at Sunset Boulevard under construction year conditions can be mitigated by extending the proposed auxiliary lane upstream to start at the westbound on-ramp instead of the eastbound on-ramp at Sunset Boulevard. Since the auxiliary lane extension is not needed under design year conditions when mainline is widened, an alternate mitigation would be to operate the ramp meters on southbound SR 65 at a more restrictive rate, which may cause secondary impacts to local streets.
- The impact to the Galleria Boulevard on-ramp under construction year conditions can be mitigated by constructing the ultimate phase of the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements project. An alternate mitigation would be to operate the ramp meters on southbound SR 65 at a more restrictive rate, which may cause secondary impacts to local streets.


## Eastbound I-80

- Impacts from Auburn Boulevard to SR 65 under construction year conditions can be mitigated by constructing the ultimate phase of the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements project.


## Westbound I-80

- Impacts from the Truck Scales to Elkhorn Boulevard can be mitigated by providing a full auxiliary lane from the truck scales to Elkhorn Boulevard or adding a through lane at Elkhorn Boulevard. An alternate mitigation to the above widening options would be to operate the ramp meters on westbound I-80 and southbound SR 65 at a more restrictive rate, which may cause secondary impacts to local streets.


## Intersections

- Stanford Ranch Road/Five Star Boulevard - The impact may be mitigated by converting the eastbound middle lane from a shared left-turn/through lane to a shared left-turn/through/rightturn lane.
- Roseville Parkway/Taylor Road - The impact would likely be mitigated by providing a third southbound left-turn lane. With the widening of the approach, the pedestrian crossing distance would increase.
- Atlantic Street/Wills Road - The impact would likely be mitigated by modifying signal timing.
- Douglas Boulevard/Harding Boulevard - The impact would likely be mitigated by modifying signal timing. Alternately, an additional eastbound through lane would increase capacity.
- Douglas Boulevard/I-80 Eastbound Ramps - The impact would likely be mitigated by modifying signal timing or adjusting the ramp meter timing to reduce queuing onto the local street.
- Douglas Boulevard/Sunrise Avenue - This impact may be mitigated by modifying signal timing. Alternately, the addition of a second southbound right turn lane would increase capacity.
- Rocklin Road/Granite Drive - This impact under construction year conditions may be mitigated by constructing the planned I-80/Rocklin Road Interchange Improvements.
- Rocklin Road/I-80 Westbound Ramps - This impact may be mitigated by signal timing and/or providing additional storage for the ramp meter on the Rocklin Road on-ramp to westbound I-80 to reduce queuing onto the local street.
- Rocklin Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps - This impact under construction year conditions may be mitigated by constructing the planned I-80/Rocklin Road Interchange Improvements.


### 6.4. Safety Assessment

The build alternatives will likely provide similar improvements to transportation safety. A key improvement will be provided by congestion reduction on the freeway. Rear-end collisions on the freeway are associated with congested conditions. As noted in the existing conditions section, rear-end collisions in the study area are highest on southbound SR 65 during the congested AM and PM peak periods. Since the build alternatives will reduce congestion compared to Alternative 3 (No Build), the expected number of rear-end end collision would be reduced with the build alternatives.

Roadway design standards are used to provide consistent expectations for drivers, which helps improve transportation safety by reducing collision risks. When these standards are not met, collision risks may increase. The currently proposed design exceptions related to freeway operations are narrow shoulder widths at the Blue Oaks Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Boulevard overcrossings. Compared to Alternative 3 (No Build), Alternatives 1 and 2 will have a narrower clear recovery zone at these two spot locations.

### 6.5. Comparison of Project Alternatives

In general, the build alternatives perform similarly under design year conditions. Table 31 compares the build alternatives across a range of performance measures based on the project objectives. As listed in Section 1.3, the project objectives can be summarized as reducing congestion and improving safety.

In the comparison summary table, two performance measures for the overall network performance are provided: the sum of the AM and PM peak period volume served (throughput) and vehicle hours of delay. The three build alternatives have similar performance, with less than 0.01 percent difference in volume
and less than 0.2 percent difference in delay between the alternatives. Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane) has the better network performance primarily due to the improved PM peak period operation for southbound SR 65.

The comparison table also lists the total number of design year AM and PM peak hour impacts for study freeway sections and intersections. Alternative 2 (General Purpose Lane) has the fewest freeway impacts; however, both alternatives have about the same performance on westbound I-80 during the AM peak hour where all of the impacts are located. The intersection impacts are at the same locations for both alternatives.

| TABLE 31: ALTERNATIVE COMPARISON SUMMARY - DESIGN YEAR PEAK PERIOD CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Difference ${ }^{\mathbf{1}}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Network Throughput (vehicles) | 508,940 | 508,290 | $+650(1)$ |  |  |  |  |
| Network Delay (vehicle-hours) | 16,010 | 16,050 | $-40(1)$ |  |  |  |  |
| Freeway Impacts | 5 | 1 | $-4(2)$ |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Impacts | 4 | 4 | $0(-)$ |  |  |  |  |
| Northbound SR 65 PM Peak Hour Travel Time |  |  |  |  | $7: 52$ | $7: 53$ | $-1(1)$ |
| Southbound SR 65 AM Peak Hour Travel Time |  |  |  |  | $7: 49$ | $7: 53$ | $-4(1)$ |
| Note: <br> Source: $\quad$ 1. The alternative with the better performance is listed in parentheses. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The peak hour travel times for the peak directions of SR 65 are nearly the same. During the AM peak hour, the southbound travel time is lower for Alternative 1 by 4 seconds. The difference is small, but Alternative 1 provides a better overall travel time.

In summary, both build alternatives would meet the project need and purpose. Alternative 1 would provide better network conditions, better southbound freeway operations, and fewer intersection impacts.
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## VMT by Speed Bin

## Alternative Comparison

Design Year



PM Peak Period

| VMT by Speed Bin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alternative | $0-5 \mathrm{mph}$ | 5-10 mph | 10-15 mph | 15-20 mph | $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 5 ~ m p h ~}$ | 25-30 mph | 30-35 mph | 35-40 mph | 40-45 mph | 45-50 mph | 50-55 mph | 55-60 mph | 60-65 mph |
| 1-Carpool Lane | 6,249 | 22,004 | 113,161 | 214,733 | 307,671 | 347,679 | 389,519 | 325,912 | 273,837 | 182,181 | 151,844 | 107,432 | 23,324 |
| 2 - General Purpose Lane | 6,229 | 22,144 | 114,111 | 210,300 | 306,919 | 352,964 | 378,374 | 318,186 | 285,606 | 187,932 | 154,114 | 105,590 | 23,292 |
| 3 - No Build | 6,259 | 22,386 | 133,296 | 270,745 | 349,950 | 354,232 | 391,268 | 313,898 | 252,585 | 138,757 | 135,430 | 66,047 | 16,478 |



## Alternative Comparison

Construction Year

AM Peak Period

| VMT by Speed Bin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alternative | $0-5 \mathrm{mph}$ | 5-10 mph | 10-15 mph | 15-20 mph | 20-25 mph | 25-30 mph | 30-35 mph | $35-40 \mathrm{mph}$ | 40-45 mph | 45-50 mph | 50-55 mph | $55-60 \mathrm{mph}$ | 60-65 mph |
| 1-Carpool Lane | 4,841 | 23,580 | 60,076 | 124,588 | 153,118 | 165,103 | 178,115 | 246,057 | 200,697 | 83,148 | 152,837 | 153,499 | 105,440 |
| 2-General Purpose Lane | 4,842 | 23,436 | 60,283 | 124,652 | 153,880 | 163,496 | 178,578 | 244,661 | 203,117 | 80,398 | 148,503 | 159,720 | 105,788 |
| 3 - No Build | 4,839 | 23,175 | 61,530 | 126,088 | 152,404 | 182,641 | 177,630 | 252,464 | 219,449 | 94,585 | 162,922 | 123,080 | 66,347 |



PM Peak Period

| VMT by Speed Bin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alternative | $0-5 \mathrm{mph}$ | 5-10 mph | 10-15 mph | $15-20 \mathrm{mph}$ | 20-25 mph | 25-30 mph | 30-35 mph | 35-40 mph | 40-45 mph | 45-50 mph | 50-55 mph | 55-60 mph | 60-65 mph |
| 1-Carpool Lane | 3,421 | 8,000 | 77,807 | 144,599 | 188,353 | 243,356 | 225,126 | 264,522 | 219,130 | 177,236 | 137,689 | 183,986 | 49,792 |
| 2 - General Purpose Lane | 3,440 | 8,033 | 77,141 | 148,023 | 186,453 | 237,088 | 226,090 | 264,802 | 224,749 | 174,961 | 136,517 | 185,619 | 50,295 |
| 3 - No Build | 3,414 | 7,010 | 78,308 | 148,851 | 198,961 | 267,934 | 243,080 | 279,975 | 213,537 | 175,998 | 153,674 | 127,583 | 18,720 |

PM Peak Period VMT
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Design Year
Freeway Operations Results
Eastbound $1-80$
$\square$ Rocklin Rd $\quad \square$
Alternative 1 - Carpool Lane

| Diverge | Basic | Merge | Basic | Diverge | Basic | Merge | Merge |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CT25 | CT2 | CT22 | ¢ 12 - | - 124 | - 17 | B/18 | - 12 |
| ${ }^{1725}$ | CT22 | CT24 | $\overline{\mathrm{c}} 124$ | - | C 121 | $\bar{c} / 22$ | c/26 |

Alternative 2 - General Purpose Lane


Alternative 3 - № Build


Westbound I-80
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Westbound I-80
$\square \quad \square \quad$ Riverside Ave $\quad \square$ Antelope Road $\quad \square$

Alternative 1-Carpool Lane


Alternative 2-General Purpose Lane


Alternative 3 - No Build


## Northbound SR 65



Sunset Blvd
Alternative 1-Carpool Lane


Alternative 2 - General Purpose Lane


Alternative 3 - No Build


Legend:

> | LOS A - D | Interchange | AM Peak Hour LOS / Density |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LOS E | <> HOV Lane $\quad$ PM Peak Hour LOS / Density |  |
| > LOS F | Facility Type (Basic, Merge, Diverge, or Weave) > |  |

F/90 Project Impact

Freeway Operations Results

## Northbound SR 65

Whitney Ranch Pkwy

| Twelve Bridges Dr $\quad$ Lincoln Blvd $\quad$ Ferrari Ranch Rd |
| :--- | :--- |

Alternative 1 - Carpool Lane


Alternative 2-General Purpose Lane

native 3 - No Build


Legend:

LOS A - D LOS E LOS F

| Interchange | AM Peak Hour LOS / Density |
| :---: | :--- |
| $<>$ HOV Lane | PM Peak Hour LOS / Density |

Facility Type (Basic, Merge, Diverge, or Weave)

F/90 Project Impact

Freeway Operations Results

## Southbound SR 65

$\qquad$

Placer Pkwy
Sunset Blvd
Alternative 1 - Carpool Lane


Alternative 2 - General Purpose Lane


## Alternative 3 - No Build



Legend:

## LOS A - D LOS E

LOS F

## Southbound SR 65



Alternative 2 - General Purpose Lane


[^6]F/90 Project Impact

## Eastbound I-80



Alternative 1 - Carpool Lane


Alternative 2 - General Purpose Lane


Alternative 3 - No Build


Freeway Operations Results

## Eastbound I-80



## Alternative 1 - Carpool Lane



Alternative 2-General Purpose Lane


Alternative 3 - No Build


Legend:
LOS A - D
LOS E LOS E LOS F
Interchange AM Peak Hour LOS / Density PM Peak Hour LOS / Density
Facility Type (Basic, Merge, Diverge, or Weave)

## Westbound I-80

Sierra College Blvd
Rocklin Rd $\qquad$ Atlantic St

Alternative 1 - Carpool Lane


Alternative 2-General Purpose Lane


Alternative 3 - No Build


## Westbound l-80

Douglas Blvd

Alternative 1 - Carpool Lane


Alternative 2-General Purpose Lane


Alternative 3 - No Build


Legend:
Facility Type (Basic, Merge, Diverge, or Weave)

## Northbound SR 65
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Alternative 2-General Purpose Lane


Alternative 3 - No Build
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## Northbound SR 65

Whitney Ranch Pkwy

| Twelve Bridges Dr $\quad$ Lincoln Blvd $\quad \square$ Ferrari Ranch Rd |
| :--- | :--- |

Alternative 1 - Carpool Lane


Alternative 2 - General Purpose Lane


Alternative 3 - No Build


## Southbound SR 65

Alternative 1 - Carpool Lane


Alternative 2 - General Purpose Lane


Alternative 3 - No Build


Legend:

Interchange
<> HOV Lane PM Peak Hour LOS / Density
Facility Type (Basic, Merge, Diverge, or Weave)

Froject Impact

## Southbound SR 65

Alternative 1 - Carpool Lane


Alternative 2 - General Purpose Lane


Alternative 3 - No Build


Legend:
LOS A - D LOS E LOS F

| Interchange |
| :--- |
| <> HOV Lane |
| Facility Type (Basic, Merge, Diverge, or Weave) |$\quad$| AM Peak Hour LOS / Density |
| :--- |
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## Intersection Analysis Results Summary Tables



| TABLE 18A: INTERSECTION OPERATIONS RESULTS design year am peak hour conditions |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 |
| 1. Lincoln Blvd / Sterling Pkwy | C | B / 15 | B / 14 | B / 15 |
| 2. Twelve Bridges Dr / SR 65 SB Ramps | c | B/15 | B / 16 | B / 16 |
| 3. Twelve Bridges Dr / SR 65 NB Ramps | c | C / 22 | C / 23 | C / 29 |
| 4. Sunset Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | C/ 32 | C / 27 | B/17 |
| 5. Sunset Blvd / SR 65 NB Ramps | c | B / 12 | B / 12 | B/14 |
| 6. Blue Oaks Blvd / Washington Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | E/57 | E/59 | F/90 |
| 7. Blue Oaks Blvd / SR 65 NB Ramps | c | B/17 | B/16 | B/17 |
| 8. Pleasant Grove Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | A / 9 | A / 8 | B/17 |
| 9. Pleasant Grove Blvd / SR 65 NB Ramps | c | B / 16 | B / 16 | B / 14 |
| 10. Stanford Ranch Rd / Five Star Blvd | C | C / 27 | C / 26 | C / 26 |
| 11. Stanford Ranch Rd / SR 65 NB Ramps | D | B / 11 | B / 12 | B / 19 |
| 12. Galleria Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | D | B / 19 | B / 17 | D / 55 |
| 13. Galleria Blvd / Antelope Creek Dr | C | A / 10 | A / 10 | A/ 8 |
| 14. Galleria Blvd / Roseville Pkwy | E | D / 47 | D / 45 | D/41 |
| 15. Roseville Pkwy / Creekside Ridge Dr | C | A / 8 | A / 8 | A / 8 |
| 16. Roseville Pkwy / Taylor Rd | D | E/70 | E/66 | E/60 |
| 17. Roseville Pkwy / Sunrise Ave | E | C / 33 | C / 35 | C / 33 |
| 18. Atlantic St / Wills Rd | C | C / 23 | C / 21 | B/19 |
| 19. Atlantic St / I-80 WB Ramps | C | B / 11 | B / 14 | C/30 |
| 20. Eureka Rd / Taylor Rd / I-80 EB Ramps | E | C / 30 | C/30 | C/ 30 |
| 21. Eureka Rd / Sunrise Ave | C | D/41 | D/41 | D/41 |
| 22. Harding Blvd / Wills Rd | c | B / 16 | B / 15 | B/15 |
| 23. Douglas Blvd / Harding Blvd | E | C/ 26 | C / 28 | C/ 26 |
| 24. Douglas Blvd / I-80 WB Ramps | C | C / 21 | B / 19 | C / 22 |
| 25. Douglas Blvd / I-80 EB Ramps | C | C / 28 | C / 24 | C / 29 |
| 26. Douglas Blvd / Sunrise Ave | D | D/54 | D / 44 | D/43 |
| 27. Pacific St / Woodside Dr | C | A / 8 | A/ 8 | A/ 8 |
| 28. Pacific St / Sunset Blvd | C | C/ 26 | C/ 26 | C/ 29 |
| 29. Rocklin Rd / Granite Dr | c | C / 29 | C / 28 | C/ 26 |
| 30. Rocklin Rd / I-80 WB Ramps | C | C/23 | C/ 24 | C/ 22 |
| 31. Rocklin Rd / I-80 EB Ramps | c | C/30 | C / 26 | D/41 |
| 32. Rocklin Rd / Aguilar Rd | C | A / 10 | A / 10 | A / 9 |



TABLE 19A: INTERSECTION OPERATIONS RESULTS - DESIGN YEAR PM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS

| Intersection | Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Lincoln Blvd / Sterling Pkwy | C | C / 23 | B / 17 | C / 20 |
| 2. Twelve Bridges Dr / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | C / 27 | C / 28 | B / 16 |
| 3. Twelve Bridges Dr / SR 65 NB Ramps | C | C / 20 | B / 20 | C / 22 |
| 4. Sunset Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | A / 10 | B / 15 | B / 17 |
| 5. Sunset Blvd / SR 65 NB Ramps | C | B / 16 | B / 11 | B / 14 |
| 6. Blue Oaks Blvd / Washington Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | F/140 | F/153 | F/214 |
| 7. Blue Oaks Blvd / SR 65 NB Ramps | C | D / 45 | D / 49 | F/94 |
| 8. Pleasant Grove Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | A / 9 | A / 8 | C / 30 |
| 9. Pleasant Grove Blvd / SR 65 NB Ramps | C | B / 15 | B / 14 | B / 13 |
| 10. Stanford Ranch Rd / Five Star Blvd | C | F/82 | E/57 | F/85 |
| 11. Stanford Ranch Rd / SR 65 NB Ramps | D | D / 36 | B / 19 | C / 21 |
| 12. Galleria Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | D | C / 25 | B / 19 | C / 27 |
| 13. Galleria Blvd / Antelope Creek Dr | C | C / 28 | C / 29 | C / 28 |
| 14. Galleria Blvd / Roseville Pkwy | E | F/93 | F/82 | F/93 |
| 15. Roseville Pkwy / Creekside Ridge Dr | C | D / 50 | D / 47 | D / 50 |
| 16. Roseville Pkwy / Taylor Rd | D | D / 52 | D / 52 | E/55 |
| 17. Roseville Pkwy / Sunrise Ave | E | E / 70 | E/57 | F/89 |
| 18. Atlantic St / Wills Rd | C | C / 24 | C / 25 | C / 30 |
| 19. Atlantic St / I-80 WB Ramps | C | B / 13 | C / 24 | C / 22 |
| 20. Eureka Rd / Taylor Rd / I-80 EB Ramps | E | E / 75 | F/81 | F/99 |
| 21. Eureka Rd/ Sunrise Ave | C | F/94 | F/103 | F/104 |
| 22. Harding Blvd / Wills Rd | C | B / 17 | B / 16 | B / 19 |
| 23. Douglas Blvd / Harding Blvd | E | F/91 | F/96 | E/ 69 |
| 24. Douglas Blvd / I-80 WB Ramps | C | C / 28 | C / 33 | C / 20 |
| 25. Douglas Blvd / I-80 EB Ramps | C | D / 37 | D / 37 | D / 39 |
| 26. Douglas Blvd / Sunrise Ave | D | F/254 | F/241 | F/239 |
| 27. Pacific St / Woodside Dr | C | A / 10 | B / 11 | A / 10 |
| 28. Pacific St / Sunset Blvd | C | C / 33 | D / 37 | D / 37 |
| 29. Rocklin Rd/ Granite Dr | C | F/95 | F/84 | F/101 |
| 30. Rocklin Rd/ I-80 WB Ramps | C | E/68 | E/63 | D / 54 |
| 31. Rocklin Rd / I-80 EB Ramps | C | C / 21 | B / 20 | C / 21 |
| 32. Rocklin Rd/ Aguilar Rd | C | C/ 32 | C / 31 | C / 28 |
| 33. Lincoln Blvd / SR 65 NB Off-ramp | C | B / 12 | B / 10 | A / 8 |

TABLE 19A: INTERSECTION OPERATIONS RESULTS - DESIGN YEAR PM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS

| Intersection | Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34. Lincoln Blvd / SR 65 SB On-ramp | C | $\mathrm{B} / 17$ | $\mathrm{~B} / 17$ | $\mathrm{~B} / 15$ |
| 35. Placer Pkwy / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | $\mathrm{B} / 19$ | $\mathrm{C} / 22$ | $\mathrm{C} / 24$ |
| 36. Whitney Ranch Pkwy / SR 65 NB Ramps | C | $\mathrm{C} / 22$ | $\mathrm{C} / 21$ | $\mathrm{C} / 24$ |

Note: Bold and underline font indicate unacceptable operations. Shaded cells indicate a project impact. The LOS and average delay in seconds per vehicle are reported.
Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015

| TABLE 20A: MAXIMUM QUEUE LENGTH RESULTS DESIGN YEAR AM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Off-ramp | Storage | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 |
| Eastbound I-80 at Eastbound Douglas Blvd | 1,400 | 50 | 25 |
| Eastbound I-80 at Westbound Douglas Blvd | 1,250 | 100 | 125 |
| Eastbound I-80 at Eureka Rd | 1,700 | 700 | 500 |
| Eastbound I-80 at Rocklin Rd | 1,080 | 325 | 300 |
| Westbound I-80 at Rocklin Rd | 1,230 | 175 | 200 |
| Westbound I-80 at Westbound Atlantic St | 1,430 | 25 | 25 |
| Westbound I-80 at Eastbound Atlantic St | 1,150 | 50 | 75 |
| Westbound I-80 at Douglas Blvd | 1,530 | 400 | 450 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Northbound Stanford Ranch Rd | 1,170 | 200 | 200 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Southbound Stanford Ranch Rd | 1,800 | 25 | 25 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Pleasant Grove Blvd | 1,420 | 200 | 200 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Blue Oaks Blvd | 1,100 | 325 | 300 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Sunset Blvd | 1,400 | 225 | 250 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Whitney Ranch Pkwy | 1,620 | 300 | 325 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Twelve Bridges Dr | 1,500 | 200 | 175 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Lincoln Blvd | 1,940 | 200 | 175 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Twelve Bridges Dr | 1,500 | 250 | 275 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Placer Pkwy | 1,650 | 975 | 825 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Sunset Blvd | 1,330 | 275 | 275 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Blue Oaks Blvd | 2,260 | 1,425 | 975 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Pleasant Grove Blvd | 1,130 | 200 | 175 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Southbound Galleria Blvd | 1,130 | 375 | 400 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Northbound Galleria Blvd | 1,780 | 50 | 50 |
| Note: Bold and underline font indicate queues that excee reported value is the average maximum peak-hour <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 | ramp leng <br> e length in | aded cells indica | ect impact. The |


| TABLE 21A: MAXIMUM QUEUE LENGTH RESULTS DESIGN YEAR PM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Off-ramp | Storage | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 |
| Eastbou | nd I-80 at Eastbound Douglas Blvd | 1,400 | 1,150 | 1,175 |
| Eastbound | nd I-80 at Westbound Douglas Blvd | 1,250 | 175 | 225 |
| Eastbou | d I-80 at Eureka Rd | 1,700 | 350 | 400 |
| Eastbou | nd I-80 at Rocklin Rd | 1,080 | 325 | 300 |
| Westbo | nd I-80 at Rocklin Rd | 1,230 | 450 | 375 |
| Westbo | nd I-80 at Westbound Atlantic St | 1,430 | 50 | 25 |
| Westbo | nd I-80 at Eastbound Atlantic St | 1,150 | 250 | 400 |
| Westbo | nd I-80 at Douglas Blvd | 1,530 | 525 | 550 |
| Northbour | und SR 65 at Northbound Stanford Ranch Rd | 1,170 | 475 | 325 |
| Northbour | und SR 65 at Southbound Stanford Ranch Rd | 1,800 | 25 | 25 |
| Northbour | und SR 65 at Pleasant Grove Blvd | 1,420 | 225 | 200 |
| Northbour | und SR 65 at Blue Oaks Blvd | 1,100 | 250 | 275 |
| Northbour | und SR 65 at Sunset Blvd | 1,400 | 250 | 250 |
| Northbour | und SR 65 at Whitney Ranch Pkwy | 1,620 | 500 | 500 |
| Northbour | und SR 65 at Twelve Bridges Dr | 1,500 | 125 | 100 |
| Northbour | und SR 65 at Lincoln Blvd | 1,940 | 425 | 375 |
| Southbour | und SR 65 at Twelve Bridges Dr | 1,500 | 225 | 225 |
| Southbour | und SR 65 at Placer Pkwy | 1,650 | 375 | 350 |
| Southbour | und SR 65 at Sunset Blvd | 1,330 | 225 | 225 |
| Southbour | und SR 65 at Blue Oaks Blvd | 2,260 | 900 | 850 |
| Southbour | und SR 65 at Pleasant Grove Blvd | 1,130 | 150 | 150 |
| Southbour | und SR 65 at Southbound Galleria Blvd | 1,130 | 400 | 400 |
| Southbour | und SR 65 at Northbound Galleria Blvd | 1,780 | 325 | 175 |
| Note: Bold and underline font indicate queues that exceed the ramp length. Shaded cells indicate a project impact. The reported value is the average maximum peak-hour queue length in feet. <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |


| TABLE 26A: INTERSECTION OPERATIONS RESULTS CONSTRUCTION YEAR AM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 |
| 1. Lincoln Blvd / Sterling Pkwy | C | B / 11 | B / 11 | A / 10 |
| 2. Twelve Bridges Dr / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | B / 10 | B / 10 | A / 9 |
| 3. Twelve Bridges Dr / SR 65 NB Ramps | C | A / 9 | A / 9 | A / 9 |
| 4. Sunset Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | B / 11 | B / 12 | B / 10 |
| 5. Sunset Blvd / SR 65 NB Ramps | C | B / 13 | B / 13 | B / 15 |
| 6. Blue Oaks Blvd / Washington Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | C / 31 | C / 35 | D / 52 |
| 7. Blue Oaks Blvd / SR 65 NB Ramps | C | B / 12 | B / 15 | B / 13 |
| 8. Pleasant Grove Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | A / 7 | A / 7 | A / 6 |
| 9. Pleasant Grove Blvd / SR 65 NB Ramps | C | B / 14 | B / 14 | B / 11 |
| 10. Stanford Ranch Rd / Five Star Blvd | C | C / 27 | C / 27 | C / 29 |
| 11. Stanford Ranch Rd / SR 65 NB Ramps | D | B / 15 | B / 20 | B / 18 |
| 12. Galleria Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | D | B / 17 | B / 17 | B / 17 |
| 13. Galleria Blvd / Antelope Creek Dr | C | B / 14 | B / 13 | B / 14 |
| 14. Galleria Blvd / Roseville Pkwy | E | D / 41 | D / 42 | D / 37 |
| 15. Roseville Pkwy / Creekside Ridge Dr | C | A / 8 | A / 8 | B / 11 |
| 16. Roseville Pkwy / Taylor Rd | D | D / 49 | D / 46 | F/133 |
| 17. Roseville Pkwy / Sunrise Ave | E | C / 28 | C / 28 | C / 23 |
| 18. Atlantic St / Wills Rd | C | C / 24 | C / 24 | B / 19 |
| 19. Atlantic St / I-80 WB Ramps | C | B / 15 | B / 14 | B / 11 |
| 20. Eureka Rd / Taylor Rd / I-80 EB Ramps | E | C / 25 | C / 25 | C / 22 |
| 21. Eureka Rd/ Sunrise Ave | C | C / 32 | C / 33 | C / 26 |
| 22. Harding Blvd / Wills Rd | C | C / 23 | C / 25 | B / 14 |
| 23. Douglas Blvd / Harding Blvd | E | D / 51 | C/ 30 | D / 36 |
| 24. Douglas Blvd / I-80 WB Ramps | C | C / 23 | C / 24 | B / 20 |
| 25. Douglas Blvd / I-80 EB Ramps | C | B / 20 | A / 10 | B / 12 |
| 26. Douglas Blvd / Sunrise Ave | D | C / 33 | C / 33 | C / 28 |
| 27. Pacific St / Woodside Dr | C | A / 7 | A / 7 | A / 9 |
| 28. Pacific St / Sunset Blvd | C | C / 24 | C / 24 | C / 27 |
| 29. Rocklin Rd / Granite Dr | C | B / 17 | B / 18 | B / 19 |
| 30. Rocklin Rd/ I-80 WB Ramps | C | C / 23 | C / 29 | C / 21 |
| 31. Rocklin Rd / I-80 EB Ramps | C | D / 42 | D / 49 | D / 37 |
| 32. Rocklin Rd / Aguilar Rd | C | B / 14 | C / 20 | C / 23 |


| TABLE 26A: INTERSECTION OPERATIONS RESULTS CONSTRUCTION YEAR AM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Intersection | Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 |
| 33. Linco | In Blvd / SR 65 NB Off-ramp | C | A / 6 | A / 6 | A / 6 |
| 34. Linco | In Blvd / SR 65 SB On-ramp | C | C / 21 | C / 22 | C / 20 |
| 35. Place | r Pkwy / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | A / 9 | A / 8 | A / 9 |
| 36. Whitn | ney Ranch Pkwy / SR 65 NB Ramps | C | A / 9 | A / 9 | B / 11 |
| Note: Bold and underline font indicate unacceptable operations. Shaded cells indicate a project impact. The LOS and average delay in seconds per vehicle are reported. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source: | Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |


| TABLE 27A: INTERSECTION OPERATIONS RESULTS CONSTRUCTION YEAR PM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 |
| 1. Lincoln Blvd / Sterling Pkwy | C | A / 9 | A / 10 | A / 8 |
| 2. Twelve Bridges Dr / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | B / 12 | B / 12 | A/7 |
| 3. Twelve Bridges Dr / SR 65 NB Ramps | C | B / 11 | B / 11 | A/9 |
| 4. Sunset Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | A/ 6 | A/ 6 | B / 12 |
| 5. Sunset Blvd / SR 65 NB Ramps | C | B / 13 | B / 14 | B / 17 |
| 6. Blue Oaks Blvd / Washington Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | D/47 | D/44 | F/126 |
| 7. Blue Oaks Blvd / SR 65 NB Ramps | C | B / 15 | B / 18 | E/70 |
| 8. Pleasant Grove Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | C / 31 | C/ 29 | A/7 |
| 9. Pleasant Grove Blvd / SR 65 NB Ramps | C | C/ 24 | C/ 33 | B / 12 |
| 10. Stanford Ranch Rd / Five Star Blvd | C | F/92 | E/76 | D/48 |
| 11. Stanford Ranch Rd / SR 65 NB Ramps | D | C / 23 | C/ 25 | B / 12 |
| 12. Galleria Blvd / SR 65 SB Ramps | D | B / 16 | B / 17 | B / 16 |
| 13. Galleria Blvd / Antelope Creek Dr | C | C / 23 | C/ 25 | C / 24 |
| 14. Galleria Blvd / Roseville Pkwy | E | E/ 61 | E/ 62 | E/58 |
| 15. Roseville Pkwy / Creekside Ridge Dr | C | C / 34 | C/ 32 | C/ 26 |
| 16. Roseville Pkwy / Taylor Rd | D | D / 51 | D/53 | D/42 |
| 17. Roseville Pkwy / Sunrise Ave | E | D / 42 | D / 41 | C/ 30 |
| 18. Atlantic St / Wills Rd | C | D/39 | D/36 | C / 22 |
| 19. Atlantic St / I-80 WB Ramps | c | B / 13 | B / 12 | B / 12 |
| 20. Eureka Rd / Taylor Rd / I-80 EB Ramps | E | D / 52 | E/72 | D / 41 |
| 21. Eureka Rd / Sunrise Ave | C | D/44 | D/44 | E/62 |
| 22. Harding Blvd / Wills Rd | C | C / 26 | C / 26 | B/19 |
| 23. Douglas Blvd / Harding Blvd | E | E/77 | F/128 | F/92 |
| 24. Douglas Blvd / I-80 WB Ramps | C | C/35 | C / 31 | C / 31 |
| 25. Douglas Blvd / I-80 EB Ramps | C | D / 41 | D/35 | C / 29 |
| 26. Douglas Blvd / Sunrise Ave | D | D / 54 | F/86 | D/39 |
| 27. Pacific St / Woodside Dr | C | A/ 7 | A/ 7 | A / 9 |
| 28. Pacific St / Sunset Blvd | c | C/ 30 | C / 29 | F/86 |
| 29. Rocklin Rd / Granite Dr | c | F/130 | F/130 | F/127 |
| 30. Rocklin Rd / I-80 WB Ramps | C | C / 27 | C / 25 | D/38 |
| 31. Rocklin Rd / I-80 EB Ramps | c | E/57 | D/46 | C/33 |
| 32. Rocklin Rd / Aguilar Rd | C | C / 23 | C / 23 | C / 30 |


| TABLE 27A: INTERSECTION OPERATIONS RESULTS CONSTRUCTION YEAR PM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Intersection | Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 |
| 33. Lincol | In Blvd / SR 65 NB Off-ramp | C | A / 9 | A / 9 | A / 8 |
| 34. Lincol | In Blvd / SR 65 SB On-ramp | C | C / 23 | C / 22 | C / 21 |
| 35. Placer | r Pkwy / SR 65 SB Ramps | C | A / 9 | A / 9 | A / 9 |
| 36. Whitn | ney Ranch Pkwy / SR 65 NB Ramps | C | C / 32 | C / 27 | C / 23 |
| Note: Bold and underline font indicate unacceptable operations. Shaded cells indicate a project impact. The LOS and average delay in seconds per vehicle are reported. <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |


| TABLE 28A: MAXIMUM QUEUE LENGTH RESULTS CONSTRUCTION YEAR AM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Off-ramp | Storage | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 |
| Eastbound I-80 at Eastbound Douglas Blvd | 1,400 | 25 | 25 |
| Eastbound I-80 at Westbound Douglas Blvd | 1,250 | 125 | 125 |
| Eastbound I-80 at Eureka Rd | 1,700 | 500 | 400 |
| Eastbound I-80 at Rocklin Rd | 1,080 | 300 | 350 |
| Westbound I-80 at Rocklin Rd | 1,230 | 125 | 125 |
| Westbound I-80 at Westbound Atlantic St | 1,430 | 25 | 25 |
| Westbound I-80 at Eastbound Atlantic St | 1,150 | 25 | 25 |
| Westbound I-80 at Douglas Blvd | 1,530 | 350 | 350 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Northbound Stanford Ranch Rd | 1,170 | 125 | 100 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Southbound Stanford Ranch Rd | 1,800 | 25 | 25 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Pleasant Grove Blvd | 1,420 | 150 | 150 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Blue Oaks Blvd | 1,100 | 600 | 650 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Sunset Blvd | 1,400 | 275 | 275 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Whitney Ranch Pkwy | 1,620 | 150 | 150 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Twelve Bridges Dr | 1,500 | 75 | 75 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Lincoln Blvd | 1,940 | 25 | 25 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Twelve Bridges Dr | 1,500 | 125 | 125 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Placer Pkwy | 1,650 | 200 | 200 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Sunset Blvd | 1,330 | 200 | 200 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Blue Oaks Blvd | 2,260 | 350 | 350 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Pleasant Grove Blvd | 1,130 | 175 | 150 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Southbound Galleria Blvd | 1,130 | 275 | 275 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Northbound Galleria Blvd | 1,780 | 50 | 50 |
| Note: Bold and underline font indicate queues that exceed reported value is the average maximum peak-hour <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 | ramp leng e length in | aded cells indica | ect impact. The |


| TABLE 29A: MAXIMUM QUEUE LENGTH RESULTS CONSTRUCTION YEAR PM PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Off-ramp | Storage | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 |
| Eastbound I-80 at Eastbound Douglas Blvd | 1,400 | 50 | 25 |
| Eastbound I-80 at Westbound Douglas Blvd | 1,250 | 1,100 | 950 |
| Eastbound I-80 at Eureka Rd | 1,700 | 1,125 | 1,675 |
| Eastbound I-80 at Rocklin Rd | 1,080 | 925 | 700 |
| Westbound I-80 at Rocklin Rd | 1,230 | 200 | 175 |
| Westbound I-80 at Westbound Atlantic St | 1,430 | 50 | 25 |
| Westbound I-80 at Eastbound Atlantic St | 1,150 | 25 | 25 |
| Westbound I-80 at Douglas Blvd | 1,530 | 325 | 300 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Northbound Stanford Ranch Rd | 1,170 | 350 | 400 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Southbound Stanford Ranch Rd | 1,800 | 25 | 50 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Pleasant Grove Blvd | 1,420 | 200 | 250 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Blue Oaks Blvd | 1,100 | 525 | 925 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Sunset Blvd | 1,400 | 225 | 225 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Whitney Ranch Pkwy | 1,620 | 200 | 225 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Twelve Bridges Dr | 1,500 | 100 | 100 |
| Northbound SR 65 at Lincoln Blvd | 1,940 | 25 | 25 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Twelve Bridges Dr | 1,500 | 100 | 100 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Placer Pkwy | 1,650 | 150 | 175 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Sunset Blvd | 1,330 | 125 | 150 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Blue Oaks Blvd | 2,260 | 250 | 250 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Pleasant Grove Blvd | 1,130 | 150 | 125 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Southbound Galleria Blvd | 1,130 | 250 | 275 |
| Southbound SR 65 at Northbound Galleria Blvd | 1,780 | 150 | 175 |
| Note: Bold and underline font indicate queues that exceed the ramp length. Shaded cells indicate a project impact. The reported value is the average maximum peak-hour queue length in feet. <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |

# SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements 

## Ramp Meter Calculations

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: Stanford Ranch Rd/SR 65 Northbound Ramps
Ramp: Stanford Ranch Road to Northbound SR 65 Scenario: Build Alternative Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered +1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 720 Peak Period Volume: 2,150

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $14 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 617 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 655 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 164 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 615 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 21 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Asrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $19 \%$ | 80 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 97 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 110 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $31 \%$ | 127 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 414 | 355 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $19 \%$ | 130 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 464 | 398 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 183 | 157 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 550 | 471 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 181 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 621 | 532 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $30 \%$ | 209 | 179 | 15 | 15 | 3.83 | 179 | 703 | 602 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $25 \%$ | 180 | 154 | 0 | 6 | 1.44 | 154 | 753 | 645 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $28 \%$ | 204 | 175 | 11 | 17 | 4.20 | 175 | 774 | 663 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $22 \%$ | 162 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 755 | 647 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 187 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 733 | 628 |
| $9: 0-9: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 182 | 156 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 735 | 630 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 169 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 700 | 600 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 169 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 707 | 606 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 176 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 696 | 596 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 9 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 508 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.02 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.12 |$\quad$

Project: Stanford Ranch Rd/SR 65 Northbound Ramps
Ramp: Stanford Ranch Road to Northbound SR 65 Scenario: Build Alternative Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 1,430
Peak Period Volume: 5,270

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $17 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 1,192 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 900 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 225 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 615 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 21 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> (lated <br> Dehicles | Total <br> (veh-hr) | Metered <br> Vehicles <br> Delayed | Hourly <br> Volume | Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $24 \%$ | 336 | 280 | 55 | 55 | 13.77 | 280 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 330 | 275 | 50 | 105 | 26.28 | 275 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 358 | 298 | 73 | 179 | 44.63 | 298 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 364 | 303 | 78 | 257 | 64.23 | 303 | 1388 | 1157 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 338 | 282 | 57 | 314 | 78.41 | 282 | 1390 | 1159 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $22 \%$ | 325 | 271 | 46 | 360 | 89.89 | 271 | 1385 | 1154 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 397 | 331 | 106 | 465 | 116.36 | 331 | 1424 | 1187 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $27 \%$ | 390 | 325 | 100 | 566 | 141.38 | 325 | 1450 | 1209 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 385 | 321 | 96 | 661 | 165.36 | 321 | 1497 | 1248 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 349 | 291 | 66 | 727 | 181.83 | 291 | 1521 | 1268 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 318 | 265 | 40 | 767 | 191.84 | 265 | 1442 | 1202 |
| $5: 45-3: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 349 | 291 | 66 | 833 | 208.32 | 291 | 1401 | 1168 |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 302 | 252 | 27 | 860 | 215.00 | 252 | 1318 | 1099 |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $29 \%$ | 379 | 316 | 91 | 951 | 237.72 | 316 | 1348 | 1124 |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 299 | 249 | 24 | 975 | 243.78 | 249 | 1329 | 1108 |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 308 | 257 | 32 | 1007 | 251.71 | 257 | 1288 | 1074 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 1,322 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 3,533 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.37 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 22.45 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 833 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue $(\mathrm{ft})$ | 24,998 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: Stanford Ranch Rd/SR 65 Northbound Ramps
Ramp: Stanford Ranch Road to Northbound SR 65 Scenario: Build Alternative Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered +1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 720 Peak Period Volume: 2,150

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $14 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 617 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 625 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 156 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 615 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 41 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Asrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $19 \%$ | 80 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 97 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 110 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $31 \%$ | 127 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 414 | 355 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $19 \%$ | 130 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 464 | 398 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 183 | 157 | 1 | 1 | 0.13 | 157 | 550 | 471 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 181 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 621 | 532 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $30 \%$ | 209 | 179 | 23 | 23 | 5.70 | 179 | 703 | 602 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $25 \%$ | 180 | 154 | 0 | 21 | 5.19 | 154 | 753 | 645 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $28 \%$ | 204 | 175 | 19 | 39 | 9.83 | 175 | 774 | 663 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $22 \%$ | 162 | 139 | 0 | 22 | 5.46 | 139 | 755 | 647 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 187 | 160 | 4 | 26 | 6.45 | 160 | 733 | 628 |
| $9: 0-9: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 182 | 156 | 0 | 25 | 6.37 | 156 | 735 | 630 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 169 | 145 | 0 | 14 | 3.51 | 145 | 700 | 600 |
| $9: 30-945$ | $24 \%$ | 169 | 145 | 0 | 3 | 0.64 | 145 | 707 | 606 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 176 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 696 | 596 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 43 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,409 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.03 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.84 |$\quad$

Project: Stanford Ranch Rd/SR 65 Northbound Ramps
Ramp: Stanford Ranch Road to Northbound SR 65 Scenario: Build Alternative Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 1,430
Peak Period Volume: 5,270

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $17 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 1,192 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 1,250 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 313 |$\quad$$\quad$|  |
| ---: | ---: |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> (emand | Total <br> (ehicles | Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3:00-3:15 | $24 \%$ | 336 | 280 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 330 | 275 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 358 | 298 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 364 | 303 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1388 | 1157 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 338 | 282 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1390 | 1159 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $22 \%$ | 325 | 271 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1385 | 1154 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 397 | 331 | 18 | 18 | 4.60 | 331 | 1424 | 1187 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $27 \%$ | 390 | 325 | 13 | 31 | 7.74 | 325 | 1450 | 1209 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 385 | 321 | 8 | 39 | 9.85 | 321 | 1497 | 1248 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 349 | 291 | 0 | 18 | 4.44 | 291 | 1521 | 1268 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 318 | 265 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1442 | 1202 |
| $5: 45-3: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 349 | 291 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1401 | 1168 |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 302 | 252 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1318 | 1099 |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $29 \%$ | 379 | 316 | 3 | 3 | 0.85 | 316 | 1348 | 1124 |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 299 | 249 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1329 | 1108 |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 308 | 257 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1288 | 1074 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 27 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,268 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.02 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.26 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 39 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 591 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Pleasant Grove Blvd to Northbound SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 290
Peak Period Volume: 870

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $12 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 255 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 330 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 83 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 580 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 19 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> ulated <br> Dehicles | Total <br> (veh-hr) | Metered <br> Vehicles <br> Delayed | Hourly <br> Volume | Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $19 \%$ | 28 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:15-6:30 | $23 \%$ | 34 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 39 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $31 \%$ | 45 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 146 | 128 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $19 \%$ | 37 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 155 | 136 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 51 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 172 | 151 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 51 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 184 | 162 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $30 \%$ | 59 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 198 | 174 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $25 \%$ | 94 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0.03 | 83 | 255 | 224 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $28 \%$ | 107 | 94 | 12 | 12 | 2.92 | 94 | 311 | 273 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $22 \%$ | 84 | 74 | 0 | 3 | 0.76 | 74 | 344 | 302 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 98 | 86 | 4 | 7 | 1.67 | 86 | 383 | 337 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 102 | 90 | 7 | 14 | 3.46 | 90 | 391 | 344 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 94 | 83 | 0 | 14 | 3.49 | 83 | 378 | 332 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 94 | 83 | 0 | 14 | 3.52 | 83 | 388 | 341 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 98 | 86 | 4 | 18 | 4.43 | 86 | 388 | 341 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 20 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 678 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.03 |
| Average Delay (min) | 1.80 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Pleasant Grove Blvd to Northbound SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 550
Peak Period Volume: 2,030

| HOV Bypass (\%) | 10\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 495 | Storage Length (ft) | 580 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 510 | Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 128 | Maximum Storage (veh) | 19 |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Demand | Total <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $24 \%$ | 116 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 114 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 123 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 125 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 478 | 430 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 123 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 485 | 436 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $22 \%$ | 118 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 489 | 440 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 144 | 130 | 2 | 2 | 0.52 | 130 | 510 | 459 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $27 \%$ | 142 | 128 | 0 | 2 | 0.59 | 128 | 527 | 474 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 156 | 140 | 13 | 15 | 3.81 | 140 | 560 | 504 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 142 | 128 | 0 | 16 | 3.88 | 128 | 584 | 526 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 129 | 116 | 0 | 4 | 1.02 | 116 | 569 | 512 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 142 | 128 | 0 | 4 | 1.09 | 128 | 569 | 512 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 122 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 535 | 481 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $29 \%$ | 153 | 138 | 10 | 10 | 2.54 | 138 | 546 | 491 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 121 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 538 | 484 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 125 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 521 | 469 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 11 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 769 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.01 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 0.85 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 16 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 465 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Pleasant Grove Blvd to Northbound SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered
Peak Hour Volume: 290
Peak Period Volume: 870

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $0 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 290 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 370 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 93 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 580 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 39 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $19 \%$ | 28 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:15-6:30 | $23 \%$ | 34 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 39 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $31 \%$ | 45 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 146 | 146 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $19 \%$ | 37 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 155 | 155 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 51 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 172 | 172 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 51 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 184 | 184 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $30 \%$ | 59 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 198 | 198 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $25 \%$ | 94 | 94 | 2 | 2 | 0.38 | 94 | 255 | 255 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $28 \%$ | 107 | 107 | 15 | 16 | 4.00 | 107 | 311 | 311 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $22 \%$ | 84 | 84 | 0 | 8 | 1.88 | 84 | 344 | 344 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 98 | 98 | 6 | 13 | 3.25 | 98 | 383 | 383 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 102 | 102 | 10 | 23 | 5.63 | 102 | 391 | 391 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 94 | 94 | 2 | 24 | 6.00 | 94 | 378 | 378 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 94 | 94 | 2 | 26 | 6.38 | 94 | 388 | 388 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 98 | 98 | 6 | 31 | 7.75 | 98 | 388 | 388 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 35 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 771 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.05 |
| Average Delay (min) | 2.74 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Pleasant Grove Blvd to Northbound SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered
Peak Hour Volume: 550
Peak Period Volume: 2,030

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $0 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 550 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 550 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 138 |$\quad$$\quad$


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> (emand | Total <br> ulated <br> Dehicles | Total <br> (veh-hr) | Metered <br> Vehicles <br> Delayed | Hourly <br> Volume | Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3:00-3:15 | $24 \%$ | 116 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 114 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 123 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 125 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 478 | 478 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 123 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 485 | 485 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $22 \%$ | 118 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 489 | 489 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 144 | 144 | 7 | 7 | 1.63 | 144 | 510 | 510 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $27 \%$ | 142 | 142 | 5 | 11 | 2.75 | 142 | 527 | 527 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 156 | 156 | 19 | 30 | 7.38 | 156 | 560 | 560 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 142 | 142 | 5 | 34 | 8.50 | 142 | 584 | 584 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 129 | 129 | 0 | 26 | 6.38 | 129 | 569 | 569 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 142 | 142 | 5 | 30 | 7.50 | 142 | 569 | 569 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 122 | 122 | 0 | 15 | 3.63 | 122 | 535 | 535 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $29 \%$ | 153 | 153 | 16 | 30 | 7.50 | 153 | 546 | 546 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 121 | 121 | 0 | 14 | 3.38 | 121 | 538 | 538 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 125 | 125 | 0 | 1 | 0.25 | 125 | 521 | 521 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 34 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 855 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.04 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 2.39 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 34 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 510 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Blue Oaks Blvd to Northbound SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 610 Peak Period Volume: $\quad \mathbf{2 , 4 3 0}$

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $10 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 548 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 635 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 159 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 470 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 16 |


| Time Interval | Hourly Arrival Distribution | 15-Minute Volumes | Metered 15-Minute min flows | Excess <br> Demand | ```Accum- ulated Vehicles``` | Total Delay (veh-hr) | Vehicles Delayed | Total Hourly Volume | Metered Hourly Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6:00-6:15 | 22\% | 71 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:15-6:30 | 24\% | 75 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:30-6:45 | 21\% | 67 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:45-7:00 | 33\% | 105 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 318 | 286 |
| 7:00-7:15 | 24\% | 129 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 376 | 338 |
| 7:15-7:30 | 36\% | 194 | 174 | 16 | 16 | 3.92 | 174 | 495 | 445 |
| 7:30-7:45 | 13\% | 73 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 501 | 450 |
| 7:45-8:00 | 27\% | 146 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 542 | 487 |
| 8:00-8:15 | 25\% | 170 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 583 | 524 |
| 8:15-8:30 | 23\% | 154 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 543 | 488 |
| 8:30-8:45 | 26\% | 176 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 646 | 581 |
| 8:45-9:00 | 27\% | 182 | 164 | 5 | 5 | 1.22 | 164 | 682 | 613 |
| 9:00-9:15 | 27\% | 170 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 682 | 613 |
| 9:15-9:30 | 25\% | 160 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 688 | 619 |
| 9:30-9:45 | 22\% | 143 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 655 | 589 |
| 9:45-10:00 | 26\% | 167 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 640 | 575 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 5 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 338 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.02 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 0.91 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Blue Oaks Blvd to Northbound SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 1,000
Peak Period Volume: 3,550

| HOV Bypass (\%) | 17\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 833 | Storage Length (ft) | 470 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 900 | Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 225 | Maximum Storage (veh) | 16 |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> Volumes | 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> Dehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Metered <br> Vehicles <br> Delayed | Hourly <br> Volume | Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $19 \%$ | 199 | 166 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 263 | 219 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $30 \%$ | 311 | 259 | 34 | 34 | 8.50 | 259 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 256 | 213 | 0 | 22 | 5.55 | 213 | 1029 | 857 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $25 \%$ | 253 | 211 | 0 | 8 | 1.97 | 211 | 1083 | 902 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 258 | 215 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1078 | 898 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 274 | 228 | 3 | 3 | 0.80 | 228 | 1041 | 867 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 239 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1024 | 853 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $24 \%$ | 235 | 196 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1006 | 838 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $31 \%$ | 300 | 250 | 25 | 25 | 6.21 | 250 | 1048 | 873 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 219 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 993 | 827 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 219 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 973 | 810 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 234 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 972 | 809 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $30 \%$ | 268 | 223 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 940 | 783 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 211 | 176 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 932 | 776 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $21 \%$ | 191 | 159 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 904 | 753 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 23 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,161 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.02 |
| Average Delay (min) | 1.19 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 34 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 1,020 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Location: SR 65/Blue Oaks Blvd
Ramp: Blue Oaks Blvd to Northbound SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered
Peak Hour Volume: 610 Peak Period Volume: $\mathbf{2 , 4 3 0}$

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $0 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 610 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 665 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 166 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 470 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 31 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $22 \%$ | 71 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 75 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $21 \%$ | 67 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $33 \%$ | 105 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 318 | 318 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $24 \%$ | 129 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 376 | 376 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $36 \%$ | 194 | 194 | 28 | 28 | 6.94 | 194 | 495 | 495 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $13 \%$ | 73 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 501 | 501 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $27 \%$ | 146 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 542 | 542 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $25 \%$ | 170 | 170 | 4 | 4 | 0.94 | 170 | 583 | 583 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 154 | 154 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 543 | 543 |
| $8: 3-8: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 176 | 176 | 10 | 10 | 2.44 | 176 | 646 | 646 |
| $8: 45-900$ | $27 \%$ | 182 | 182 | 16 | 26 | 6.38 | 182 | 682 | 682 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 170 | 170 | 4 | 29 | 7.31 | 170 | 682 | 682 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 160 | 160 | 0 | 23 | 5.75 | 160 | 688 | 688 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $22 \%$ | 143 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 655 | 655 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 167 | 167 | 1 | 1 | 0.19 | 167 | 640 | 640 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 30 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,219 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.02 |
| Average Delay (min) | 1.47 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 29 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 439 |

Location: SR 65/Blue Oaks Blvd
Ramp: Blue Oaks Blvd to Northbound SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered
Peak Hour Volume: 1,000
Peak Period Volume: 3,550

| HOV Bypass (\%) | 0\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 1,000 | Storage Length (ft) | 470 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 1,120 | Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 280 | Maximum Storage (veh) | 31 |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $19 \%$ | 199 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 263 | 263 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $30 \%$ | 311 | 311 | 31 | 31 | 7.75 | 311 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 256 | 256 | 0 | 7 | 1.75 | 256 | 1029 | 1029 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $25 \%$ | 253 | 253 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1083 | 1083 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 258 | 258 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1078 | 1078 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 274 | 274 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1041 | 1041 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 239 | 239 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1024 | 1024 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $24 \%$ | 235 | 235 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1006 | 1006 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $31 \%$ | 300 | 300 | 20 | 20 | 5.00 | 300 | 1048 | 1048 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 219 | 219 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 993 | 993 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 219 | 219 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 973 | 973 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 234 | 234 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 972 | 972 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $30 \%$ | 268 | 268 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 940 | 940 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 211 | 211 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 932 | 932 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $21 \%$ | 191 | 191 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 904 | 904 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 15 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 867 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.02 |
| Average Delay (min) | 1.00 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 31 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 465 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Eastbound Sunset Blvd to NB SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 160
Peak Period Volume: 580

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $17 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 133 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 240 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 60 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 570 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 19 |


| Time Interval | Hourly Arrival Distribution | 15-Minute Volumes | Metered 15-Minute min flows | Excess <br> Demand | ```Accum- ulated Vehicles``` | Total Delay (veh-hr) | Vehicles Delayed | Total Hourly Volume | Metered Hourly Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6:00-6:15 | 25\% | 34 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:15-6:30 | 25\% | 34 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:30-6:45 | 25\% | 34 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:45-7:00 | 25\% | 34 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 136 | 113 |
| 7:00-7:15 | 14\% | 16 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 118 | 98 |
| 7:15-7:30 | 36\% | 42 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 126 | 105 |
| 7:30-7:45 | 18\% | 21 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 113 | 94 |
| 7:45-8:00 | 32\% | 37 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 116 | 96 |
| 8:00-8:15 | 30\% | 59 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 159 | 132 |
| 8:15-8:30 | 17\% | 33 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 150 | 124 |
| 8:30-8:45 | 27\% | 52 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 181 | 150 |
| 8:45-9:00 | 27\% | 52 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 196 | 163 |
| 9:00-9:15 | 26\% | 18 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 155 | 129 |
| 9:15-9:30 | 26\% | 18 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 140 | 116 |
| 9:30-9:45 | 26\% | 18 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 106 | 88 |
| 9:45-10:00 | 22\% | 16 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 70 | 58 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 0 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 0 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.00 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 0.00 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Eastbound Sunset Blvd to NB SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 420
Peak Period Volume: 1,630

| HOV Bypass (\%) | 15\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 356 | Storage Length (ft) | 570 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 445 | Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 111 | Maximum Storage (veh) | 19 |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> (lated <br> Dehicles | Total <br> (veh-hr) | Metered <br> Vehicles <br> Delayed | Hourly <br> Volume | Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 49 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 53 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $32 \%$ | 69 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $21 \%$ | 45 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 216 | 183 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $33 \%$ | 100 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 267 | 226 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $22 \%$ | 68 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 282 | 239 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $33 \%$ | 100 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 313 | 265 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $12 \%$ | 36 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 304 | 258 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 139 | 118 | 6 | 6 | 1.62 | 118 | 343 | 291 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $20 \%$ | 108 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 383 | 324 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $28 \%$ | 146 | 124 | 12 | 12 | 3.11 | 124 | 429 | 363 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 139 | 118 | 6 | 19 | 4.73 | 118 | 532 | 451 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $35 \%$ | 53 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 446 | 378 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 38 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 376 | 318 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 41 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 271 | 230 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $12 \%$ | 18 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 150 | 127 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 9 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 359 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.03 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.58 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 19 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 567 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Westbound Sunset Blvd to NB SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 270
Peak Period Volume: 700

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $14 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 232 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 260 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 65 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 800 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 27 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> ulated <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $22 \%$ | 30 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $22 \%$ | 30 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 35 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $32 \%$ | 45 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 140 | 120 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $15 \%$ | 45 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 155 | 133 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 75 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 200 | 172 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $30 \%$ | 90 | 77 | 12 | 12 | 3.05 | 77 | 255 | 219 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $29 \%$ | 87 | 75 | 10 | 22 | 5.46 | 75 | 297 | 255 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $29 \%$ | 72 | 62 | 0 | 19 | 4.65 | 62 | 324 | 278 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $35 \%$ | 85 | 73 | 8 | 27 | 6.63 | 73 | 334 | 287 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $21 \%$ | 51 | 44 | 0 | 5 | 1.31 | 44 | 295 | 253 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $15 \%$ | 36 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 244 | 209 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $17 \%$ | 34 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 206 | 177 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $31 \%$ | 63 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 184 | 158 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $32 \%$ | 65 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 198 | 170 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $20 \%$ | 40 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 202 | 173 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 21 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 330 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.06 |
| Average Delay (min) | 3.83 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Westbound Sunset Blvd to NB SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 480
Peak Period Volume: 1,830

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $20 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume $(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr})$ | 385 |
| Metering Rate $(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr})$ | 405 |
| Discharge Rate $(\mathrm{veh} / 15 \mathrm{~min})$ | 101 |$\quad$


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 101 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 107 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $28 \%$ | 125 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 110 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 443 | 356 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $22 \%$ | 116 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 458 | 368 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $28 \%$ | 147 | 118 | 17 | 17 | 4.20 | 118 | 498 | 400 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 137 | 110 | 9 | 26 | 6.38 | 110 | 510 | 410 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 119 | 96 | 0 | 20 | 4.96 | 96 | 519 | 417 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $25 \%$ | 110 | 88 | 0 | 7 | 1.73 | 88 | 513 | 412 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 110 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 476 | 382 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 115 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 454 | 365 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 113 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 448 | 360 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $31 \%$ | 112 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 450 | 361 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $28 \%$ | 101 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 441 | 354 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $19 \%$ | 71 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 397 | 319 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $22 \%$ | 81 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 365 | 293 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 17 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 412 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.04 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 2.51 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 26 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 766 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: EB Whitney Ranch Pkwy to NB SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 480 Peak Period Volume: $\quad 1,750$

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $12 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 420 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 555 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 139 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 590 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 20 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $25 \%$ | 47 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 47 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 47 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 47 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 188 | 165 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $14 \%$ | 50 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 191 | 167 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $36 \%$ | 135 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 279 | 244 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $18 \%$ | 67 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 299 | 262 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $32 \%$ | 118 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 370 | 324 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $30 \%$ | 180 | 158 | 19 | 19 | 4.69 | 158 | 500 | 438 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $17 \%$ | 100 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 465 | 407 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 160 | 140 | 1 | 1 | 0.31 | 140 | 558 | 488 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $27 \%$ | 160 | 140 | 1 | 3 | 0.63 | 140 | 600 | 525 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 67 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 487 | 426 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 67 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 454 | 397 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 67 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 361 | 316 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $22 \%$ | 57 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 258 | 226 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 6 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 438 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{hr})$ | 0.01 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 0.77 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: EB Whitney Ranch Pkwy to NB SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 420
Peak Period Volume: 1,630

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $18 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 345 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 595 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 149 |$\quad$$\quad$|  |
| ---: | ---: |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> (lated <br> Delay <br> (eh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 144 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 156 | 128 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $32 \%$ | 204 | 168 | 19 | 19 | 4.73 | 168 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $21 \%$ | 132 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 636 | 523 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $33 \%$ | 136 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 628 | 516 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $22 \%$ | 93 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 565 | 464 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $33 \%$ | 136 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 497 | 409 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $12 \%$ | 49 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 414 | 340 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 113 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 391 | 321 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $20 \%$ | 88 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 386 | 317 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $28 \%$ | 120 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 370 | 304 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 113 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 434 | 357 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $35 \%$ | 208 | 171 | 22 | 22 | 5.55 | 171 | 529 | 435 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 150 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 591 | 486 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 162 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 633 | 520 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $12 \%$ | 69 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 589 | 484 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 5 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 168 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.03 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.69 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 19 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 568 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: WB Whitney Ranch Pkwy to NB SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 430 Peak Period Volume: 1,120

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $15 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 367 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 470 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 118 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 870 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 29 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> ulated <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $22 \%$ | 36 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $22 \%$ | 36 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 42 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $32 \%$ | 54 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 168 | 143 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $15 \%$ | 78 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 210 | 179 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 129 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 303 | 258 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $30 \%$ | 156 | 133 | 15 | 15 | 3.87 | 133 | 417 | 355 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $29 \%$ | 151 | 129 | 11 | 27 | 6.67 | 129 | 514 | 438 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $29 \%$ | 101 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 537 | 458 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $35 \%$ | 120 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 528 | 450 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $21 \%$ | 72 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 444 | 378 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $15 \%$ | 51 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 344 | 293 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $17 \%$ | 46 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 289 | 246 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $31 \%$ | 85 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 254 | 217 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $32 \%$ | 87 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 269 | 229 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $20 \%$ | 53 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 271 | 231 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 11 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 262 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.04 |
| Average Delay (min) | 2.42 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: WB Whitney Ranch Pkwy to NB SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 670
Peak Period Volume: 2,550

| HOV Bypass (\%) | 18\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 547 | Storage Length (ft) | 870 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 745 | Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 186 | Maximum Storage (veh) | 29 |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 211 | 172 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 223 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $28 \%$ | 261 | 213 | 27 | 27 | 6.68 | 213 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 230 | 188 | 1 | 28 | 7.04 | 188 | 925 | 755 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $22 \%$ | 154 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 868 | 708 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $28 \%$ | 195 | 159 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 840 | 685 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 181 | 148 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 760 | 620 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 157 | 128 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 687 | 561 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $25 \%$ | 161 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 694 | 566 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 161 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 660 | 539 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 168 | 137 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 647 | 528 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 166 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 656 | 535 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $31 \%$ | 208 | 170 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 703 | 574 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $28 \%$ | 187 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 729 | 595 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $19 \%$ | 132 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 693 | 566 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $22 \%$ | 150 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 677 | 552 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 14 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 401 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.03 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 2.06 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 28 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 845 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Location: SR 65/Twelve Bridges Dr
Ramp: Twelve Bridges Dr to Northbound SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 880 Peak Period Volume: 1,700

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $22 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 684 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 900 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 225 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 950 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 32 |


| Time Interval | Hourly Arrival Distribution | 15-Minute Volumes | Metered 15-Minute min flows | Excess <br> Demand | ```Accum- ulated Vehicles``` | Total Delay (veh-hr) | Vehicles Delayed | Total Hourly Volume | Metered Hourly Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6:00-6:15 | 13\% | 18 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:15-6:30 | 28\% | 39 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:30-6:45 | 30\% | 41 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:45-7:00 | 28\% | 39 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 137 | 106 |
| 7:00-7:15 | 9\% | 60 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 179 | 139 |
| 7:15-7:30 | 14\% | 87 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 227 | 176 |
| 7:30-7:45 | 38\% | 239 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 425 | 330 |
| 7:45-8:00 | 39\% | 249 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 635 | 493 |
| 8:00-8:15 | 42\% | 467 | 363 | 138 | 138 | 34.46 | 363 | 1042 | 810 |
| 8:15-8:30 | 20\% | 223 | 173 | 0 | 86 | 21.53 | 173 | 1178 | 915 |
| 8:30-8:45 | 20\% | 219 | 170 | 0 | 31 | 7.82 | 170 | 1158 | 900 |
| 8:45-9:00 | 19\% | 210 | 163 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1119 | 869 |
| 9:00-9:15 | 20\% | 128 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 780 | 606 |
| 9:15-9:30 | 29\% | 190 | 148 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 747 | 580 |
| 9:30-9:45 | 24\% | 155 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 683 | 531 |
| 9:45-10:00 | 28\% | 181 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 654 | 508 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 64 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 706 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.09 |
| Average Delay (min) | 5.42 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 138 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 4,136 |

Location: SR 65/Twelve Bridges Dr
Ramp: Twelve Bridges Dr to Northbound SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 1,030
Peak Period Volume: 3,390

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $20 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 827 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 900 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 225 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 950 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 32 |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 309 | 248 | 23 | 23 | 5.74 | 248 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 255 | 205 | 0 | 3 | 0.66 | 205 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 284 | 228 | 3 | 6 | 1.38 | 228 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 266 | 213 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1114 | 894 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 285 | 229 | 4 | 4 | 0.93 | 229 | 1090 | 875 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $22 \%$ | 235 | 189 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1070 | 859 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 270 | 217 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1056 | 847 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 263 | 211 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1053 | 845 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $32 \%$ | 321 | 258 | 33 | 33 | 8.15 | 258 | 1089 | 874 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 257 | 206 | 0 | 14 | 3.46 | 206 | 1111 | 892 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $21 \%$ | 206 | 165 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1047 | 840 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $21 \%$ | 213 | 171 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 997 | 800 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $24 \%$ | 239 | 192 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 915 | 734 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $38 \%$ | 375 | 301 | 76 | 76 | 18.99 | 301 | 1033 | 829 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $19 \%$ | 185 | 148 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1012 | 812 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $20 \%$ | 195 | 156 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 994 | 798 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 20 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,373 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.01 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 0.89 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 33 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 978 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Twelve Bridges Dr to Northbound SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered
Peak Hour Volume: 880 Peak Period Volume: 1,700

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $0 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 880 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 1,645 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 411 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 850 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 57 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $13 \%$ | 18 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $28 \%$ | 39 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $30 \%$ | 41 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $28 \%$ | 39 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 137 | 137 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $9 \%$ | 60 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 179 | 179 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $14 \%$ | 87 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 227 | 227 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $38 \%$ | 239 | 239 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 425 | 425 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $39 \%$ | 249 | 249 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 635 | 635 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $42 \%$ | 467 | 467 | 56 | 56 | 13.94 | 467 | 1042 | 1042 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $20 \%$ | 223 | 223 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1178 | 1178 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $20 \%$ | 219 | 219 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1158 | 1158 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $19 \%$ | 210 | 210 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1119 | 1119 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $20 \%$ | 128 | 128 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 780 | 780 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $29 \%$ | 190 | 190 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 747 | 747 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 155 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 683 | 683 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $28 \%$ | 181 | 181 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 654 | 654 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 14 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 467 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.03 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.79 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 56 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 836 |

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Twelve Bridges Dr to Northbound SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered
Peak Hour Volume: 1,030
Peak Period Volume: $\mathbf{3 , 3 9 0}$

| HOV Bypass (\%) | 0\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 1,030 | Storage Length (ft) | 850 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 1,085 | Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 271 | Maximum Storage (veh) | 57 |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Demand | Total <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 309 | 309 | 38 | 38 | 9.44 | 309 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 255 | 255 | 0 | 22 | 5.38 | 255 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 284 | 284 | 13 | 34 | 8.56 | 284 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 266 | 266 | 0 | 29 | 7.25 | 266 | 1114 | 1114 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 285 | 285 | 14 | 43 | 10.69 | 285 | 1090 | 1090 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $22 \%$ | 235 | 235 | 0 | 7 | 1.63 | 235 | 1070 | 1070 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 270 | 270 | 0 | 5 | 1.31 | 270 | 1056 | 1056 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 263 | 263 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1053 | 1053 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $32 \%$ | 321 | 321 | 50 | 50 | 12.44 | 321 | 1089 | 1089 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 257 | 257 | 0 | 36 | 8.88 | 257 | 1111 | 1111 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $21 \%$ | 206 | 206 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1047 | 1047 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $21 \%$ | 213 | 213 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 997 | 997 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $24 \%$ | 239 | 239 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 915 | 915 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $38 \%$ | 375 | 375 | 104 | 104 | 25.94 | 375 | 1033 | 1033 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $19 \%$ | 185 | 185 | 0 | 18 | 4.38 | 185 | 1012 | 1012 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $20 \%$ | 195 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 994 | 994 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 66 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 2,482 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.03 |
| Average Delay (min) | 1.58 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 50 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 746 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Twelve Bridges Dr to Northbound SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 880 Peak Period Volume: 1,700

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $22 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 684 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 1,225 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 306 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 850 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 57 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $13 \%$ | 18 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $28 \%$ | 39 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $30 \%$ | 41 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $28 \%$ | 39 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 137 | 106 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $9 \%$ | 60 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 179 | 139 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $14 \%$ | 87 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 227 | 176 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $38 \%$ | 239 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 425 | 330 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $39 \%$ | 249 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 635 | 493 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $42 \%$ | 467 | 363 | 57 | 57 | 14.15 | 363 | 1042 | 810 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $20 \%$ | 223 | 173 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1178 | 915 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $20 \%$ | 219 | 170 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1158 | 900 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $19 \%$ | 210 | 163 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1119 | 869 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $20 \%$ | 128 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 780 | 606 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $29 \%$ | 190 | 148 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 747 | 580 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 155 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 683 | 531 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $28 \%$ | 181 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 654 | 508 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 14 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 363 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.04 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 2.34 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 57 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 849 |

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Twelve Bridges Dr to Northbound SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 1,030
Peak Period Volume: $\mathbf{3 , 3 9 0}$

| HOV Bypass (\%) | 20\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 827 | Storage Length (ft) | 850 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 865 | Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 216 | Maximum Storage (veh) | 57 |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 309 | 248 | 32 | 32 | 7.93 | 248 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 255 | 205 | 0 | 20 | 5.03 | 205 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 284 | 228 | 12 | 32 | 7.95 | 228 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 266 | 213 | 0 | 29 | 7.25 | 213 | 1114 | 894 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 285 | 229 | 12 | 41 | 10.37 | 229 | 1090 | 875 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $22 \%$ | 235 | 189 | 0 | 14 | 3.46 | 189 | 1070 | 859 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 270 | 217 | 0 | 14 | 3.56 | 217 | 1056 | 847 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 263 | 211 | 0 | 9 | 2.27 | 211 | 1053 | 845 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $32 \%$ | 321 | 258 | 41 | 50 | 12.61 | 258 | 1089 | 874 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 257 | 206 | 0 | 40 | 10.11 | 206 | 1111 | 892 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $21 \%$ | 206 | 165 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1047 | 840 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $21 \%$ | 213 | 171 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 997 | 800 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $24 \%$ | 239 | 192 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 915 | 734 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $38 \%$ | 375 | 301 | 85 | 85 | 21.17 | 301 | 1033 | 829 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $19 \%$ | 185 | 148 | 0 | 17 | 4.23 | 148 | 1012 | 812 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $20 \%$ | 195 | 156 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 994 | 798 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 71 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 2,203 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.03 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.92 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 50 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 756 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Lincoln Blvd to Southbound SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 1,540
Peak Period Volume: 4,190

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $19 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 1,251 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 900 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 225 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 540 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 18 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $22 \%$ | 293 | 238 | 13 | 13 | 3.28 | 238 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $22 \%$ | 289 | 235 | 10 | 23 | 5.74 | 235 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $28 \%$ | 374 | 304 | 79 | 102 | 25.47 | 304 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $29 \%$ | 386 | 314 | 89 | 191 | 47.64 | 314 | 1342 | 1091 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $19 \%$ | 289 | 235 | 10 | 200 | 50.11 | 235 | 1338 | 1087 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $22 \%$ | 323 | 262 | 37 | 238 | 59.48 | 262 | 1372 | 1115 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $30 \%$ | 444 | 361 | 136 | 374 | 93.43 | 361 | 1442 | 1172 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $29 \%$ | 435 | 354 | 129 | 502 | 125.56 | 354 | 1491 | 1212 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $29 \%$ | 459 | 373 | 148 | 650 | 162.56 | 373 | 1661 | 1350 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 409 | 332 | 107 | 758 | 189.40 | 332 | 1747 | 1420 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $22 \%$ | 345 | 280 | 55 | 813 | 203.24 | 280 | 1648 | 1339 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 382 | 310 | 85 | 898 | 224.60 | 310 | 1595 | 1296 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 376 | 306 | 81 | 979 | 244.74 | 306 | 1512 | 1229 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $21 \%$ | 305 | 248 | 23 | 1002 | 250.45 | 248 | 1408 | 1144 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 370 | 301 | 76 | 1077 | 269.37 | 301 | 1433 | 1165 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 368 | 299 | 74 | 1152 | 287.89 | 299 | 1419 | 1153 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 2,243 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 4,752 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{hr})$ | 0.47 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 28.32 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Lincoln Blvd to Southbound SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 1,470
Peak Period Volume: 4,570

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $14 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 1,268 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 900 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 225 |$\quad$$\quad$|  |
| ---: | ---: |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> (lated <br> Delay <br> (eh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 380 | 328 | 103 | 103 | 25.72 | 328 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $27 \%$ | 360 | 311 | 86 | 188 | 47.12 | 311 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 312 | 269 | 44 | 233 | 58.17 | 269 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 306 | 264 | 39 | 272 | 67.93 | 264 | 1358 | 1172 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 431 | 372 | 147 | 419 | 104.64 | 372 | 1409 | 1216 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 371 | 320 | 95 | 514 | 128.42 | 320 | 1420 | 1225 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 348 | 300 | 75 | 589 | 147.24 | 300 | 1456 | 1256 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 369 | 318 | 93 | 682 | 170.58 | 318 | 1519 | 1311 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 376 | 324 | 99 | 782 | 195.44 | 324 | 1464 | 1263 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $29 \%$ | 414 | 357 | 132 | 914 | 228.49 | 357 | 1507 | 1300 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 342 | 295 | 70 | 984 | 246.01 | 295 | 1501 | 1295 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $21 \%$ | 292 | 252 | 27 | 1011 | 252.74 | 252 | 1424 | 1229 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 342 | 295 | 70 | 1081 | 270.26 | 295 | 1390 | 1199 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 311 | 268 | 43 | 1124 | 281.10 | 268 | 1287 | 1110 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 307 | 265 | 40 | 1164 | 291.07 | 265 | 1252 | 1080 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $20 \%$ | 246 | 212 | 0 | 1152 | 287.88 | 212 | 1206 | 1041 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 1,672 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 3,711 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.45 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 27.04 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 1011 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue $(\mathrm{ft})$ | 30,329 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Lincoln Blvd to Southbound SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered
Peak Hour Volume: 1,540 Peak Period Volume: 4,190

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $0 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 1,540 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 1,740 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 435 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 540 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 36 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $22 \%$ | 293 | 293 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $22 \%$ | 289 | 289 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $28 \%$ | 374 | 374 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $29 \%$ | 386 | 386 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1342 | 1342 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $19 \%$ | 289 | 289 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1338 | 1338 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $22 \%$ | 323 | 323 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1372 | 1372 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $30 \%$ | 444 | 444 | 9 | 9 | 2.25 | 444 | 1442 | 1442 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $29 \%$ | 435 | 435 | 0 | 9 | 2.25 | 435 | 1491 | 1491 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $29 \%$ | 459 | 459 | 24 | 33 | 8.25 | 459 | 1661 | 1661 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 409 | 409 | 0 | 7 | 1.75 | 409 | 1747 | 1747 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $22 \%$ | 345 | 345 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1648 | 1648 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 382 | 382 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1595 | 1595 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 376 | 376 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1512 | 1512 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $21 \%$ | 305 | 305 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1408 | 1408 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 370 | 370 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1433 | 1433 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 368 | 368 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1419 | 1419 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 15 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,747 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.01 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 0.50 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 33 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 495 |

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Lincoln Blvd to Southbound SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered
Peak Hour Volume: 1,470
Peak Period Volume: 4,570

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $0 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 1,470 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 1,580 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 395 |$\quad$$\quad$|  |
| ---: | ---: |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 380 | 380 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $27 \%$ | 360 | 360 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 312 | 312 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 306 | 306 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1358 | 1358 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 431 | 431 | 36 | 36 | 9.00 | 431 | 1409 | 1409 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 371 | 371 | 0 | 12 | 3.00 | 371 | 1420 | 1420 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 348 | 348 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1456 | 1456 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 369 | 369 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1519 | 1519 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 376 | 376 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1464 | 1464 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $29 \%$ | 414 | 414 | 19 | 19 | 4.75 | 414 | 1507 | 1507 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 342 | 342 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1501 | 1501 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $21 \%$ | 292 | 292 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1424 | 1424 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 342 | 342 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1390 | 1390 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 311 | 311 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1287 | 1287 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 307 | 307 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1252 | 1252 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $20 \%$ | 246 | 246 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1206 | 1206 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 17 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,216 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.01 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 0.83 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 36 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 540 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Lincoln Blvd to Southbound SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 1,540
Peak Period Volume: 4,190

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $19 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 1,251 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 1,405 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 351 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 540 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 36 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> ulated <br> Dehicles | Total <br> (veh-hr) | Metered <br> Vehicles <br> Delayed | Hourly <br> Volume | Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $22 \%$ | 293 | 238 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $22 \%$ | 289 | 235 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $28 \%$ | 374 | 304 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $29 \%$ | 386 | 314 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1342 | 1091 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $19 \%$ | 289 | 235 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1338 | 1087 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $22 \%$ | 323 | 262 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1372 | 1115 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $30 \%$ | 444 | 361 | 10 | 10 | 2.39 | 361 | 1442 | 1172 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $29 \%$ | 435 | 354 | 2 | 12 | 2.95 | 354 | 1491 | 1212 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $29 \%$ | 459 | 373 | 22 | 34 | 8.39 | 373 | 1661 | 1350 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 409 | 332 | 0 | 15 | 3.67 | 332 | 1747 | 1420 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $22 \%$ | 345 | 280 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1648 | 1339 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 382 | 310 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1595 | 1296 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 376 | 306 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1512 | 1229 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $21 \%$ | 305 | 248 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1408 | 1144 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 370 | 301 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1433 | 1165 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 368 | 299 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1419 | 1153 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 17 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,420 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.01 |
| Average Delay (min) | 0.74 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Lincoln Blvd to Southbound SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 1,470
Peak Period Volume: 4,570

| HOV Bypass (\%) | 14\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 1,268 | Storage Length (ft) | 540 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 1,345 | Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 336 | Maximum Storage (veh) | 36 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Demand | Total <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 380 | 328 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $27 \%$ | 360 | 311 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 312 | 269 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 306 | 264 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1358 | 1172 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 431 | 372 | 36 | 36 | 8.91 | 372 | 1409 | 1216 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 371 | 320 | 0 | 19 | 4.87 | 320 | 1420 | 1225 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 348 | 300 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1456 | 1256 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 369 | 318 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1519 | 1311 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 376 | 324 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1464 | 1263 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $29 \%$ | 414 | 357 | 21 | 21 | 5.24 | 357 | 1507 | 1300 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 342 | 295 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1501 | 1295 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $21 \%$ | 292 | 252 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1424 | 1229 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 342 | 295 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1390 | 1199 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 311 | 268 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1287 | 1110 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 307 | 265 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1252 | 1080 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $20 \%$ | 246 | 212 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1206 | 1041 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 19 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,049 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.02 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.09 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 36 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 534 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Twelve Bridges Dr to Southbound SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 1,070
Peak Period Volume: 3,470

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $17 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 888 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 900 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 225 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 590 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 20 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $22 \%$ | 112 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $22 \%$ | 110 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $28 \%$ | 143 | 119 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $29 \%$ | 148 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 513 | 426 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $17 \%$ | 172 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 573 | 475 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 247 | 205 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 710 | 589 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $30 \%$ | 309 | 256 | 31 | 31 | 7.83 | 256 | 876 | 727 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $30 \%$ | 315 | 261 | 36 | 68 | 16.90 | 261 | 1043 | 865 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $32 \%$ | 348 | 289 | 64 | 131 | 32.81 | 289 | 1219 | 1011 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 256 | 212 | 0 | 119 | 29.65 | 212 | 1228 | 1019 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 258 | 214 | 0 | 108 | 26.90 | 214 | 1177 | 976 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $21 \%$ | 231 | 192 | 0 | 74 | 18.55 | 192 | 1093 | 907 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 278 | 231 | 6 | 80 | 19.95 | 231 | 1023 | 849 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $21 \%$ | 225 | 187 | 0 | 41 | 10.36 | 187 | 992 | 823 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 274 | 227 | 2 | 44 | 10.93 | 227 | 1008 | 836 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 272 | 226 | 1 | 44 | 11.09 | 226 | 1049 | 870 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 185 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 2,294 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.08 |
| Average Delay (min) | 4.84 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Twelve Bridges Dr to Southbound SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 940
Peak Period Volume: 3,440

| HOV Bypass (\%) | 10\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 844 | Storage Length (ft) | 590 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 900 | Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 225 | Maximum Storage (veh) | 20 |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 285 | 256 | 31 | 31 | 7.75 | 256 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $27 \%$ | 270 | 243 | 18 | 49 | 12.14 | 243 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 234 | 210 | 0 | 34 | 8.44 | 210 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 230 | 207 | 0 | 15 | 3.84 | 207 | 1019 | 915 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $29 \%$ | 247 | 222 | 0 | 12 | 3.06 | 222 | 981 | 881 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 213 | 191 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 924 | 830 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 195 | 175 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 885 | 795 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $22 \%$ | 189 | 170 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 844 | 758 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $33 \%$ | 340 | 305 | 80 | 80 | 20.10 | 305 | 937 | 842 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $29 \%$ | 303 | 272 | 47 | 128 | 31.90 | 272 | 1027 | 923 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 235 | 211 | 0 | 114 | 28.42 | 211 | 1067 | 958 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $15 \%$ | 158 | 142 | 0 | 31 | 7.66 | 142 | 1036 | 931 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 123 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 819 | 736 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 112 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 628 | 564 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 110 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 503 | 452 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $20 \%$ | 88 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 433 | 389 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 123 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 2,068 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.06 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 3.58 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 128 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 3,828 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Twelve Bridges Dr to Southbound SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered
Peak Hour Volume: 1,070
Peak Period Volume: 3,470

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $0 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 1,070 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 1,225 |
| Discharge Rate $(\mathrm{veh} / 15 \mathrm{~min})$ | 306 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 850 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 57 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $22 \%$ | 112 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $22 \%$ | 110 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $28 \%$ | 143 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $29 \%$ | 148 | 148 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 513 | 513 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $17 \%$ | 172 | 172 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 573 | 573 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 247 | 247 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 710 | 710 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $30 \%$ | 309 | 309 | 3 | 3 | 0.69 | 309 | 876 | 876 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $30 \%$ | 315 | 315 | 9 | 12 | 2.88 | 315 | 1043 | 1043 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $32 \%$ | 348 | 348 | 42 | 53 | 13.31 | 348 | 1219 | 1219 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 256 | 256 | 0 | 3 | 0.75 | 256 | 1228 | 1228 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 258 | 258 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1177 | 1177 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $21 \%$ | 231 | 231 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1093 | 1093 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 278 | 278 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1023 | 1023 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $21 \%$ | 225 | 225 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 992 | 992 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 274 | 274 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1008 | 1008 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 272 | 272 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1049 | 1049 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 18 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,228 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.01 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 0.86 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 53 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 799 |

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Twelve Bridges Dr to Southbound SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered
Peak Hour Volume: 940
Peak Period Volume: 3,440

| HOV Bypass (\%) | 0\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 940 | Storage Length (ft) | 850 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 1,175 | Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 294 | Maximum Storage (veh) | 57 |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> (lated <br> Dehicles | Total <br> (veh-hr) | Metered <br> Vehicles <br> Delayed | Hourly <br> Volume | Holume <br> Volum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 285 | 285 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $27 \%$ | 270 | 270 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 234 | 234 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 230 | 230 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1019 | 1019 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $29 \%$ | 247 | 247 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 981 | 981 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 213 | 213 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 924 | 924 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 195 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 885 | 885 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $22 \%$ | 189 | 189 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 844 | 844 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $33 \%$ | 340 | 340 | 46 | 46 | 11.56 | 340 | 937 | 937 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $29 \%$ | 303 | 303 | 9 | 56 | 13.88 | 303 | 1027 | 1027 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 235 | 235 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1067 | 1067 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $15 \%$ | 158 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1036 | 1036 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 123 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 819 | 819 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 112 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 628 | 628 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 110 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 503 | 503 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $20 \%$ | 88 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 433 | 433 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 25 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 643 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.04 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 2.37 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 56 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 833 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Westbound Placer Pkwy to SB SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 370 Peak Period Volume: $\quad 1,110$

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $30 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 257 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 360 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 90 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 640 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 21 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $18 \%$ | 57 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 79 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $28 \%$ | 91 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $30 \%$ | 97 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 324 | 225 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $22 \%$ | 70 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 337 | 234 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 84 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 342 | 238 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $22 \%$ | 70 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 321 | 223 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $30 \%$ | 94 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 318 | 221 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 99 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 347 | 241 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $33 \%$ | 144 | 100 | 10 | 10 | 2.55 | 100 | 407 | 283 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $20 \%$ | 88 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 425 | 296 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 101 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 432 | 301 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 150 | 104 | 14 | 14 | 3.59 | 104 | 483 | 336 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 130 | 90 | 0 | 15 | 3.71 | 90 | 469 | 326 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $19 \%$ | 106 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 487 | 339 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $29 \%$ | 159 | 111 | 21 | 21 | 5.16 | 111 | 545 | 379 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 15 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 406 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.04 |
| Average Delay (min) | 2.22 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Westbound Placer Pkwy to SB SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 390
Peak Period Volume: 1,210

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $28 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 280 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 340 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 85 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 640 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 21 |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> (lated <br> Dehicles | Total <br> (veh-hr) | Metered <br> Vehicles <br> Delayed | Hourly <br> Volume | Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $24 \%$ | 109 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 100 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $32 \%$ | 144 | 103 | 18 | 18 | 4.56 | 103 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $21 \%$ | 93 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 446 | 320 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 108 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 445 | 319 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $21 \%$ | 96 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 441 | 316 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $32 \%$ | 147 | 105 | 20 | 20 | 5.10 | 105 | 444 | 318 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 110 | 79 | 0 | 14 | 3.57 | 79 | 461 | 331 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $34 \%$ | 110 | 79 | 0 | 8 | 2.03 | 79 | 463 | 332 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 76 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 443 | 318 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 81 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 377 | 270 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $17 \%$ | 54 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 321 | 230 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $31 \%$ | 96 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 307 | 220 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 74 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 305 | 219 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 85 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 309 | 222 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $18 \%$ | 57 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 312 | 224 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 15 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 366 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.04 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 2.50 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 20 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 612 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Eastbound Placer Pkwy to SB SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 570
Peak Period Volume: 1,980

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $17 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 472 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 650 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 163 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 920 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 31 |


| Time Interval | Hourly Arrival Distribution | 15-Minute Volumes | Metered 15-Minute min flows | Excess <br> Demand | ```Accum- ulated Vehicles``` | Total Delay (veh-hr) | Vehicles Delayed | Total Hourly Volume | Metered Hourly Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6:00-6:15 | 26\% | 53 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:15-6:30 | 19\% | 38 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:30-6:45 | 26\% | 51 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:45-7:00 | 29\% | 59 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 201 | 167 |
| 7:00-7:15 | 19\% | 140 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 288 | 239 |
| 7:15-7:30 | 25\% | 181 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 431 | 357 |
| 7:30-7:45 | 24\% | 174 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 554 | 459 |
| 7:45-8:00 | 32\% | 232 | 192 | 30 | 30 | 7.45 | 192 | 727 | 603 |
| 8:00-8:15 | 23\% | 91 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 678 | 562 |
| 8:15-8:30 | 27\% | 108 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 605 | 501 |
| 8:30-8:45 | 27\% | 108 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 539 | 447 |
| 8:45-9:00 | 24\% | 97 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 404 | 335 |
| 9:00-9:15 | 26\% | 115 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 428 | 355 |
| 9:15-9:30 | 25\% | 112 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 432 | 358 |
| 9:30-9:45 | 25\% | 113 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 437 | 362 |
| 9:45-10:00 | 24\% | 106 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 446 | 370 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 7 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 192 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.04 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 2.32 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Eastbound Placer Pkwy to SB SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 750
Peak Period Volume: 2,820

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $23 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 577 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 650 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 163 |$\quad$$\quad$|  |
| ---: | ---: |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 225 | 173 | 11 | 11 | 2.67 | 173 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 204 | 157 | 0 | 5 | 1.30 | 157 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $28 \%$ | 241 | 185 | 23 | 28 | 7.05 | 185 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 195 | 150 | 0 | 16 | 3.95 | 150 | 865 | 666 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 190 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 830 | 639 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 175 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 801 | 617 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $28 \%$ | 190 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 750 | 577 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $18 \%$ | 125 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 680 | 523 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 217 | 167 | 5 | 5 | 1.13 | 167 | 707 | 544 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $29 \%$ | 235 | 181 | 18 | 23 | 5.73 | 181 | 767 | 590 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 201 | 155 | 0 | 15 | 3.78 | 155 | 778 | 599 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $20 \%$ | 162 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 815 | 627 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $24 \%$ | 142 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 740 | 570 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $29 \%$ | 169 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 674 | 519 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 151 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 624 | 480 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $20 \%$ | 119 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 581 | 447 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 26 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,168 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.02 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.31 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 28 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 846 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Westbound Sunset Blvd to SB SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 680 Peak Period Volume: $\quad 2,030$

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $6 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 641 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 740 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 185 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 595 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 20 |


| Time Interval | Hourly Arrival Distribution | 15-Minute Volumes | Metered 15-Minute min flows | Excess <br> Demand | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Accum- } \\ \text { ulated } \\ \text { Vehicles } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total Delay (veh-hr) | Vehicles Delayed | Total Hourly Volume | Metered Hourly Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6:00-6:15 | 18\% | 61 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:15-6:30 | 24\% | 85 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:30-6:45 | 28\% | 98 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:45-7:00 | 30\% | 105 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 349 | 329 |
| 7:00-7:15 | 22\% | 162 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 450 | 424 |
| 7:15-7:30 | 26\% | 194 | 183 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 559 | 527 |
| 7:30-7:45 | 22\% | 162 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 623 | 587 |
| 7:45-8:00 | 30\% | 217 | 204 | 19 | 19 | 4.87 | 204 | 735 | 693 |
| 8:00-8:15 | 23\% | 143 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 716 | 675 |
| 8:15-8:30 | 33\% | 209 | 197 | 12 | 12 | 2.99 | 197 | 731 | 689 |
| 8:30-8:45 | 20\% | 127 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 696 | 656 |
| 8:45-9:00 | 23\% | 147 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 626 | 590 |
| 9:00-9:15 | 27\% | 120 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 603 | 568 |
| 9:15-9:30 | 24\% | 104 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 498 | 469 |
| 9:30-9:45 | 19\% | 85 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 456 | 430 |
| 9:45-10:00 | 29\% | 127 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 436 | 411 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 8 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 401 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.02 |
| Average Delay (min) | 1.17 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Westbound Sunset Blvd to SB SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 960
Peak Period Volume: 2,970

| HOV Bypass (\%) | 11\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 850 | Storage Length (ft) | 595 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 900 | Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 225 | Maximum Storage (veh) | 20 |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> (lated <br> Delay <br> (eh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $24 \%$ | 218 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 201 | 178 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $32 \%$ | 286 | 253 | 28 | 28 | 7.03 | 253 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $21 \%$ | 185 | 164 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 890 | 788 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 205 | 181 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 877 | 776 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $21 \%$ | 183 | 162 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 859 | 760 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $32 \%$ | 280 | 248 | 23 | 23 | 5.70 | 248 | 853 | 755 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 209 | 185 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 877 | 776 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $34 \%$ | 356 | 315 | 90 | 90 | 22.52 | 315 | 1028 | 910 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 246 | 218 | 0 | 83 | 20.70 | 218 | 1091 | 966 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 260 | 230 | 5 | 88 | 21.97 | 230 | 1071 | 948 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $17 \%$ | 173 | 153 | 0 | 16 | 4.00 | 153 | 1035 | 916 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $31 \%$ | 219 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 898 | 795 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 169 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 821 | 727 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 194 | 172 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 755 | 668 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $18 \%$ | 130 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 712 | 630 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 82 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,417 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.06 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 3.47 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 90 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 2,702 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Westbound Sunset Blvd to SB SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered
Peak Hour Volume: 680 Peak Period Volume: $\quad \mathbf{2 , 0 3 0}$

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $0 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 680 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 715 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 179 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 595 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 40 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $18 \%$ | 61 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 85 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $28 \%$ | 98 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $30 \%$ | 105 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 349 | 349 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $22 \%$ | 162 | 162 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 450 | 450 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 194 | 194 | 15 | 15 | 3.81 | 194 | 559 | 559 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $22 \%$ | 162 | 162 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 623 | 623 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $30 \%$ | 217 | 217 | 38 | 38 | 9.56 | 217 | 735 | 735 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 143 | 143 | 0 | 3 | 0.63 | 143 | 716 | 716 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $33 \%$ | 209 | 209 | 30 | 33 | 8.19 | 209 | 731 | 731 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $20 \%$ | 127 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 696 | 696 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 147 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 626 | 626 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 120 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 603 | 603 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 104 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 498 | 498 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $19 \%$ | 85 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 456 | 456 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $29 \%$ | 127 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 436 | 436 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 22 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 763 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{hr})$ | 0.03 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.74 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Westbound Sunset Blvd to SB SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered
Peak Hour Volume: 960
Peak Period Volume: 2,970

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $0 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume $(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr})$ | 960 |
| Metering Rate $(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr})$ | 1,270 |
| Discharge Rate $(\mathrm{veh} / 15 \mathrm{~min})$ | 318 |$\quad$$\quad$|  |
| ---: |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> (lated <br> Dehicles | Total <br> (veh-hr) | Metered <br> Vehicles <br> Delayed | Hourly <br> Volume | Volume <br> Volurl |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $24 \%$ | 218 | 218 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 201 | 201 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $32 \%$ | 286 | 286 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $21 \%$ | 185 | 185 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 890 | 890 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 205 | 205 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 877 | 877 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $21 \%$ | 183 | 183 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 859 | 859 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $32 \%$ | 280 | 280 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 853 | 853 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 209 | 209 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 877 | 877 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $34 \%$ | 356 | 356 | 39 | 39 | 9.63 | 356 | 1028 | 1028 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 246 | 246 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1091 | 1091 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 260 | 260 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1071 | 1071 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $17 \%$ | 173 | 173 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1035 | 1035 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $31 \%$ | 219 | 219 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 898 | 898 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 169 | 169 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 821 | 821 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 194 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 755 | 755 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $18 \%$ | 130 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 712 | 712 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 10 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 356 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.03 |
| Average Delay (min) | 1.62 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 39 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 578 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Eastbound Sunset Blvd to SB SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 550 Peak Period Volume: 1,910

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $14 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 474 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 500 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 125 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 560 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 37 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | Metered <br> Volumes | Meninute <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> Dehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> veh-hr) | Metered <br> Vehicles <br> Delayed | Hourly <br> Volume | Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 112 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $19 \%$ | 81 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 109 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $29 \%$ | 125 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 427 | 368 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $19 \%$ | 96 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 411 | 354 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 124 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 454 | 391 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 119 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 464 | 399 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $32 \%$ | 159 | 137 | 12 | 12 | 2.97 | 137 | 498 | 429 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 134 | 115 | 0 | 2 | 0.56 | 115 | 536 | 461 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $27 \%$ | 160 | 138 | 13 | 15 | 3.75 | 138 | 572 | 492 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 160 | 138 | 13 | 28 | 6.94 | 138 | 613 | 528 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 143 | 123 | 0 | 26 | 6.47 | 123 | 597 | 514 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 151 | 130 | 5 | 31 | 7.72 | 130 | 614 | 529 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 147 | 127 | 2 | 32 | 8.11 | 127 | 601 | 517 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 149 | 128 | 3 | 36 | 8.93 | 128 | 590 | 508 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 140 | 121 | 0 | 31 | 7.81 | 121 | 587 | 505 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 53 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,156 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{hr})$ | 0.05 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 2.76 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Eastbound Sunset Blvd to SB SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 750
Peak Period Volume: 2,820

| HOV Bypass (\%) | 23\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 577 | Storage Length (ft) | 560 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 640 | Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 160 | Maximum Storage (veh) | 37 |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Demand | Total <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 225 | 173 | 13 | 13 | 3.30 | 173 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 204 | 157 | 0 | 10 | 2.55 | 157 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $28 \%$ | 241 | 185 | 25 | 36 | 8.93 | 185 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 195 | 150 | 0 | 26 | 6.45 | 150 | 865 | 666 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 190 | 146 | 0 | 12 | 3.01 | 146 | 830 | 639 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 175 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 801 | 617 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $28 \%$ | 190 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 750 | 577 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $18 \%$ | 125 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 680 | 523 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 217 | 167 | 7 | 7 | 1.76 | 167 | 707 | 544 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $29 \%$ | 235 | 181 | 21 | 28 | 6.98 | 181 | 767 | 590 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 201 | 155 | 0 | 23 | 5.65 | 155 | 778 | 599 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $20 \%$ | 162 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 815 | 627 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $24 \%$ | 142 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 740 | 570 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $29 \%$ | 169 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 674 | 519 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 151 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 624 | 480 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $20 \%$ | 119 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 581 | 447 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 39 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,315 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.03 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.76 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 36 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 536 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Westbound Blue Oaks Blvd to SB SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 530 Peak Period Volume: $\quad 1,790$

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $9 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 481 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 510 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 128 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 1,140 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 38 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $20 \%$ | 98 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $21 \%$ | 102 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $29 \%$ | 145 | 132 | 4 | 4 | 1.02 | 132 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $30 \%$ | 149 | 135 | 8 | 12 | 2.96 | 135 | 494 | 448 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 138 | 125 | 0 | 10 | 2.39 | 125 | 534 | 485 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $27 \%$ | 134 | 122 | 0 | 4 | 0.92 | 122 | 566 | 514 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 128 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 549 | 498 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $19 \%$ | 94 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 494 | 448 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $29 \%$ | 162 | 147 | 20 | 20 | 4.88 | 147 | 518 | 470 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $28 \%$ | 159 | 144 | 17 | 36 | 9.08 | 144 | 543 | 493 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 138 | 125 | 0 | 34 | 8.52 | 125 | 553 | 502 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $19 \%$ | 109 | 99 | 0 | 5 | 1.37 | 99 | 568 | 515 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 77 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 483 | 438 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $28 \%$ | 83 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 407 | 369 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $22 \%$ | 63 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 332 | 301 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 69 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 292 | 265 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 31 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,029 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.03 |
| Average Delay (min) | 1.82 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 36 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 1,090 |

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Westbound Blue Oaks Blvd to SB SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 370
Peak Period Volume: 1,330

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $2 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 362 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 370 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 93 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 1,140 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 38 |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> (lated <br> Delay <br> (eh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 92 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 92 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $28 \%$ | 101 | 99 | 6 | 6 | 1.59 | 99 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $21 \%$ | 74 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 359 | 351 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $24 \%$ | 78 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 345 | 338 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 81 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 334 | 327 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 82 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 315 | 308 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $27 \%$ | 87 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 328 | 321 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $32 \%$ | 131 | 128 | 36 | 36 | 8.93 | 128 | 381 | 373 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 94 | 92 | 0 | 35 | 8.81 | 92 | 394 | 386 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $21 \%$ | 87 | 85 | 0 | 28 | 6.98 | 85 | 399 | 391 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 104 | 102 | 9 | 37 | 9.30 | 102 | 416 | 407 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 119 | 116 | 24 | 61 | 15.30 | 116 | 404 | 395 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 99 | 97 | 4 | 66 | 16.40 | 97 | 409 | 400 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 111 | 109 | 16 | 82 | 20.44 | 109 | 433 | 424 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $22 \%$ | 93 | 91 | 0 | 80 | 20.07 | 91 | 422 | 413 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 36 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 506 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.07 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 4.22 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 37 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 1,116 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Eastbound Blue Oaks Blvd to SB SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 1,340
Peak Period Volume: 4,810

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $15 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 1,137 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 900 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 225 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 800 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 27 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $19 \%$ | 151 | 128 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:15-6:30 | $23 \%$ | 183 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $30 \%$ | 242 | 205 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $28 \%$ | 219 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 795 | 674 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 327 | 277 | 52 | 52 | 13.09 | 277 | 971 | 824 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $27 \%$ | 385 | 327 | 102 | 154 | 38.49 | 327 | 1173 | 995 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 368 | 312 | 87 | 241 | 60.27 | 312 | 1299 | 1102 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 371 | 315 | 90 | 331 | 82.70 | 315 | 1451 | 1231 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $22 \%$ | 272 | 231 | 6 | 337 | 84.13 | 231 | 1396 | 1184 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 321 | 272 | 47 | 384 | 95.95 | 272 | 1332 | 1130 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 278 | 236 | 11 | 395 | 98.65 | 236 | 1242 | 1054 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $29 \%$ | 362 | 307 | 82 | 477 | 119.17 | 307 | 1233 | 1046 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $30 \%$ | 326 | 277 | 52 | 528 | 132.05 | 277 | 1287 | 1092 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 251 | 213 | 0 | 516 | 129.02 | 213 | 1217 | 1032 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 253 | 215 | 0 | 506 | 126.42 | 215 | 1192 | 1011 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 272 | 231 | 6 | 511 | 127.85 | 231 | 1102 | 935 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 1,108 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 3,211 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{hr})$ | 0.34 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 20.70 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Eastbound Blue Oaks Blvd to SB SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 1,420
Peak Period Volume: 5,050

| HOV Bypass (\%) | 13\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 1,238 | Storage Length (ft) | 800 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 900 | Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 225 | Maximum Storage (veh) | 27 |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 353 | 308 | 83 | 83 | 20.67 | 308 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 368 | 321 | 96 | 178 | 44.60 | 321 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 412 | 359 | 134 | 312 | 78.12 | 359 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 372 | 324 | 99 | 412 | 102.92 | 324 | 1505 | 1312 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 366 | 319 | 94 | 506 | 126.42 | 319 | 1518 | 1323 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 346 | 302 | 77 | 582 | 145.56 | 302 | 1496 | 1304 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 368 | 321 | 96 | 678 | 169.49 | 321 | 1452 | 1266 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 319 | 278 | 53 | 731 | 182.75 | 278 | 1399 | 1219 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $29 \%$ | 421 | 367 | 142 | 873 | 218.23 | 367 | 1454 | 1267 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 342 | 298 | 73 | 946 | 236.50 | 298 | 1450 | 1264 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 367 | 320 | 95 | 1041 | 260.22 | 320 | 1449 | 1263 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $22 \%$ | 317 | 276 | 51 | 1092 | 273.04 | 276 | 1447 | 1261 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 366 | 319 | 94 | 1186 | 296.54 | 319 | 1392 | 1213 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $32 \%$ | 439 | 383 | 158 | 1344 | 335.94 | 383 | 1489 | 1298 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 328 | 286 | 61 | 1405 | 351.16 | 286 | 1450 | 1264 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $19 \%$ | 257 | 224 | 0 | 1404 | 350.90 | 224 | 1390 | 1211 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 1,859 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 3,792 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.49 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 29.41 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 1092 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 32,765 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: Eastbound Blue Oaks Blvd to SB SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 1,340
Peak Period Volume: 4,810

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $15 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 1,137 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 1,205 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 301 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 800 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 53 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> ulated <br> Delaicles | Total <br> (veh-hr) | Metered <br> Vehicles <br> Delayed | Hourly <br> Volume | Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $19 \%$ | 151 | 128 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:15-6:30 | $23 \%$ | 183 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $30 \%$ | 242 | 205 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $28 \%$ | 219 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 795 | 674 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 327 | 277 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 971 | 824 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $27 \%$ | 385 | 327 | 25 | 25 | 6.33 | 327 | 1173 | 995 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 368 | 312 | 11 | 36 | 9.06 | 312 | 1299 | 1102 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 371 | 315 | 13 | 50 | 12.42 | 315 | 1451 | 1231 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $22 \%$ | 272 | 231 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1396 | 1184 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 321 | 272 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1332 | 1130 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 278 | 236 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1242 | 1054 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $29 \%$ | 362 | 307 | 6 | 6 | 1.45 | 307 | 1233 | 1046 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $30 \%$ | 326 | 277 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1287 | 1092 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 251 | 213 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1217 | 1032 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 253 | 215 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1192 | 1011 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 272 | 231 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1102 | 935 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 29 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,260 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.02 |
| Average Delay (min) | 1.39 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: Eastbound Blue Oaks Blvd to SB SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 1,420
Peak Period Volume: 5,050

| HOV Bypass (\%) | 13\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 1,238 | Storage Length (ft) | 800 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 1,270 | Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 318 | Maximum Storage (veh) | 53 |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 353 | 308 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 3:15-3:30 | $24 \%$ | 368 | 321 | 3 | 3 | 0.81 | 321 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 412 | 359 | 42 | 45 | 11.20 | 359 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 372 | 324 | 7 | 52 | 12.88 | 324 | 1505 | 1312 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 366 | 319 | 1 | 53 | 13.26 | 319 | 1518 | 1323 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 346 | 302 | 0 | 37 | 9.27 | 302 | 1496 | 1304 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 368 | 321 | 3 | 40 | 10.08 | 321 | 1452 | 1266 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 319 | 278 | 0 | 1 | 0.21 | 278 | 1399 | 1219 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $29 \%$ | 421 | 367 | 49 | 50 | 12.57 | 367 | 1454 | 1267 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 342 | 298 | 0 | 31 | 7.71 | 298 | 1450 | 1264 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 367 | 320 | 2 | 33 | 8.30 | 320 | 1449 | 1263 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $22 \%$ | 317 | 276 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1447 | 1261 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 366 | 319 | 1 | 1 | 0.37 | 319 | 1392 | 1213 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $32 \%$ | 439 | 383 | 65 | 67 | 16.65 | 383 | 1489 | 1298 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 328 | 286 | 0 | 35 | 8.74 | 286 | 1450 | 1264 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $19 \%$ | 257 | 224 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1390 | 1211 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 86 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 3,208 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.03 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.61 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 53 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 795 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: WB Pleasant Grove Blvd to SB SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 740 Peak Period Volume: $\quad 2,940$

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $28 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 534 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 565 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 141 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 650 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 22 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $19 \%$ | 115 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 137 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 147 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $33 \%$ | 195 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 594 | 428 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $25 \%$ | 202 | 146 | 4 | 4 | 1.10 | 146 | 681 | 491 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 205 | 148 | 7 | 11 | 2.73 | 148 | 749 | 540 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 205 | 148 | 7 | 17 | 4.37 | 148 | 807 | 582 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 183 | 132 | 0 | 8 | 2.04 | 132 | 795 | 573 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 155 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 748 | 539 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 180 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 723 | 521 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 157 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 675 | 487 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $28 \%$ | 193 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 685 | 494 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $29 \%$ | 152 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 682 | 492 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $29 \%$ | 156 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 658 | 474 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $21 \%$ | 112 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 613 | 442 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $21 \%$ | 113 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 533 | 384 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 10 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 573 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.02 |
| Average Delay (min) | 1.07 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: WB Pleasant Grove Blvd to SB SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 640
Peak Period Volume: $\mathbf{2 , 6 3 0}$

| HOV Bypass (\%) | 27\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 464 | Storage Length (ft) | 650 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 490 | Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 123 | Maximum Storage (veh) | 22 |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> (lated <br> Dehicles | Total <br> (veh-hr) | Metered <br> Vehicles <br> Delayed | Hourly <br> Volume | Holurly <br> Volue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $25 \%$ | 165 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $29 \%$ | 191 | 139 | 16 | 16 | 4.02 | 139 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $20 \%$ | 132 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 165 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 653 | 474 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $25 \%$ | 172 | 125 | 2 | 2 | 0.57 | 125 | 660 | 479 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 163 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 632 | 459 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 167 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 667 | 484 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $28 \%$ | 198 | 144 | 21 | 21 | 5.29 | 144 | 700 | 508 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $24 \%$ | 142 | 103 | 0 | 2 | 0.42 | 103 | 670 | 486 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 146 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 653 | 474 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 138 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 624 | 453 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $27 \%$ | 156 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 582 | 422 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $24 \%$ | 135 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 575 | 417 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 151 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 580 | 421 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 153 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 595 | 432 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 135 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 574 | 416 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 10 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 510 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.02 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.21 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 21 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 634 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: EB Pleasant Grove Blvd to SB SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 810 Peak Period Volume: $\quad 2,790$

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $16 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 677 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 700 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 175 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 900 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 30 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $18 \%$ | 57 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 75 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $31 \%$ | 100 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $29 \%$ | 93 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 325 | 272 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 192 | 161 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 460 | 385 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $28 \%$ | 227 | 190 | 15 | 15 | 3.71 | 190 | 612 | 512 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 206 | 172 | 0 | 12 | 3.03 | 172 | 718 | 600 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 194 | 162 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 819 | 685 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 211 | 176 | 1 | 1 | 0.37 | 176 | 838 | 701 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 191 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 802 | 671 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 194 | 162 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 790 | 661 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 197 | 165 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 793 | 663 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $35 \%$ | 244 | 204 | 29 | 29 | 7.27 | 204 | 826 | 691 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 169 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 804 | 672 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 164 | 137 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 774 | 647 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $17 \%$ | 116 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 693 | 580 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 14 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 743 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.02 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.16 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 29 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 872 |

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: EB Pleasant Grove Blvd to SB SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 1,190
Peak Period Volume: 4,620

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $19 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 960 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 900 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 225 |$\quad$$\quad$|  |
| ---: | ---: |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> (lated <br> Delay <br> (eh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $25 \%$ | 281 | 227 | 2 | 2 | 0.44 | 227 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 275 | 222 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 258 | 208 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 293 | 236 | 11 | 11 | 2.86 | 236 | 1107 | 893 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $24 \%$ | 272 | 219 | 0 | 6 | 1.48 | 219 | 1098 | 886 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $30 \%$ | 340 | 274 | 49 | 55 | 13.82 | 274 | 1163 | 938 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 264 | 213 | 0 | 43 | 10.83 | 213 | 1169 | 943 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 264 | 213 | 0 | 31 | 7.83 | 213 | 1140 | 920 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 350 | 282 | 57 | 89 | 22.19 | 282 | 1218 | 983 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $27 \%$ | 332 | 268 | 43 | 132 | 32.92 | 268 | 1210 | 976 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $22 \%$ | 271 | 219 | 0 | 125 | 31.34 | 219 | 1217 | 982 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 296 | 239 | 14 | 139 | 34.80 | 239 | 1249 | 1008 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 231 | 186 | 0 | 101 | 25.15 | 186 | 1130 | 912 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $28 \%$ | 238 | 192 | 0 | 68 | 16.91 | 192 | 1036 | 836 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 194 | 157 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 959 | 774 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $22 \%$ | 182 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 845 | 682 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 159 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 2,391 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.07 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 3.98 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 139 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 4,176 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: EB Pleasant Grove Blvd to SB SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered
Peak Hour Volume: 810 Peak Period Volume: 2,790

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $0 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 810 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 805 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 201 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 900 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 60 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> ulated <br> Delaicles | Total <br> (veh-hr) | Metered <br> Vehicles <br> Delayed | Hourly <br> Volume | Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6:00-6:15 | $18 \%$ | 57 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| 6:15-6:30 | $23 \%$ | 75 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $31 \%$ | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $29 \%$ | 93 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 325 | 325 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 192 | 192 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 460 | 460 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $28 \%$ | 227 | 227 | 26 | 26 | 6.44 | 227 | 612 | 612 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 206 | 206 | 5 | 31 | 7.63 | 206 | 718 | 718 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 194 | 194 | 0 | 23 | 5.81 | 194 | 819 | 819 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 211 | 211 | 10 | 33 | 8.25 | 211 | 838 | 838 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 191 | 191 | 0 | 23 | 5.69 | 191 | 802 | 802 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 194 | 194 | 0 | 16 | 3.88 | 194 | 790 | 790 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 197 | 197 | 0 | 11 | 2.81 | 197 | 793 | 793 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $35 \%$ | 244 | 244 | 43 | 54 | 13.50 | 244 | 826 | 826 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 169 | 169 | 0 | 22 | 5.44 | 169 | 804 | 804 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 164 | 164 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 774 | 774 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $17 \%$ | 116 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 693 | 693 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 59 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,833 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.03 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.95 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: EB Pleasant Grove Blvd to SB SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered
Peak Hour Volume: 1,190
Peak Period Volume: 4,620

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $0 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 1,190 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 1,245 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 311 |$\quad$$\quad$|  |
| ---: | ---: |


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> (lated <br> Delay <br> (eh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $25 \%$ | 281 | 281 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 275 | 275 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 258 | 258 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 293 | 293 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1107 | 1107 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $24 \%$ | 272 | 272 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1098 | 1098 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $30 \%$ | 340 | 340 | 29 | 29 | 7.19 | 340 | 1163 | 1163 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 264 | 264 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1169 | 1169 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 264 | 264 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1140 | 1140 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 350 | 350 | 39 | 39 | 9.69 | 350 | 1218 | 1218 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $27 \%$ | 332 | 332 | 21 | 60 | 14.88 | 332 | 1210 | 1210 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $22 \%$ | 271 | 271 | 0 | 19 | 4.81 | 271 | 1217 | 1217 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 296 | 296 | 0 | 4 | 1.00 | 296 | 1249 | 1249 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 231 | 231 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1130 | 1130 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $28 \%$ | 238 | 238 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1036 | 1036 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 194 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 959 | 959 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $22 \%$ | 182 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 845 | 845 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 38 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,589 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.02 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.42 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 60 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 893 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Ramp: EB Pleasant Grove Blvd to SB SR 65 Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 810 Peak Period Volume: $\quad 2,790$

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $16 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume (veh/hr) | 677 |
| Metering Rate (veh/hr) | 670 |
| Discharge Rate (veh/15 min) | 168 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 900 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 60 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Excess <br> Demand | Accum- <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Vehicles <br> Delayed | Total <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Metered <br> Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $18 \%$ | 57 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 75 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $31 \%$ | 100 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $29 \%$ | 93 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 325 | 272 |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $23 \%$ | 192 | 161 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 460 | 385 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $28 \%$ | 227 | 190 | 22 | 22 | 5.59 | 190 | 612 | 512 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 206 | 172 | 5 | 27 | 6.78 | 172 | 718 | 600 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 194 | 162 | 0 | 22 | 5.47 | 162 | 819 | 685 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 211 | 176 | 9 | 31 | 7.71 | 176 | 838 | 701 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 191 | 160 | 0 | 23 | 5.77 | 160 | 802 | 671 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 194 | 162 | 0 | 18 | 4.46 | 162 | 790 | 661 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 197 | 165 | 0 | 15 | 3.78 | 165 | 793 | 663 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $35 \%$ | 244 | 204 | 37 | 52 | 12.92 | 204 | 826 | 691 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 169 | 141 | 0 | 26 | 6.38 | 141 | 804 | 672 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 164 | 137 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 774 | 647 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $17 \%$ | 116 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 693 | 580 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 59 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,533 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{hr})$ | 0.04 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 2.30 |$\quad$

Location: SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements
Ramp: EB Pleasant Grove Blvd to SB SR 65
Scenario: Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 1,190
Peak Period Volume: 4,620

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $19 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume $(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr})$ | 960 |
| Metering Rate $(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr})$ | 985 |
| Discharge Rate $(\mathrm{veh} / 15 \mathrm{~min})$ | 246 |$\quad$


| Time <br> Interval | Arrival <br> Distribution | 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> (lated <br> Dehicles | Total <br> (veh-hr) | Metered <br> Vehicles <br> Delayed | Hourly <br> Volume | Holurly <br> Volue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $25 \%$ | 281 | 227 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 275 | 222 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 258 | 208 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 293 | 236 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1107 | 893 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $24 \%$ | 272 | 219 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1098 | 886 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $30 \%$ | 340 | 274 | 28 | 28 | 7.03 | 274 | 1163 | 938 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 264 | 213 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1169 | 943 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $23 \%$ | 264 | 213 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1140 | 920 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $28 \%$ | 350 | 282 | 36 | 36 | 9.04 | 282 | 1218 | 983 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $27 \%$ | 332 | 268 | 22 | 58 | 14.46 | 268 | 1210 | 976 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $22 \%$ | 271 | 219 | 0 | 30 | 7.56 | 219 | 1217 | 982 |
| $5: 45-6: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 296 | 239 | 0 | 23 | 5.72 | 239 | 1249 | 1008 |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 231 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1130 | 912 |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $28 \%$ | 238 | 192 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1036 | 836 |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 194 | 157 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 959 | 774 |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $22 \%$ | 182 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 845 | 682 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 44 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,282 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.03 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 2.05 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 58 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 867 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: Stanford Ranch Rd/SR 65 Northbound Ramps
Ramp: Galleria Boulevard to Southbound SR 65
Scenario: Build Alternative Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 720
Peak Period Volume: $\mathbf{2 , 4 2 0}$

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $21 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume $(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr})$ | 568 |
| Metering Rate $(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr})$ | 645 |
| Discharge Rate $(\mathrm{veh} / 15 \mathrm{~min})$ | 161 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 640 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 21 |

$\left.\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline \begin{array}{c}\text { Time } \\ \text { Interval }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Hourly } \\ \text { Arrival } \\ \text { Distribution }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Estimated } \\ \text { 15-Minute } \\ \text { Volumes }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Metered } \\ \text { 15-Minute } \\ \text { min flows }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Accum- } \\ \text { Excess } \\ \text { Demand }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Total } \\ \text { ulated } \\ \text { Vehicles }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Total } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (veh-hr) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Metered } \\ \text { Vehicles } \\ \text { Delayed }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Hourly } \\ \text { Volume }\end{array} \\ \hline 6: 00-6: 15 & 18 \% & 92 & 73 & 0 & 0 & 0.00 & 0 & & \\ \text { Volume }\end{array}\right\}$

| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 6 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 343 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.02 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 0.97 |$\quad$| $\quad$ Maximum Queue (veh) | 20 |
| ---: | ---: |

Project: Stanford Ranch Rd/SR 65 Northbound Ramps Ramp: Galleria Boulevard to Southbound SR 65
Scenario: Build Alternative Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 1 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 1,210
Peak Period Volume: $\mathbf{4 , 6 7 0}$

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $15 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume $(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr})$ | 1,031 |
| Metering Rate $(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr})$ | 900 |
| Discharge Rate $(\mathrm{veh} / 15 \mathrm{~min})$ | 225 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 640 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 21 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | Estimated <br> 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Metered <br> Vehicles <br> Delayed | Cotal <br> Hourly <br> Volume | Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $25 \%$ | 310 | 264 | 39 | 39 | 9.79 | 264 |  |  |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $24 \%$ | 305 | 260 | 35 | 74 | 18.51 | 260 |  |  |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $25 \%$ | 317 | 270 | 45 | 119 | 29.79 | 270 |  |  |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $26 \%$ | 330 | 281 | 56 | 175 | 43.84 | 281 | 1262 | 1075 |
| $4: 00-4: 15$ | $25 \%$ | 324 | 276 | 51 | 226 | 56.61 | 276 | 1276 | 1087 |
| $4: 15-4: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 321 | 274 | 49 | 275 | 68.75 | 274 | 1292 | 1101 |
| $4: 30-4: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 337 | 287 | 62 | 337 | 84.29 | 287 | 1312 | 1118 |
| $4: 45-5: 00$ | $25 \%$ | 321 | 274 | 49 | 386 | 96.42 | 274 | 1303 | 1110 |
| $5: 00-5: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 303 | 258 | 33 | 419 | 104.72 | 258 | 1282 | 1092 |
| $5: 15-5: 30$ | $25 \%$ | 274 | 233 | 8 | 427 | 106.84 | 233 | 1235 | 1052 |
| $5: 30-5: 45$ | $24 \%$ | 268 | 228 | 3 | 431 | 107.68 | 228 | 1166 | 994 |
| $5: 45-3: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 267 | 228 | 3 | 433 | 108.31 | 228 | 1112 | 948 |
| $3: 00-3: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 288 | 245 | 20 | 454 | 113.41 | 245 | 1097 | 935 |
| $3: 15-3: 30$ | $26 \%$ | 285 | 243 | 18 | 471 | 117.87 | 243 | 1108 | 944 |
| $3: 30-3: 45$ | $27 \%$ | 293 | 250 | 25 | 496 | 124.04 | 250 | 1133 | 965 |
| $3: 45-4: 00$ | $20 \%$ | 222 | 189 | 0 | 460 | 115.08 | 189 | 1088 | 927 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 836 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 3,133 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{hr})$ | 0.27 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 16.00 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 433 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 12,997 |

## RAMP METERING ANALYSIS

Project: Stanford Ranch Rd/SR 65 Northbound Ramps
Ramp: Galleria Boulevard to Southbound SR 65
Scenario: Build Alternative Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 720
Peak Period Volume: $\mathbf{2 , 4 2 0}$

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $21 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume $(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr})$ | 568 |
| Metering Rate $(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr})$ | 600 |
| Discharge Rate $(\mathrm{veh} / 15 \mathrm{~min})$ | 150 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 640 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 43 |


| Time <br> Interval | Hourly <br> Arrival <br> Distribution | Estimated <br> 15-Minute <br> Volumes | Metered <br> 15-Minute <br> min flows | Accum- <br> Excess <br> Demand | Total <br> ulated <br> Vehicles | Total <br> Delay <br> (veh-hr) | Metered <br> Vehicles <br> Delayed | Hourly <br> Volume | Hourly <br> Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 00-6: 15$ | $18 \%$ | 92 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 15-6: 30$ | $20 \%$ | 101 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 30-6: 45$ | $29 \%$ | 144 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| $6: 45-7: 00$ | $33 \%$ | 164 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 501 |  |
| $7: 00-7: 15$ | $25 \%$ | 196 | 155 | 5 | 5 | 1.17 | 155 | 605 | 495 |
| $7: 15-7: 30$ | $21 \%$ | 164 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 668 | 527 |
| $7: 30-7: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 207 | 163 | 13 | 13 | 3.34 | 163 | 731 | 577 |
| $7: 45-8: 00$ | $29 \%$ | 227 | 179 | 29 | 43 | 10.63 | 179 | 794 | 627 |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | $26 \%$ | 168 | 133 | 0 | 25 | 6.28 | 133 | 766 | 605 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | $27 \%$ | 172 | 136 | 0 | 11 | 2.71 | 136 | 774 | 611 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | $23 \%$ | 148 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 715 | 564 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 155 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 643 | 507 |
| $9: 00-9: 15$ | $27 \%$ | 164 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 639 | 504 |
| $9: 15-9: 30$ | $23 \%$ | 139 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 606 | 478 |
| $9: 30-9: 45$ | $26 \%$ | 154 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 612 | 483 |
| $9: 45-10: 00$ | $24 \%$ | 147 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 604 | 477 |


| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 24 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 766 |
| Average Delay (hr) | 0.03 |
| Average Delay (min) | 1.89 |$\quad$| $\quad$ Maximum Queue (veh) | 43 |
| ---: | ---: |

Project: Stanford Ranch Rd/SR 65 Northbound Ramps Ramp: Galleria Boulevard to Southbound SR 65 Scenario: Build Alternative Design Year Conditions

Configuration: 2 metered + 1 HOV
Peak Hour Volume: 1,210
Peak Period Volume: $\mathbf{4 , 6 7 0}$

| HOV Bypass (\%) | $15 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Metered Volume $(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr})$ | 1,031 |
| Metering Rate $(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr})$ | 1,080 |
| Discharge Rate $(\mathrm{veh} / 15 \mathrm{~min})$ | 270 |


| Storage Length (ft) | 640 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |
| Maximum Storage (veh) | 43 |

$\left.\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline \begin{array}{c}\text { Time } \\ \text { Interval }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Hourly } \\ \text { Arrival } \\ \text { Distribution }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Estimated } \\ \text { 15-Minute } \\ \text { Volumes }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Metered } \\ \text { 15-Minute } \\ \text { min flows }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Accum- } \\ \text { Excess } \\ \text { Demand }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Total } \\ \text { ulated } \\ \text { Vehicles }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Total } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (veh-hr) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Metered } \\ \text { Vehicles } \\ \text { Delayed }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Totarly } \\ \text { Hourla } \\ \text { Volume }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Volume }\end{array}\right\}$

| Total Delay (veh-hr) | 40 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Total Vehicles Delayed (veh) | 1,920 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{hr})$ | 0.02 |
| Average Delay $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.24 |


| Maximum Queue (veh) | 42 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 624 |

## SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements

## Vissim Model Results - Existing Conditions

I-80/SR-65 Interchange

## Existing Conditions

| Time | VHT | VHD | Freeway <br> VHD | VMT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 AM | 4,955 | 815 | 71 | 222,524 |
| 7 AM | 9,325 | 2,820 | 768 | 326,342 |
| 8 AM | 9,752 | 2,750 | 487 | 342,530 |
| 9 AM | 7,281 | 1,422 | 133 | 290,677 |
| AM 4-HR | 31,314 | 7,807 | 1,459 | $1,182,073$ |
| 3 PM | 12,101 | 4,072 | 1,118 | 388,230 |
| 4 PM | 13,111 | 4,838 | 1,510 | 399,194 |
| 5 PM | 14,507 | 5,760 | 1,740 | 418,208 |
| 6 PM | 10,249 | 2,753 | 195 | 357,162 |
| PM 4-HR | 49,967 | 17,423 | 4,564 | $1,562,794$ |
| AM \& PM | 81,281 | 25,230 | 6,023 | $2,744,867$ |

Freeway VHD is delay when speed is
less than 35 mph on freeway links



VMT by Speed Bin

| Time | 0-5 mph | 5-10 mph | 10-15 mph | 15-20 mph | 20-25 mph | 25-30 mph | 30-35 mph | 35-40 mph | 40-45 mph | 45-50 mph | 50-55 mph | 55-60 mph | 60-65 mph |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 AM | 0 | 20 | 137 | 645 | 19,035 | 9,907 | 30,264 | 43,004 | 49,530 | 10,970 | 19,087 | 44,052 | 33,441 |
| 7 AM | 898 | 1,734 | 6,784 | 46,117 | 62,160 | 58,011 | 67,869 | 76,657 | 51,912 | 24,558 | 38,864 | 18,977 | 5,002 |
| 8 AM | 2,759 | 18,713 | 36,875 | 47,933 | 42,238 | 77,382 | 52,406 | 66,414 | 55,494 | 35,443 | 35,724 | 18,724 | 10,493 |
| 9 AM | 1,200 | 3,910 | 15,849 | 28,721 | 39,373 | 44,156 | 46,698 | 63,137 | 46,069 | 15,678 | 61,416 | 37,048 | 14,161 |
| AM 4-HR | 4,856 | 24,377 | 59,646 | 123,416 | 162,806 | 189,457 | 197,237 | 249,212 | 203,006 | 86,650 | 155,092 | 118,801 | 63,097 |
| 3 PM | 986 | 1,718 | 10,411 | 37,741 | 60,415 | 71,338 | 61,776 | 72,526 | 58,693 | 42,953 | 39,499 | 23,065 | 3,348 |
| 4 PM | 923 | 2,580 | 32,375 | 39,279 | 61,525 | 67,866 | 62,203 | 82,481 | 51,583 | 42,338 | 34,833 | 19,799 | 2,422 |
| 5 PM | 920 | 2,593 | 32,268 | 32,268 | 56,983 | 71,846 | 70,372 | 66,839 | 59,471 | 41,140 | 36,252 | 19,949 | 2,403 |
| 6 PM | 652 | 258 | 5,883 | 32,596 | 36,277 | 64,218 | 51,007 | 60,898 | 41,940 | 25,173 | 36,280 | 52,444 | 10,076 |
| PM 4-HR | 3,480 | 7,149 | 80,936 | 141,884 | 215,201 | 275,268 | 245,359 | 282,745 | 211,688 | 151,605 | 146,864 | 115,257 | 18,248 |
| AM \& PM | 8,337 | 31,526 | 140,582 | 265,300 | 378,006 | 464,725 | 442,596 | 531,956 | 414,693 | 238,254 | 301,955 | 234,059 | 81,345 |



| AM Peak Period |  |  | Modeled Conditions |  |  |  | Link Flow Criteria |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Measured Volumes |  |  |  |  | Link GEH Criteria |
|  | Link | Demand Volume (vph) | Served Volume (vph) | Difference |  |  |  |  | Measure | Meets Target? | Target | Meets Target? |
| Fwy | Location |  |  | vph | \% | GEH |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | EB - Auburn Blvd Off to On-ramp | 18,390 | 18,521 | 131 | 1\% | 1.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Auburn Blvd On-ramp | 2,374 | 2,405 | 31 | 1\% | 0.6 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | 20,764 | 20,898 | 134 | 1\% | 0.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Douglas Blvd EB Off-Ramp | 4,053 | 4,035 | -18 | 0\% | 0.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Douglas Blvd EB to WB off-ramp | 16,711 | 16,832 | 121 | 1\% | 0.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Douglas Blvd WB Off-Ramp | 940 | 972 | 32 | 3\% | 1.0 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-Ramp | 15,771 | 15,848 | 77 | 0\% | 0.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Douglas Blvd On-Ramp | 2,981 | 2,951 | -30 | -1\% | 0.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd | 18,752 | 18,783 | 31 | 0\% | 0.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Eureka Rd Off-Ramp | 3,572 | 3,754 | 182 | 5\% | 3.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Eureka Rd Off to On-ramp | 15,180 | 15,015 | -166 | -1\% | 1.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Eureka Rd EB On-Ramp | 494 | 516 | 22 | 4\% | 1.0 | +/-100 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Eureka Rd EB to WB On-Ramp | 15,674 | 15,526 | -148 | -1\% | 1.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB-Eureka Rd WB On-Ramp | 1,475 | 1,384 | -91 | -6\% | 2.4 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Eureka Rd to Taylor Rd | 17,149 | 16,903 | -246 | -1\% | 1.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Taylor Rd Off-Ramp | 744 | 814 | 70 | 9\% | 2.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Taylor Rd to SR-65 | 16,405 | 16,074 | -332 | -2\% | 2.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - SR-65 Off-Ramp | 8,324 | 7,693 | -631 | -8\% | 7.1 | +/-400 vph | No | <5 | No |  |  |
|  | EB - SR-65 Off to On-Ramp | 8,081 | 8,365 | 284 | 4\% | 3.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - SR-65 On-Ramp | 3,601 | 3,595 | -6 | 0\% | 0.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - SR-65 to Rocklin Rd | 11,682 | 11,947 | 265 | 2\% | 2.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Rocklin Rd Off-Ramp | 3,709 | 3,797 | 88 | 2\% | 1.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | 7,973 | 8,128 | 155 | 2\% | 1.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Rocklin Rd On-Ramp | 612 | 592 | -20 | -3\% | 0.8 | +/-100 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Rocklin Rd to Sierra College Blvd | 8,585 | 8,713 | 128 | 1\% | 1.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Sierra College Rd Off-Ramp | 960 | 988 | 28 | 3\% | 0.9 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-Ramp | 7,625 | 7,716 | 91 | 1\% | 1.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-Ramp | 411 | 402 | -9 | -2\% | 0.5 | +/-100 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Sierra College Blvd SB to NB On-Ramp | 8,036 | 8,117 | 81 | 1\% | 0.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-Ramp | 876 | 835 | -41 | -5\% | 1.4 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | EB - Sierra College Blvd to Horseshoe Bar Rd | 8,912 | 8,947 | 35 | 0\% | 0.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Horseshoe Bar Rd to Sierra College Blvd | 13,864 | 13,940 | 76 | 1\% | 0.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | 2,282 | 2,259 | -23 | -1\% | 0.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | 11,582 | 11,672 | 90 | 1\% | 0.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-Ramp | 194 | 196 | 2 | 1\% | 0.1 | +/-100 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Sierra College Blvd NB to SB On-Ramp | 11,776 | 11,864 | 88 | 1\% | 0.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | wB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-Ramp | 945 | 971 | 26 | 3\% | 0.8 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Sierra College Blvd to Rocklin Rd | 12,721 | 12,828 | 107 | 1\% | 1.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Rocklin Rd Off-Ramp | 686 | 686 | 0 | 0\% | 0.0 | +/-100 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-Ramp | 12,035 | 12,130 | 95 | 1\% | 0.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Rocklin Rd On-Ramp | 2,695 | 2,765 | 70 | 3\% | 1.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Rocklin Rd to SR-65 | 14,730 | 14,881 | 151 | 1\% | 1.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - SR-65 Off-Ramp | 3,865 | 4,072 | 207 | 5\% | 3.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - SR-65 Off to On-Ramp | 10,865 | 10,789 | -76 | -1\% | 0.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | Wb-SR-65 On-Ramp | 11,253 | 11,211 | -42 | 0\% | 0.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - SR-65 to Taylor Rd | 22,118 | 21,631 | -487 | -2\% | 3.3 | +/-400 vph | No | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Taylor Rd On-Ramp | 1,837 | 1,864 | 27 | 1\% | 0.6 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Taylor Rd to Atlantic St | 23,955 | 23,855 | -100 | 0\% | 0.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Atlantic St WB off-Ramp | 1,039 | 1,041 | 2 | 0\% | 0.0 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Atlantic St WB to EB Off-ramp | 22,916 | 22,807 | -109 | 0\% | 0.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Atlantic St EB Off-ramp | 2,814 | 2,719 | -95 | -3\% | 1.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Atlantic St Off to On-ramp | 20,102 | 20,087 | -15 | 0\% | 0.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Atlantic St On-Ramp | 2,382 | 2,293 | -89 | -4\% | 1.8 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Atlatnic St to Douglas Blva | 22,484 | 22,376 | -108 | 0\% | 0.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Douglas Blvd Off-Ramp | 3,203 | 3,058 | -145 | -5\% | 2.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Douglas Blvd off to On-Ramp | 19,281 | 19,318 | 37 | 0\% | 0.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | wB - Douglas Blvd WB On-Ramp | 2,693 | 2,507 | -186 | -7\% | 3.7 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Douglas Blvd WB to EB On-Ramp | 21,974 | 21,825 | -150 | -1\% | 1.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Douglas Blvd EB On-Ramp | 1,255 | 1,257 | 2 | 0\% | 0.0 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Douglas Blva to Riverside Ave | 23,229 | 23,071 | -158 | -1\% | 1.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Riverside Ave Off-ramp | 1,860 | 1,689 | -171 | -9\% | 4.1 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Riverside Ave Off to On-Ramp | 21,369 | 21,375 | 6 | 0\% | 0.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Riverside Ave NB On-ramp | 699 | 723 | 24 | 3\% | 0.9 | +/-100 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Riverside Ave NB to SB On-Ramp | 22,068 | 22,098 | 30 | 0\% | 0.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Riverside Ave SB On-ramp | 4,233 | 4,324 | 91 | 2\% | 1.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Riverside Ave to Antelope Rd | 26,301 | 26,420 | 119 | 0\% | 0.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Antelope Rd Off-ramp | 1,270 | 1,151 | -119 | -9\% | 3.4 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Antelope Rd Off to On-Ramp | 25,031 | 25,275 | 244 | 1\% | 1.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Antelope Rd WB On-ramp | 2,088 | 2,083 | -5 | 0\% | 0.1 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Antelope Rd WB to EB On-Ramp | 27,119 | 27,359 | 240 | 1\% | 1.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Antelope Rd EB On-ramp | 1,448 | 1,441 | -7 | -1\% | 0.2 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Antelope Rd to Elkhorn Blvd | 28,567 | 28,633 | 66 | 0\% | 0.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off-ramp | 2,315 | 2,148 | -167 | -7\% | 3.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB-Elkhorn Blvd Off to On-Ramp | 26,252 | 26,653 | 401 | 2\% | 2.5 | +/-400 vph | No | $<5$ | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Elkhorn Blvd WB On-ramp | 2,597 | 2,587 | -10 | 0\% | 0.2 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Elkhorn Blvd WB to EB On-Ramp | 28,849 | 29,235 | 386 | 1\% | 2.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Elkhorn Blvd EB On-ramp | 3,184 | 3,160 | -24 | -1\% | 0.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |  |  |
|  | WB - Elkhorn Blvd to Madison Ave | 32,033 | 32,393 | 360 | 1\% | 2.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | NB - $1-80$ to Stanford Ranch Rd | 12,189 | 11,737 | -452 | -4\% | 4.1 | +/-400 vph | No | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off-Ramp | 2,331 | 2,239 | -92 | -4\% | 1.9 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off to On-Ramp | 9,858 | 9,487 | -371 | -4\% | 3.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | NB - Stanford Ranch Rd On-Ramp | 1,712 | 1,698 | -14 | -1\% | 0.3 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |  |  |
|  | NB - Stanford Ranch Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | 11,570 | 11,169 | -401 | -3\% | 3.8 | +/-400 vph | No | < 5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-Ramp | 2,131 | 1,978 | -153 | -7\% | 3.4 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-Ramp | 9,439 | 9,184 | -255 | -3\% | 2.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |  |  |
|  | NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd On-Ramp | 830 | 810 | -20 | -2\% | 0.7 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |
|  | NB - Pleasant Grove to Blue Oaks Blvd | 10,269 | 9,990 | -279 | -3\% | 2.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |  |  |


|  | \|nB - Blue Oaks Blvd off-Ramp | 4,193 | 4,035 | -158 | -4\% | 2.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-Ramp | 6,076 | 5,942 | -134 | -2\% | 1.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | NB - Blue Oaks Blvd On-Ramp | 1,134 | 1,118 | -16 | -1\% | 0.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | NB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | 7,210 | 7,052 | -158 | -2\% | 1.9 | $+/-400 \mathrm{vph}$ | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | NB - Sunset Blvd Off-Ramp | 3,371 | 3,279 | -92 | -3\% | 1.6 | $+/-400 \mathrm{vph}$ | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | NB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | 3,839 | 3,766 | -73 | -2\% | 1.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | NB - Sunset Blvd EB On-Ramp | 113 | 117 | 4 | 4\% | 0.4 | +/-100 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | NB - Sunset Blvd EB to WB On-ramp | 3,952 | 3,883 | -70 | -2\% | 1.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | NB - Sunset Blvd WB On-Ramp | 609 | 597 | -12 | -2\% | 0.5 | +/-100 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | NB - Sunset Blvd to Twelve Bridges Dr | 4,561 | 4,467 | -94 | -2\% | 1.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off-Ramp | 979 | 915 | -64 | -7\% | 2.1 | +/-15\% | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | NB - Twelve Bridges Dr off to On-ramp | 3,582 | 3,542 | -41 | -1\% | 0.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | NB - Twelve Bridges Dr On-Ramp | 631 | 607 | -24 | -4\% | 1.0 | +/-100 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | NB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Sterling Pkwy | 4,213 | 4,147 | -66 | -2\% | 1.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | 3 - Sterling Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr | 8,307 | 8,327 | 20 | 0\% | 0.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | SB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off-Ramp <br> SB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-Ramp <br> SB - Twelve Bridges Dr On-Ramp | 865 | 852 | -14 | -2\% | 0.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  |  | 7,442 | 7,474 | 32 | 0\% | 0.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  |  | 1,930 | 1,876 | -54 | -3\% | 1.2 | +/-15\% | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | SB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Sunset Blvd | 9,372 | 9,343 | -29 | 0\% | 0.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  |  | 1,081 | 1,041 | -40 | -4\% | 1.2 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | SB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp <br> SB - Sunset Blvd WB On-Ramp | 8,291 | 8,294 | 3 | 0\% | 0.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  |  | 1,224 | 1,203 | -21 | -2\% | 0.6 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | SB - Sunset Blvd WB On-Ramp <br> SB - Sunset Blvd WB to EB On-Ramp <br> SB - Sunset Blvd EB On-Ramp | 9,515 | 9,497 | -18 | 0\% | 0.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  |  | 1,075 | 1,040 | -35 | -3\% | 1.1 | +/-15\% | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | SB - Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks BlvdSB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-Ramp | 10,590 | 10,534 | -56 | -1\% | 0.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  |  | 1,761 | 1,798 | 37 | 2\% | 0.9 | +/-15\% | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | SB-Blue Oaks Blvd off to On-Ramp | 8,829 | 8,729 | -100 | -1\% | 1.1 | $+/-400 \mathrm{vph}$ | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  |  | 1,330 | 1,217 | -113 | -9\% | 3.2 | +/-15\% | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-Ramp <br> SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB to EB On-Ramp | 10,159 | 9,943 | -216 | -2\% | 2.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | SB - Blue Oaks Blvd EB On-Ramp <br> SB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | 3,103 | 2,907 | -197 | -6\% | 3.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 13,262 | 12,846 | -416 | -3\% | 3.6 | +/-400 vph | No | < 5 | Yes |
|  | SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-Ramp | 1,680 | 1,662 | -18 | -1\% | 0.4 | +/-15\% | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | 11,582 | 11,175 | -407 | -4\% | 3.8 | +/-400 vph | No | < | Yes |
|  |  | 1,649 | 1,602 | -47 | -3\% | 1.2 | +/-15\% | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd WB to EB On-Ramp SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-Ramp | 13,231 | 12,776 | -455 | -3\% | 4.0 | +/-400 vph | No | < 5 | Yes |
|  |  | 1,839 | 1,795 | -44 | -2\% | 1.0 | +/-15\% | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | 15,070 | 14,565 | -506 | -3\% | 4.2 | +/-400 vph | No | < | Yes |
|  |  | 2,744 | 2,389 | -355 | -13\% | 7.0 | +/-15\% | Yes | < | No |
|  | SB - Galleria Blvd Off to On-RampSB - Galleria Blvd On-Ramp | 12,326 | 12,171 | -155 | -1\% | 1.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  |  | 2,528 | 2,652 | 124 | 5\% | 2.4 | +/-15\% | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | $\frac{\text { SB - Galleria Blvd to } 1-80}{\text { SB } \text {-65 } \mathrm{n} / \mathrm{O} \text { Sterling Pkwy }}$ | 14,854 | 14,821 | -33 | 0\% | 0.3 | $+/-400 \mathrm{vph}$ | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  |  | 4,945 | 5,436 | 491 | 10\% | 6.8 | +/-400 vph | No | < | No |
|  | NB SR-65 n/o Sterling Pkwy EB Sterling Pkwy e/o SR-65 | 3,235 | 3,197 | -38 | -1\% | 0.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  |  | 1,115 | 1,085 | -30 | -3\% | 0.9 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | $\frac{\text { WB Sterling Pkwy e/o SR-65 }}{\text { EB Twelve Bridges Dr w/o SB SR-65 }}$ | 3,499 | 3,042 | -457 | -13\% | 8.0 | +/-400 vph | No | < 5 | No |
|  |  | 531 | 476 | -55 | -10\% | 2.5 | +/-100 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | WB Twelve Bridges Dr w/o SB SR-65 EB Twelve Bridges Dr e/o SB SR-65 | 887 | 830 | -57 | -6\% | 1.9 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  |  | 875 | 807 | -68 | -8\% | 2.3 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | WB Twelve Bridges Dre/o SB SR-65EB Twelve Bridges Dre/o NB SR-65 | 2,296 | 2,190 | -106 | -5\% | 2.2 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  |  | 1,451 | 1,450 | -1 | 0\% | 0.0 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | EB Twelve Bridges Dr e/o NB SR-65 WB Twelve Bridges Dr e/o NB SR-65 | 2,524 | 2,531 | 7 | 0\% | 0.1 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | EB Sunset Blvd w/o SB SR-65 | 1,511 | 1,493 | -18 | -1\% | 0.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | WB Sunset Blvd W/O SB SR-65EB Sunset Blvd e/O SB SR-65 | 2,714 | 2,751 | 37 | 1\% | 0.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  |  | 1,193 | 1,172 | -21 | -2\% | 0.6 | +/-15\% | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | EB Sunset Blvd e/o SB SR-65 WB Sunset Blvd e/o SB SR-65 | 3,614 | 3,634 | 20 | 1\% | 0.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | EB Sunset Blvde/o NB SR-65WB Sunset Blvd e/o NB SR-65 | 2,632 | 2,450 | -182 | -7\% | 3.6 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  |  | 2,404 | 3,152 | 748 | 31\% | 14.2 | +/-400 vph | No | < 5 | No |
|  | EB Blue Oaks Blvd w/o Washington BlvdWB Blue Oaks Blvd w/o Washington Blva | 5,406 | 5,339 | -67 | -1\% | 0.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  |  | 2,651 | 2,518 | -133 | -5\% | 2.6 | +/-15\% | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | WB Blue Oaks Blvd w/o NB SR-65 ramp | 3,617 | 3,139 | -478 | -13\% | 8.2 | +/-400 vph | No | < | No |
|  |  | 6,018 | 5,583 | -435 | -7\% | 5.7 | +/-400 vph | No | < | No |
|  | EB Blue Oaks Blvd e/o Washington Blvd WB Blue Oaks Blvd e/o Washington Blvd | 3,264 | 3,140 | -124 | -4\% | 2.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | SB Washington Blvd s/o Blue Oaks Blvd | 1,884 | 2,159 | 275 | 15\% | 6.1 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | No |
|  | NB Washington Blvd s/o Blue Oaks Blvd | 1,289 | 1,202 | -87 | -7\% | 2.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | EB Blue Oaks Blvd e/o NB SR-65 WB Blue Oaks Blvd e/o NB SR-65 EB Pleasant Grove Blvd w/o SB SR-65 WB Pleasant Grove Blvd w/o SB SR-65 EB Pleasant Grove Blvd e/o SB SR-65 WB Pleasant Grove Blvd e/o SB SR-65 EB Pleasant Grove Blvd e/o NB SR-65 WB Pleasant Grove Blvd e/o NB SR-65 | 2,799 | 2,893 | 94 | 3\% | 1.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  |  | 2,973 | 3,024 | 51 | 2\% | 0.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  |  | 4,344 | 4,359 | 15 | 0\% | 0.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  |  | 4,792 | 4,816 | 24 | 0\% | 0.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  |  | 2,887 | 2,924 | 37 | 1\% | 0.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  |  | 5,143 | 5,121 | -22 | 0\% | 0.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  |  | 3,353 | 3,419 | 66 | 2\% | 1.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  |  | 4,308 | 4,467 | 159 | 4\% | 2.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | EB Five Star Blvd w/o Stanford Ranch Rd WB Five Star Blvd w/o Stanford Ranch Rd EB Five Star Blvd e/o Stanford Ranch Rd WB Five Star Blvd e/o Stanford Ranch Rd SB Stanford Ranch Rd n/o Five Star Blvd NB Stanford Ranch Rd n/o Five Star Blvd SB Stanford Ranch Rd s/o Five Star Blvd NB Stanford Ranch Rd s/o Five Star Blvd | 731 | 643 | -88 | -12\% | 3.4 | +/-15\% | Yes | < | Yes |
|  |  | 813 | 811 | -2 | 0\% | 0.1 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  |  | 953 | 916 | -37 | -4\% | 1.2 | +/-15\% | Yes | < | Yes |
|  |  | 1,207 | 1,173 | -34 | -3\% | 1.0 | +/-15\% | Yes | < | Yes |
|  |  | 3,832 | 4,162 | 330 | 9\% | 5.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | No |
|  |  | 2,174 | 2,033 | -141 | -7\% | 3.1 | +/-15\% | Yes | < | Yes |
|  |  | 5,143 | 5,294 | 151 | 3\% | 2.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  |  | 3,313 | 3,076 | -237 | -7\% | 4.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | SB Stanford Ranch Rd n/o NB SR-65 | 4,978 | 5,258 | 280 | 6\% | 3.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | NB Stanford Ranch Rd $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{O}$ NB SR-65SB Galleria Blvd $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{OBS}$ SR-65 | 3,372 | 3,260 | -112 | -3\% | 1.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  |  | 5,173 | 5,272 | 99 | 2\% | 1.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | NB Galleria Blvd $n / 0$ SB SR-65SB Galleria Blvd $s / 0$ SB SR-65 | 2,948 | 2,746 | -202 | -7\% | 3.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  |  | 5,320 | 5,196 | -124 | -2\% | 1.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | SB Galleria Blvd s/o SB SR-65 NB Galleria Blvd s/o SB SR-65 | 2,879 | 2,939 | 60 | 2\% | 1.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | EB Antelope Creek Dr w/o Galleria Blvd | 167 | 177 | 10 | 6\% | 0.8 | +/-100 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | WB Antelope Creek Dr w/o Galleria Blvd EB Antelope Creek Dre/o Galleria Blvd | 366 | 366 | 0 | 0\% | 0.0 | +/-100 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  |  | 593 | 613 | 20 | 3\% | 0.8 | +/-100 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | WB Antelope Creek Dr e/o Galleria Blvd | 482 | 524 | 42 | 9\% | 1.9 | +/-100 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | SB Galleria Blvd n/o Antelope Creek Dr NB Galleria Blvd n/o Antelope Creek Dr | 4,660 | 4,497 | -163 | -4\% | 2.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  |  | 2,837 | 2,888 | 51 | 2\% | 1.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | NB Galleria Blvd n/o Antelope Creek Dr SB Galleria Blvd s/o Antelope Creek Dr | 4,292 | 4,162 | -130 | -3\% | 2.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | NB Galleria Blvd $s / 0$ Antelope Creek Dr | 2,779 | 2,804 | 25 | 1\% | 0.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  |  | 5,267 | 5,330 | 63 | 1\% | 0.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < | Yes |
|  | WB Roseville Pkwy w/o Galleria Blvd EB Roseville Pkwy e/o Galleria Blvd | 3,091 | 3,205 | 114 | 4\% | 2.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  |  | 5,218 | 5,228 | 10 | 0\% | 0.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |


| WB Roseville Pkwy e/o Galleria Blvd SB Galleria Blvd n /o Roseville Pkwy NB Galleria Blvd n/o Roseville Pkwy SB Galleria Blvd s/o Roseville Pkwy NB Galleria Blvd s/o Roseville Pkwy | 3,859 | 3,908 | 49 | 1\% | 0.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4,339 | 4,192 | -147 | -3\% | 2.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 |  |
|  | 2,900 | 2,928 | 28 | 1\% | 0.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 3,779 | 3,606 | -173 | -5\% | 2.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 1,523 | 1,537 | 14 | 1\% | 0.4 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| EB Roseville Pkwy w/o Creekside Ridge Dr WB Roseville Pkwy w/o Creekside Ridge Dr SB Creekside Ridge Dr n/o Roseville Pkwy NB Creekside Ridge Dr n/o Roseville Pkwy SB Creekside Ridge Dr s/o Roseville Pkwy NB Creekside Ridge Dr s/o Roseville Pkwy | 5,205 | 5,165 | -40 | -1\% | 0.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 3,958 | 4,010 | 52 | 1\% | 0.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 294 | 341 | 47 | 16\% | 2.6 | +/-100 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 825 | 700 | -125 | -15\% | 4.5 | +/-15\% | No | <5 | Yes |
|  | 54 | 53 | -1 | -2\% | 0.1 | +/-100 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 43 | 48 | 5 | 11\% | 0.7 | +/-100 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| EB Roseville Pkwy w/o Taylor Rd WB Roseville Pkwy w/o Taylor Rd EB Roseville Pkwy e/o Taylor Rd WB Roseville Pkwy e/o Taylor Rd SB Taylor Rd n/o Roseville Pkwy NB Taylor Rd n/o Roseville Pkwy SB Taylor Rd s/o Roseville Pkwy NB Taylor Rd s/o Roseville Pkwy | 5,267 | 5,434 | 167 | 3\% | 2.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 4,562 | 4,690 | 128 | 3\% | 1.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 6,555 | 6,307 | -248 | -4\% | 3.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 4,804 | 4,616 | -189 | -4\% | 2.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 1,907 | 1,781 | -127 | -7\% | 2.9 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 1,193 | 1,203 | 10 | 1\% | 0.3 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 1,631 | 1,472 | -159 | -10\% | 4.0 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 1,963 | 1,842 | -121 | -6\% | 2.8 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| EB Roseville Pkwy w/o Sunrise Ave WB Roseville Pkwy w/o Sunrise Ave EB Roseville Pkwy e/o Sunrise Ave WB Roseville Pkwy e/o Sunrise Ave SB Sunrise Ave n/o Roseville Pkwy NB Sunrise Ave n/o Roseville Pkwy SB Sunrise Ave s/o Roseville Pkwy NB Sunrise Ave s/o Roseville Pkwy | 6,452 | 6,251 | -201 | -3\% | 2.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 4,677 | 4,421 | -256 | -5\% | 3.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 5,098 | 4,917 | -182 | -4\% | 2.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 4,484 | 4,268 | -216 | -5\% | 3.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 694 | 585 | -110 | -16\% | 4.3 | +/-100 vph | No | <5 | Yes |
|  | 1,700 | 1,624 | -76 | -4\% | 1.9 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 1,790 | 1,552 | -238 | -13\% | 5.8 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | No |
|  | 1,635 | 1,409 | -226 | -14\% | 5.8 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | No |
| EB Atlantic St w/o Wills Rd WB Atlantic St w/o Wills Rd EB Atlantic St w/o WB I-80 WB Atlantic St w/o WB I-80 SB Wills Rd s/o Atlantic St NB Wills Rd s/o Atlantic St | 2,535 | 2,647 | 112 | 4\% | 2.2 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 1,895 | 1,882 | -13 | -1\% | 0.3 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 2,688 | 2,819 | 131 | 5\% | 2.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 2,057 | 2,055 | -2 | 0\% | 0.0 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 1,140 | 1,123 | -17 | -2\% | 0.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 1,131 | 1,125 | -6 | -1\% | 0.2 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| SB Galleria Blvd $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{o}$ Wills Rd NB Galleria Blvd n/o Wills Rd SB Harding Blvd s/o Wills Rd NB Harding Blvd s/o Wills Rd | 3,505 | 3,529 | 24 | 1\% | 0.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 1,795 | 1,891 | 96 | 5\% | 2.2 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 3,388 | 3,259 | -129 | -4\% | 2.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 1,679 | 1,648 | -31 | -2\% | 0.8 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| EB Eureka Rd w/o Taylor Rd WB Eureka Rd w/o Taylor Rd EB Eureka Rd e/o Taylor Rd WB Eureka Rd e/o Taylor Rd SB Taylor Rd n/o Eureka Rd NB Taylor Rd n/o Eureka Rd | 4,725 | 4,721 | -5 | 0\% | 0.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 2,623 | 3,893 | 1270 | 48\% | 22.3 | +/-400 vph | No | $<5$ | No |
|  | 6,002 | 6,106 | 104 | 2\% | 1.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 2,965 | 2,904 | -61 | -2\% | 1.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 1,495 | 1,223 | -272 | -18\% | 7.4 | +/-15\% | No | $<5$ | No |
|  | 2,163 | 2,081 | -82 | -4\% | 1.8 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| EB Eureka Rd w/o Sunrise Ave | 5,864 | 5,887 | 23 | 0\% | 0.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| WB Eureka Rd w/o Sunrise AveEB Eureka Rd e/o Sunrise Ave | 3,011 | 2,917 | -94 | -3\% | 1.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 4,522 | 4,737 | 215 | 5\% | 3.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| WB Eureka Rd e/o Sunrise AveSB Surise Ave $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{o}$ Eureka Rd | 2,448 | 2,422 | -26 | -1\% | 0.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 1,588 | 1,458 | -130 | -8\% | 3.3 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| NB Sunrise Ave n/o Eureka Rd SB Sunrise Ave s/o Eureka Rd | 1,581 | 1,618 | 37 | 2\% | 0.9 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 2,211 | 1,876 | -335 | -15\% | 7.4 | +/-15\% | No | $<5$ | No |
| NB Sunrise Ave s/o Eureka Rd | 1,425 | 1,381 | -44 | -3\% | 1.2 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 3,203 | 3,586 | 383 | 12\% | 6.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | No |
| EB Douglas Blvd w/o Harding Blvd WB Douglas Blvd w/o Harding Blvd EB Douglas Blvd e/o Harding Blvd WB Douglas Blvd e/o Harding Blvd SB Harding Blvd n/o Douglas Blvd NB Harding Blvd n/o Douglas Blvd SB Harding Blvd s/o Douglas Blvd NB Harding Blvd s/o Douglas Blvd | 2,700 | 3,150 | 450 | 17\% | 8.3 | +/-400 vph | No | $<5$ | No |
|  | 3,146 | 4,127 | 981 | 31\% | 16.3 | +/-400 vph | No | $<5$ | No |
|  | 3,404 | 3,582 | 178 | 5\% | 3.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 2,009 | 1,236 | -774 | -39\% | 19.2 | +/-15\% | No | <5 | No |
|  | 1,424 | 1,026 | -398 | -28\% | 11.4 | +/-15\% | No | $<5$ | No |
|  | 256 | 274 | 18 | 7\% | 1.1 | +/-100 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 165 | 173 | 8 | 5\% | 0.6 | +/-100 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| EB Douglas Blvd w/o Surise Ave | 6,545 | 6,170 | -375 | -6\% | 4.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| WB Douglas Blvd w/o Sunrise AveEB Dougla Blvd e/o Sunrise Ave | 5,212 | 5,192 | -21 | 0\% | 0.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 5,497 | 5,225 | -272 | -5\% | 3.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| WB Douglas Blvd e/o Sunrise Ave SB Sunrise Ave n /o Douglas Blvd | 4,698 | 4,796 | 98 | 2\% | 1.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 1,545 | 1,658 | 113 | 7\% | 2.8 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| SB Sunrise Ave $n / o$ Douglas Blvd NB Sunrise Ave n/o Douglas Blvd SB Sunrise Ave s/o Douglas Blvd | 2,298 | 2,324 | 26 | 1\% | 0.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 1,824 | 1,288 | -536 | -29\% | 13.6 | +/-15\% | No | $<5$ | No |
| SB Sunrise Ave s/o Douglas Blvd NB Sunrise Ave s/o Douglas Blvd | 2,043 | 2,254 | 211 | 10\% | 4.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| EB Woodside Dr e/o Pacific St | 188 | 184 | -4 | -2\% | 0.3 | +/-100 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| WB Woodside Dr e/o Pacific stSB Pacific St $n / 0$ Woodside Dr | 469 | 463 | -6 | -1\% | 0.3 | +/-100 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 3,309 | 3,201 | -108 | -3\% | 1.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| NB Pacific st $n / 0$ Woodside DrSB Pacific 5 St $/ 0$ Woodside Dr | 1,605 | 1,634 | 29 | 2\% | 0.7 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 3,594 | 3,475 | -119 | -3\% | 2.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| SB Pacific St s/o Woodside Dr NB Pacific St s/o Woodside Dr | 1,609 | 1,630 | 21 | 1\% | 0.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| EB Sunset Blvd w/o Pacific StWB Sunset Blvd w/o Pacific St | 3,711 | 3,624 | -87 | -2\% | 1.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 1,672 | 1,814 | 142 | 8\% | 3.4 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| WB Sunset Blvd w/o Pacific St EB Sunset Blvd e/o Pacific St | 297 | 281 | -16 | -5\% | 0.9 | +/-100 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| WB Sunset Blvd e/o Pacific St SB Pacific St n/o Sunset Blvd | 463 | 419 | -45 | -10\% | 2.1 | +/-100 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 2,096 | 2,239 | 143 | 7\% | 3.1 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| NB Pacific St n/o Sunset Blvd SB Pacific St s/o Sunset Blvd | 2,529 | 2,557 | 28 | 1\% | 0.6 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 3,311 | 3,216 | -95 | -3\% | 1.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| SB Pacific St s/o Sunset Blvd NB Pacific St s/o Sunset Blvd | 1,539 | 1,587 | 48 | 3\% | 1.2 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| EB Rocklin Rd w/o Granite DrWB Rocklin Rd w/o Granite Dr | 2,406 | 2,379 | -27 | -1\% | 0.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 1,982 | 1,934 | -48 | -2\% | 1.1 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| WB Rocklin Rd w/o Granite Dr EB Rocklin Rd e/o Granite Dr WB Rocklin Rd e/o Granite Dr | 3,000 | 3,008 | 8 | 0\% | 0.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 3,009 | 2,922 | -87 | -3\% | 1.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| WB Rocklin Rd e/o Granite Dr SB Granite Dr n/o Rocklin Rd | 1,160 | 1,165 | 5 | 0\% | 0.1 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 1,673 | 1,596 | -77 | -5\% | 1.9 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 3,153 | 3,195 | 42 | 1\% | 0.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| WB Rocklin Rd w/O WB - 180EB Rocklin Rd e W WB $1-80$ | 3,161 | 3,103 | -58 | -2\% | 1.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 1,981 | 2,005 | 24 | 1\% | 0.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| WB Rocklin Rd e/O WB $1-80$EB Rocklin Rd e/o EB $1-80$ | 3,998 | 3,994 | -4 | 0\% | 0.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 3,572 | 3,596 | 24 | 1\% | 0.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| EB Rocklin Rd e/o EB I-80 <br> EB Rocklin Rd e/o EB I-80 | 2,492 | 2,395 | -97 | -4\% | 2.0 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| EB Rocklin Rd e/o EB I-80 <br> EB Rocklin Rd w/o Aguilar Rd WB Rocklin Rd w/o Aguilar Rd EB Rocklin Rd e/o Aguilar Rd WB Rocklin Rd e/o Aguilar Rd | 3,581 | 3,561 | -20 | -1\% | 0.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 2,567 | 2,249 | -319 | -12\% | 6.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | No |
|  | 3,295 | 3,248 | -47 | -1\% | 0.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 2,029 | 1,985 | -44 | -2\% | 1.0 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | Yes |


| SB Aguilar Rd s/o Rocklin Rd | 152 | 173 | 21 | 14\% | 1.6 | +/-100 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NB Aguilar Rd s/o Rocklin Rd | 404 | 343 | -61 | -15\% | 3.2 | +/-100 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
| Overall | 1,450,418 | 1,442,063 | -8355 | -0.6\% | 6.9 | +/-5\% | Yes | <4 | No |


| Link Volumes |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Target | $\%$ Met |
| $<700 \mathrm{vph}$ | $>85 \%$ | $95 \%$ |
| $>700 \&<2,700 \mathrm{vph}$ | $>85 \%$ | $96 \%$ |
| $>2,700 \mathrm{vph}$ | $>85 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
| GEH Statistic | $>85 \%$ | $90 \%$ |


| Aggregated Volumes |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Target | $\%$ Met |
| Intersections | $>85 \%$ | $86 \%$ |
| Interchanges | $>85 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

## VISSIM Metrics

Calibration Comparison
I-80/SR 65 Interchange
Fehr \& Peers
Travel Time
June 3, 2012

AM Peak Period

|  |  | Measured | Modeled Conditions |  |  | Calibration Targets ${ }^{1}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Path | Time Period | Travel Time (minutes) | Travel Time (minutes) | Difference <br> (minutes) | Percent Difference | Target | Meets Target? |
|  | 7:15-7:30 | 10.27 | 8.40 | -1.87 | -18.2\% | +/-15\% | No |
|  | 7:45-8:00 | 10.80 | 10.38 | -0.42 | -3.9\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
| I-80 WB: Blue Oaks Blvd to Antelope Road | 8:15-8:30 | 8.05 | 8.50 | 0.45 | 5.6\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 7:00-7:15 | 6.69 | 6.79 | 0.10 | 1.5\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 7:45-8:00 | 7.28 | 7.46 | 0.18 | 2.5\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 8:15-8:30 | 6.99 | 6.89 | -0.10 | -1.5\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
| I-80 EB: Antelope Road to Blue Oaks Blvd | 8:45-9:00 | 6.93 | 6.89 | -0.04 | -0.6\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 7:00-7:15 | 7.98 | 9.34 | 1.36 | 17.0\% | +/-15\% | No |
|  | 7:30-7:45 | 8.25 | 8.46 | 0.21 | 2.5\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 8:00-8:15 | 7.83 | 8.48 | 0.64 | 8.2\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
| I-80 WB: Sierra College Blvd to Antelope Road | 8:30-8:45 | 7.73 | 8.33 | 0.60 | 7.7\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 7:15-7:30 | 5.93 | 6.58 | 0.65 | 10.9\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 7:45-8:00 | 6.13 | 6.71 | 0.58 | 9.5\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 8:30-8:45 | 5.91 | 6.55 | 0.64 | 10.9\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
| I-80 EB: Antelope Road to Sierra College Blvd | 8:45-9:00 | 6.16 | 6.55 | 0.39 | 6.4\% | +/-15\% | Yes |


| Measure | \% Cases |
| :---: | :---: |
| $>85 \%$ | $87 \%$ |
| Met Target |  |

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Network Statistics

I-80/SR 65 Interchange
Existing Conditions
AM Peak Period

| Network Performance | Vehicle Types | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Vehicles Served | All Vehicles | 143,451 | 56 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | All Vehicles | 645,274 | 1,372 |
| Travel Time [h] | All Vehicles | 13,757 | 107.7 |
| Average Speed [mph] | All Vehicles | 46.9 | 0.4 |
| Total Delay [h] | All Vehicles | 2,672 | 118.7 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | All Vehicles | 66 | 2.9 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | All Vehicles | 0.25 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | HOV | 29,190 | 103 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | HOV | 127,289 | 610 |
| Travel Time [h] | HOV | 2,707 | 23 |
| Average Speed [mph] | HOV | 47.0 | 0.3 |
| Total Delay [h] | HOV | 518 | 19 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | HOV | 63 | 2 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | HOV | 0.24 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | Truck | 3,675 | 31 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | Truck | 19,339 | 309 |
| Travel Time [h] | Truck | 398 | 6 |
| Average Speed [mph] | Truck | 48.5 | 0 |
| Total Delay [h] | Truck | 68 | 3 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | Truck | 65 | 3 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | Truck | 0.21 | 0.01 |


| Performance Measure | Vehicle Types |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HOV | Truck | All |
| Vehicles Served | 29,190 | 3,670 | 143,450 |
| Demand Volume | 24,518 | 3,839 | 143,735 |
| Percent Demand Served | $119.1 \%$ | $95.6 \%$ | $99.8 \%$ |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel | 127,290 | 19,340 | 645,270 |
| Person Miles of Travel | 267,310 | 20,310 | 786,260 |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel | 2,710 | 400 | 13,760 |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay | 520 | 70 | 2,670 |
| VHD \% of VHT | $19.2 \%$ | $17.5 \%$ | $19.4 \%$ |
| Average Delay per Vehicle $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.07 | 1.14 | 1.12 |
| Person Hours of Delay | 1,090 | 70 | 3,240 |
| Average Travel Speed | 47.0 | 48.5 | 46.9 |


| Location |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 1 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 6,073 | 57 | 112.3\% | 845 | 15 | 115.0\% |  |  |  | 59.1 | 1.3 | 24.5 | 0.6 | C |
| 2 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | Basic | 6,906 | 71 | 112.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.2 | 27.9 | 0.3 | D |
| 3 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,902 | 66 | 112.3\% |  |  |  | 1,398 | 64 | 109.9\% | 62.1 | 0.7 | 23.8 | 0.6 | C |
| 4 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,505 | 78 | 113.0\% |  |  |  | 337 | 36 | 115.0\% | 63.4 | 0.3 | 18.7 | 0.4 | B |
| 5 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,162 | 72 | 112.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.1 | 21.2 | 0.3 | C |
| 6 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 5,161 | 74 | 112.7\% | 857 | 34 | 100.2\% |  |  |  | 61.3 | 1.1 | 26.8 | 0.9 | C |
| 7 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,016 | 101 | 110.7\% |  |  |  | 1,219 | 72 | 111.4\% | 61.7 | 0.4 | 26.2 | 0.5 | C |
| 8 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,795 | 109 | 110.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.2 | 21.0 | 0.3 | C |
| 9 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | 4,798 | 116 | 110.5\% | 200 | 25 | 123.6\% |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.2 | 18.6 | 0.3 | B |
| 10 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd to Taylor Rd | Weave | 5,001 | 127 | 111.0\% | 438 | 40 | 102.9\% | 242 | 32 | 115.3\% | 62.4 | 0.4 | 23.0 | 0.6 | C |
| 11 | I-80 EB - Taylor Rd to SR-65 | Basic | 5,201 | 117 | 110.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.3 | 26.5 | 0.6 | D |
| 17 | I-80 EB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,204 | 112 | 110.3\% |  |  |  | 2,534 | 83 | 106.6\% | 61.5 | 0.6 | 27.6 | 0.4 | C |
| 18 | I-80 EB - SR-65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,671 | 96 | 113.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.0 | 0.1 | 14.1 | 0.5 | B |
| 19 | I-80 EB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 2,674 | 100 | 114.1\% | 1,275 | 72 | 111.5\% |  |  |  | 61.3 | 1.4 | 20.9 | 0.7 | C |
| 20 | I-80 EB - SR-65 to Lane Drop | Basic | 3,953 | 126 | 113.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.4 | 2.1 | 24.9 | 1.0 | C |
| 21 | I-80 EB - Lane Drop to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 3,955 | 123 | 113.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.6 | 24.6 | 0.8 | C |
| 22 | I-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,957 | 124 | 113.4\% |  |  |  | 1,284 | 72 | 113.6\% | 61.1 | 1.0 | 22.2 | 0.9 | C |
| 23 | I-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,674 | 106 | 113.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.5 | 16.9 | 0.8 | B |
| 24 | I-80 EB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 2,674 | 105 | 113.4\% | 220 | 26 | 119.1\% |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.5 | 15.7 | 0.5 | B |
| 25 | I-80 EB - Rocklin Rd to Sierra College Blvd | Basic | 2,895 | 101 | 113.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.1 | 17.2 | 0.7 | B |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| Location |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 26 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,898 | 100 | 113.9\% |  |  |  | 296 | 27 | 110.0\% | 63.3 | 0.5 | 17.9 | 0.7 | B |
| 27 | 1-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,606 | 89 | 114.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.3 | 16.5 | 0.5 | B |
| 28 | 1-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 2,608 | 89 | 114.7\% | 133 | 4 | 102.5\% |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.3 | 15.1 | 0.4 | B |
| 29 | 1-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 2,742 | 91 | 114.1\% | 277 | 8 | 107.6\% |  |  |  | 60.8 | 0.7 | 16.6 | 0.4 | B |
| 38 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,202 | 25 | 105.7\% |  |  |  | 733 | 39 | 107.7\% | 59.2 | 1.0 | 22.2 | 0.5 | C |
| 39 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,466 | 49 | 105.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.4 | 20.9 | 0.2 | C |
| 40 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 3,464 | 53 | 105.2\% | 55 | 3 | 103.4\% |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.2 | 18.1 | 0.2 | B |
| 41 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 3,517 | 57 | 105.1\% | 292 | 6 | 109.8\% |  |  |  | 60.1 | 1.0 | 19.5 | 0.4 | B |
| 42 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 3,804 | 66 | 105.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.1 | 21.2 | 0.3 | C |
| 43 | 1-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,802 | 65 | 105.2\% |  |  |  | 240 | 29 | 111.9\% | 63.1 | 0.2 | 21.2 | 0.5 | C |
| 44 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,560 | 60 | 104.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.1 | 19.8 | 0.2 | C |
| 45 | 1-80 WB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,559 | 65 | 104.7\% | 763 | 40 | 104.5\% |  |  |  | 53.4 | 2.0 | 24.4 | 1.5 | C |
| 46 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd to HOV Lane Start | Basic | 4,313 | 86 | 104.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.3 | 0.3 | 26.3 | 0.5 | D |
| 47 | I-80 WB - HOV Lane Start to SR-65 | Basic | 4,312 | 92 | 104.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.2 | 17.8 | 0.3 | B |
| 48 | I-80 WB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,311 | 95 | 104.4\% |  |  |  | 1,173 | 52 | 102.2\% | 63.1 | 0.5 | 17.8 | 0.6 | B |
| 49 | I-80 WB - SR-65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,131 | 85 | 105.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.3 | 17.7 | 0.5 | B |
| 50 | I-80 WB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 3,262 | 104 | 109.4\% | 2,916 | 80 | 103.0\% |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.1 | 24.7 | 0.3 | C |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes

| Location |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 60 | I-80 WB - Taylor Rd On-ramp | Merge | 6,040 | 128 | 103.9\% | 584 | 43 | 113.5\% |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.2 | 27.7 | 0.4 | C |
| 61 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,623 | 144 | 104.7\% |  |  |  | 347 | 38 | 112.4\% | 64.4 | 0.3 | 17.7 | 0.6 | B |
| 62 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,274 | 141 | 104.3\% |  |  |  | 828 | 63 | 100.2\% | 52.9 | 3.1 | 37.3 | 2.1 | E |
| 63 | 1-80 WB - Atlantic St Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,434 | 150 | 104.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.4 | 22.4 | 0.6 | C |
| 64 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St On-ramp | Merge | 5,431 | 137 | 104.6\% | 684 | 43 | 104.6\% |  |  |  | 59.1 | 2.1 | 24.2 | 0.9 | C |
| 65 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,114 | 144 | 104.6\% |  |  |  | 879 | 55 | 99.7\% | 56.5 | 3.0 | 18.7 | 0.9 | B |
| 66 | I-80 WB - Douglas Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,239 | 146 | 105.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.8 | 1.5 | 29.9 | 0.9 | D |
| 67 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 5,239 | 139 | 105.5\% | 797 | 52 | 103.9\% |  |  |  | 52.0 | 3.4 | 35.6 | 2.7 | E |
| 68 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 6,037 | 132 | 105.3\% | 406 | 39 | 106.8\% |  |  |  | 48.4 | 3.1 | 41.7 | 3.3 | E |
| 69 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd to Riverside Ave | Basic | 6,433 | 134 | 105.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.3 | 33.1 | 0.7 | D |
| 70 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,428 | 134 | 105.2\% |  |  |  | 473 | 43 | 89.5\% | 54.1 | 5.4 | 40.3 | 4.6 | E |
| 71 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,958 | 134 | 106.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.8 | 0.9 | 31.4 | 0.9 | D |
| 72 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave NB On-ramp | Merge | 5,960 | 132 | 106.8\% | 122 | 7 | 61.2\% |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.1 | 19.9 | 0.9 | B |
| 73 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave SB On-ramp | Merge | 6,083 | 133 | 105.2\% | 1,185 | 15 | 105.6\% |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.7 | 23.3 | 0.9 | C |
| 74 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave to Antelope Rd | Basic | 7,270 | 137 | 105.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.1 | 27.8 | 0.6 | D |
| 75 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,272 | 142 | 105.3\% |  |  |  | 288 | 40 | 87.2\% | 60.1 | 7.7 | 27.7 | 7.3 | C |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| Location | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 76 1-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,981 | 122 | 106.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 53.4 | 15.1 | 37.6 | 24.7 | E |
| 77 $1-80$ | Merge | 6,985 | 156 | 106.2\% | 546 | 26 | 103.7\% |  |  |  | 41.1 | 15.3 | 53.5 | 31.7 | F |
| 78 1-80 WB - Antelope Rd to Truck Scales | Weave | 7,558 | 233 | 106.4\% | 334 | 10 | 89.8\% | 38 | 15 |  | 38.3 | 18.8 | 61.8 | 30.7 | F |
| 79 1-80 WB - Truck Scales Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,995 | 416 | 107.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30.2 | 14.6 | 89.2 | 31.0 | F |
| 80 1-80 WB - Truck Scales On-ramp | Merge | 8,989 | 517 | 120.3\% | 38 | 15 |  |  |  |  | 23.5 | 1.2 | 106.3 | 4.3 | F |
| 81 1-80 WB - Truck Scales to Elkhorn Blvd | Basic | 8,159 | 475 | 109.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24.1 | 1.8 | 104.6 | 8.6 | F |
| 82 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,175 | 473 | 109.4\% |  |  |  | 647 | 54 | 98.7\% | 27.1 | 2.3 | 79.8 | 4.9 | F |
| 83 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,567 | 424 | 111.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 56.6 | 0.7 | 29.9 | 1.3 | D |
| 84 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 7,570 | 427 | 111.0\% | 635 | 43 | 100.6\% |  |  |  | 52.4 | 2.4 | 35.0 | 3.7 | E |
| 85 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 8,195 | 410 | 110.0\% | 810 | 23 | 100.1\% |  |  |  | 56.6 | 6.2 | 35.0 | 5.9 | E |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane. Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| Location |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 97 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,633 | 65 | 109.0\% |  |  |  | 305 | 32 | 111.7\% | 63.4 | 0.3 | 19.0 | 0.5 | B |
| 98 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,326 | 63 | 108.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.2 | 19.3 | 0.6 | C |
| 99 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr On-ramp | Merge | 2,323 | 65 | 108.5\% | 612 | 31 | 114.6\% |  |  |  | 49.7 | 1.7 | 26.0 | 1.3 | C |
| 100 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Sunset Blvd | Basic | 2,931 | 74 | 109.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.1 | 25.0 | 0.5 | C |
| 101 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,927 | 68 | 109.4\% |  |  |  | 366 | 37 | 104.5\% | 62.7 | 0.2 | 23.2 | 0.4 | C |
| 102 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,560 | 80 | 110.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.2 | 22.0 | 0.7 | C |
| 103 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 2,557 | 84 | 109.9\% | 414 | 33 | 109.9\% |  |  |  | 56.3 | 2.7 | 25.2 | 1.6 | C |
| 104 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 2,973 | 96 | 110.0\% | 314 | 23 | 104.5\% |  |  |  | 59.8 | 6.4 | 29.5 | 8.4 | D |
| 105 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Basic | 3,281 | 88 | 109.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.3 | 27.7 | 0.9 | D |
| 106 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,278 | 88 | 109.1\% |  |  |  | 633 | 36 | 117.5\% | 57.3 | 3.5 | 29.2 | 1.8 | D |
| 107 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,640 | 74 | 107.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 48.5 | 13.7 | 31.9 | 11.3 | D |
| 108 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 2,636 | 80 | 107.0\% | 371 | 32 | 95.8\% |  |  |  | 28.3 | 14.0 | 60.2 | 24.7 | F |
| 109 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | 3,008 | 96 | 105.5\% | 844 | 55 | 96.9\% | 635 | 57 | 105.5\% | 20.0 | 3.2 | 74.9 | 8.6 | F |
| 110 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,198 | 86 | 102.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19.4 | 0.7 | 88.7 | 1.8 | F |
| 111 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,190 | 71 | 102.2\% | 453 | 34 | 106.5\% |  |  |  | 20.8 | 2.1 | 72.4 | 6.0 | F |
| 112 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 3,637 | 63 | 102.6\% | 546 | 35 | 102.5\% |  |  |  | 36.5 | 0.5 | 53.4 | 1.2 | F |
| 113 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | 4,176 | 50 | 102.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.0 | 1.7 | 35.6 | 1.1 | E |
| 114 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,176 | 50 | 102.4\% |  |  |  | 763 | 44 | 95.3\% | 60.6 | 1.1 | 35.2 | 0.5 | E |
| 115 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off to Lane Add | Basic | 3,411 | 66 | 104.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.6 | 1.9 | 30.3 | 1.3 | D |
| 116 | SR-65 SB - Lane Add to Galleria Blvd On-ramp | Basic | 3,414 | 67 | 104.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.2 | 21.0 | 0.5 | C |
| 117 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 3,414 | 69 | 104.1\% | 777 | 45 | 111.6\% |  |  |  | 51.4 | 3.3 | 30.1 | 2.9 | D |
| 118 | SR-65 SB - I-80 WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,190 | 81 | 105.4\% |  |  |  | 2,918 | 82 | 103.1\% | 62.7 | 0.4 | 23.8 | 0.5 | C |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane. Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| Location |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 125 | SR-65 NB - I-80 WB On-ramp | Merge | 2,531 | 94 | 107.1\% | 1,173 | 61 | 65.3\% |  |  |  | 35.6 | 5.2 | 52.9 | 10.5 | F |
| 126 | SR-65 NB - I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Basic | 3,704 | 109 | 89.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.4 | 1.6 | 32.2 | 1.1 | D |
| 127 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,704 | 107 | 105.1\% |  |  |  | 633 | 49 | 101.3\% | 59.8 | 1.6 | 32.9 | 1.0 | D |
| 128 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,072 | 115 | 106.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.5 | 26.9 | 1.1 | D |
| 129 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,074 | 110 | 106.1\% | 561 | 45 | 106.4\% |  |  |  | 53.2 | 4.5 | 33.6 | 3.4 | D |
| 130 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Basic | 3,632 | 112 | 106.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.1 | 0.7 | 30.1 | 1.1 | D |
| 131 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,632 | 112 | 106.0\% |  |  |  | 611 | 36 | 100.5\% | 62.0 | 0.5 | 28.1 | 1.1 | D |
| 132 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,018 | 114 | 107.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.5 | 26.6 | 1.0 | D |
| 133 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Weave | 3,021 | 118 | 107.2\% | 206 | 22 | 95.0\% | 1,430 | 82 | 104.6\% | 63.3 | 0.1 | 21.1 | 1.1 | C |
| 134 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,799 | 83 | 107.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.2 | 16.0 | 0.7 | B |
| 135 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 1,799 | 86 | 108.0\% | 319 | 31 | 99.5\% |  |  |  | 60.9 | 1.1 | 17.4 | 0.6 | B |
| 136 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | 2,115 | 78 | 106.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.2 | 18.4 | 0.7 | C |
| 137 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,116 | 84 | 106.5\% |  |  |  | 1,003 | 50 | 102.4\% | 63.5 | 0.1 | 16.4 | 0.6 | B |
| 138 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,115 | 58 | 110.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.1 | 0.1 | 10.4 | 0.6 | A |
| 139 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 1,117 | 60 | 110.8\% | 38 | 14 | 113.9\% |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.4 | 10.6 | 0.5 | B |
| 140 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 1,154 | 63 | 110.8\% | 216 | 27 | 114.2\% |  |  |  | 64.3 | 0.2 | 10.3 | 0.6 | B |
| 141 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd to Twelve Bridges Dr | Basic | 1,374 | 71 | 111.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.8 | 0.2 | 12.7 | 0.5 | B |
| 142 | SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off-ramp | Diverge | 1,377 | 70 | 112.1\% |  |  |  | 275 | 33 | 96.0\% | 63.6 | 0.1 | 12.8 | 0.5 | B |
| 143 | SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,106 | 58 | 117.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.2 | 10.7 | 0.4 | A |
| 144 | SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr On-ramp | Merge | 1,109 | 59 | 117.6\% | 219 | 18 | 108.4\% |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.4 | 11.7 | 0.3 | B |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Percent } \\ & \text { Served } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 1 | SR-65/Sterling Pkwy |  | Signal | 3,592 | 4,018 | 111.9\% | 18.7 | 0.8 | B |
| 2 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 1,086 | 1,200 | 110.5\% | 3.8 | 0.2 | A |
| 3 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 1,305 | 1,426 | 109.3\% | 3.3 | 0.4 | A |
| 4 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 1,789 | 1,961 | 109.6\% | 7.0 | 0.5 | A |
| 5 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 2,101 | 2,227 | 106.0\% | 9.9 | 0.4 | A |
| 6 | SR-65 SB Ramps-Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks | Signal | 3,555 | 3,653 | 102.8\% | 43.4 | 12.9 | D |
| 7 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 2,229 | 2,308 | 103.5\% | 23.7 | 8.3 | C |
| 8 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 3,383 | 3,542 | 104.7\% | 9.1 | 1.1 | A |
| 9 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 2,720 | 2,864 | 105.3\% | 10.3 | 0.9 | B |
| 10 | Stanford Ranch Rd/Five Star Blvd | Signal | 2,578 | 2,842 | 110.2\% | 18.8 | 1.1 | B |
| 11 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Stanford Ranch Rd | Signal | 2,941 | 3,201 | 108.9\% | 8.5 | 1.3 | A |
| 12 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd | Signal | 3,107 | 3,308 | 106.5\% | 12.8 | 0.8 | B |
| 13 | Galleria Blvd/Antelope Creek Dr | Signal | 2,373 | 2,551 | 107.5\% | 10.3 | 1.0 | B |
| 14 | Galleria Blvd/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,665 | 5,153 | 110.5\% | 29.8 | 1.9 | C |
| 15 | Creekside Ridge Dr/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 3,147 | 3,527 | 112.1\% | 5.7 | 0.6 | A |
| 16 | Taylor Rd/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,274 | 4,645 | 108.7\% | 29.5 | 3.7 | C |
| 17 | North Sunrise Ave/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,073 | 4,218 | 103.6\% | 37.2 | 4.4 | D |
| 18 | Wills Rd/Atlantic St | Signal | 1,717 | 1,953 | 113.7\% | 10.2 | 0.6 | B |
| 19 | 1-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St | Signal | 2,676 | 2,885 | 107.8\% | 7.0 | 0.6 | A |
| 20 | Taylor Rd-l-80 EB Ramps/Eureka Rd | Signal | 3,496 | 4,005 | 114.6\% | 26.4 | 3.1 | C |
| 21 | North Sunrise Ave/Eureka Rd | Signal | 3,296 | 3,463 | 105.1\% | 24.1 | 4.8 | C |
| 22 | Harding Blvd/Wills Rd | Signal | 1,952 | 2,133 | 109.3\% | 11.6 | 0.8 | B |
| 23 | Harding Blvd/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 2,603 | 2,782 | 106.9\% | 18.5 | 1.2 | B |
| 24 | 1-80 WB Ramps/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 3,426 | 3,597 | 105.0\% | 14.4 | 1.4 | B |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 68,084 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 73,464 |
| Percent Served | $107.9 \%$ |

Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.
3. For Side-street Stop and Uncontrolled intersections, the delay for the highest movement is reported.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 25 | I-80 EB Ramps/Douglas Blvd |  | Signal | 3,868 | 4,094 | 105.9\% | 5.5 | 0.5 | A |
| 26 | North Sunrise Ave/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 4,048 | 4,364 | 107.8\% | 26.3 | 1.1 | C |
| 27 | Pacific St/Woodside Dr | Signal | 1,576 | 1,703 | 108.1\% | 6.6 | 0.4 | A |
| 28 | Pacific St/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 2,323 | 2,619 | 112.8\% | 17.7 | 1.5 | B |
| 29 | Granite Dr/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 1,985 | 2,085 | 105.0\% | 14.7 | 1.5 | B |
| 30 | I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,326 | 2,514 | 108.1\% | 21.3 | 2.4 | C |
| 31 | I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,448 | 2,739 | 111.9\% | 17.1 | 1.1 | B |
| 32 | Aguilar Rd/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 1,783 | 1,979 | 111.0\% | 8.0 | 1.2 | A |
| 253 | Galleria Blvd/Berry St | Signal | 1,805 | 1,944 | 107.7\% | 8.5 | 0.9 | A |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 22,162 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 24,042 |
| Percent Served | $108.5 \%$ |

Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour


|  | \|nB- Blue Oaks Blvd off-Ramp | 4,701 | 4,204 | -497 | -10.6\% | 7.5 | +/-400 vph | No | <5 | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NB - Blue Oaks Blvd off to On-Ramp | 9,620 | 9,588 | -32 | -0.3\% | 0.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | NB - Blue Oaks Blvd On-Ramp | 1,793 | 1,861 | 68 | 3.8\% | 1.6 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | NB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | 11,413 | 11,454 | 41 | 0.4\% | 0.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | NB-Sunset Blvd Off-Ramp | 2,780 | 2,705 | -75 | -2.7\% | 1.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | NB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | 8,633 | 8,754 | 121 | 1.4\% | 1.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | NB - Sunset Blvd EB On-Ramp | 247 | 249 | 2 | 0.9\% | 0.1 | +/-100 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | NB - Sunset Blvd EB to WB On-ramp | 8,880 | 9,003 | 123 | 1.4\% | 1.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | NB - Sunset Blvd WB On-Ramp | 1,002 | 955 | -47 | -4.7\% | 1.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | NB - Sunset Blvd to Twelve Bridges Dr | 9,882 | 9,958 | 76 | 0.8\% | 0.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | NB - Twelve Bridges Dr off-Ramp | 2,235 | 2,165 | -70 | -3.1\% | 1.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | NB - Twelve Bridges Dr off to On-ramp | 7,647 | 7,799 | 152 | 2.0\% | 1.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | NB - Twelve Bridges Dr On-Ramp | 1,100 | 916 | -184 | -16.7\% | 5.8 | +/-15\% | No | <5 | No |
|  | NB- - Twelve Briages Dr to Stering Pkwy | 8,747 | 8,715 | -32 | -0.4\% | 0.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | SB - Sterling Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr <br> SB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off-Ramp <br> SB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-Ramp <br> SB - Twelve Bridges Dr On-Ramp <br> SB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Sunset Blvd <br> SB - Sunset Blvd Off-Ramp <br> SB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp <br> SB - Sunset Blvd WB On-Ramp <br> SB - Sunset Blvd WB to EB On-Ramp <br> SB - Sunset Blvd EB On-Ramp <br> SB - Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd <br> SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-Ramp <br> SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-Ramp <br> SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-Ramp <br> SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB to EB On-Ramp <br> SB - Blue Oaks Blvd EB On-Ramp <br> SB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd <br> SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-Ramp <br> SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp <br> SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-Ramp <br> SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd WB to EB On-Ramp <br> SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-Ramp <br> SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd <br> SB - Galleria Blvd Off-Ramp <br> SB - Galleria Blvd Off to On-Ramp <br> SB - Galleria Blvd On-Ramp <br> SB - Galleria Blvd to I-80 | 6,566 | 6,641 | 75 | 1.1\% | 0.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  |  | 855 | 840 | -15 | -1.8\% | 0.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 5,711 | 5,807 | 96 | 1.7\% | 1.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 1,519 | 1,587 | 68 | 4.5\% | 1.7 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 7,230 | 7,417 | 187 | 2.6\% | 2.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 912 | 982 | 70 | 7.7\% | 2.3 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 6,318 | 6,459 | 141 | 2.2\% | 1.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 1,782 | 1,774 | -8 | -0.5\% | 0.2 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 8,100 | 8,238 | 138 | 1.7\% | 1.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 2,299 | 2,230 | -69 | -3.0\% | 1.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 10,399 | 10,485 | 86 | 0.8\% | 0.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 1,997 | 2,024 | 27 | 1.4\% | 0.6 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 8,402 | 8,477 | 75 | 0.9\% | 0.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 1,415 | 1,067 | -348 | -24.6\% | 9.9 | +/-15\% | No | <5 | No |
|  |  | 9,817 | 9,547 | -270 | -2.7\% | 2.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 3,384 | 3,205 | -179 | -5.3\% | 3.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 13,201 | 12,756 | -445 | -3.4\% | 3.9 | +/-400 vph | No | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 2,177 | 2,256 | 79 | 3.6\% | 1.7 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 11,024 | 10,512 | -512 | -4.6\% | 4.9 | +/-400 vph | No | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 1,252 | 1,403 | 151 | 12.1\% | 4.1 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 12,276 | 11,917 | -359 | -2.9\% | 3.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 2,281 | 2,298 | 17 | 0.8\% | 0.4 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 14,557 | 14,227 | -330 | -2.3\% | 2.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 3,198 | 2,954 | -244 | -7.6\% | 4.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 11,359 | 11,277 | -82 | -0.7\% | 0.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 3,873 | 3,913 | 40 | 1.0\% | 0.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 15,232 | 15,191 | -42 | -0.3\% | 0.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| SB SR 65 n/o Sterling PkwyNB SR $65 \mathrm{n} / \mathrm{o}$ Sterling PkwyEB Sterling Pkwy e/o SR 65WB Sterling Pkwy e/o SR 65 |  | 4,588 | 4,645 | 57 | 1.2\% | 0.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 5,719 | 5,876 | 157 | 2.7\% | 2.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 3,251 | 3,078 | -173 | -5.3\% | 3.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 2,201 | 2,212 | 11 | 0.5\% | 0.2 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | EB Twelve Bridges Dr w/o SB SR 65 WB Twelve Bridges Dr w/o SB SR-65 EB Twelve Bridges Dr e/o SB SR 65 WB Twelve Bridges Dr e/o SB SR-65 | 1,293 | 1,066 | -227 | -17.5\% | 6.6 | +-15\% | No | <5 | No |
|  |  | 980 | 972 | -8 | -0.8\% | 0.2 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 1,588 | 1,358 | -230 | -14.5\% | 6.0 | +-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | No |
|  |  | 1,939 | 2,007 | 68 | 3.5\% | 1.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | EB Twelve Bridges Dr e/o NB SR 65 WB Twelve Bridges Dr e/o NB SR-65 | 2,866 | 2,870 | 4 | 0.1\% | 0.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 2,082 | 2,260 | 178 | 8.5\% | 3.8 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | EB Sunset Blvd w/o SB SR 65 WB Sunset Blvd w/o SB SR-65 EB Sunset Blvd e/o SB SR 65 WB Sunset Blvd e/o SB SR-65 | 3,297 | 3,262 | -36 | ${ }^{-1.1 \%}$ | 0.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  |  | 2,178 | 1,974 | -204 | -9.4\% | 4.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 1,729 | 1,843 | 114 | 6.6\% | 2.7 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 3,779 | 3,574 | -205 | -5.4\% | 3.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | EB Sunset Blvd e/o NB SR 65 WB Sunset Blvd e/o NB SR-65 | 2,794 | 3,011 | 217 | 7.8\% | 4.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  |  | 3,313 | 3,699 | 386 | 11.6\% | 6.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | No |
|  | EB Blue Oaks Blvd w/o Washington Blvd WB Blue Oaks Blvd w/o Washington Blvd WB Blue Oaks Blvd w/o NB SR 65 ramp EB Blue Oaks Blvd e/o Washington Blvd WB Blue Oaks Blvd e/o Washington Blvd SB Washington Blvd s/o Blue Oaks Blvd NB Washington Blvd s/o Blue Oaks Blvd | 6,884 | 6,938 | 54 | 0.8\% | 0.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 4,031 | 4,363 | 332 | 8.2\% | 5.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | No |
|  |  | 4,121 | 3,935 | -186 | -4.5\% | 2.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 7,841 | 8,142 | 301 | 3.8\% | 3.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  |  | 4,121 | 3,935 | -186 | $-4.5 \%$ | 2.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 2,016 | 2,226 | 210 | 10.4\% | 4.6 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  |  | 2,631 | 2,893 | 262 | 9.9\% | 5.0 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | EB Blue Oaks Blvd e/o NB SR 65 WB Blue Oaks Blvd e/o NB SR 65 | 5,033 | 4,856 | -177 | -3.5\% | 2.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 4,208 | 4,167 | -41 | -1.0\% | 0.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | EB Pleasant Grove Blvd w/o SB SR 65 WB Pleasant Grove Blvd w/o SB SR-65 EB Pleasant Grove Blvd e/o SB SR 65 WB Pleasant Grove Blvd e/o SB SR-65 | 8,489 | 8,443 | -46 | -0.5\% | 0.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 7,805 | 7,617 | -188 | -2.4\% | 2.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 6,863 | 6,824 | -39 | -0.6\% | 0.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 7,535 | 7,439 | -96 | -1.3\% | 1.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | EB Pleasant Grove Blvd e/o NB SR 65 WB Pleasant Grove Blvd e/o NB SR-65 | 7,475 | 8,013 | 538 | 7.2\% | 6.1 | +/-400 vph | No | <5 | No |
|  |  | 6,206 | 6,460 | 254 | 4.1\% | 3.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | EB Five Star Blvd w/o Stanford Ranch Rd WB Five Star Blvd w/o Stanford Ranch Rd EB Five Star Blvd e/o Stanford Ranch Rd WB Five Star Blvd e/o Stanford Ranch Rd SB Stanford Ranch Rd n/o Five Star Blvd NB Stanford Ranch Rd n/o Five Star Blvd SB Stanford Ranch Rd s/o Five Star Blvd NB Stanford Ranch Rd s/o Five Star Blvd | 2,109 | 1,952 | -157 | -7.5\% | 3.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 2,278 | 2,440 | 162 | 7.1\% | 3.3 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 2,045 | 1,973 | -72 | -3.5\% | 1.6 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  |  | 2,149 | 2,048 | -101 | -4.7\% | 2.2 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 4,046 | 4,073 | 27 | 0.7\% | 0.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  |  | 5,446 | 5,674 | 228 | 4.2\% | 3.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  |  | 6,916 | 6,422 | -494 | -7.1\% | 6.0 | +/-400 vph | No | < 5 | No |
|  |  | 8,381 | 8,436 | 55 | 0.7\% | 0.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | SB Stanford Ranch Rd n/o NB SR 65 | 7,033 | 7,188 | 155 | 2.2\% | 1.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | NB Stanford Ranch Rd n/o NB SR 65 SB Galleria Blvd n/o SB SR 65 | 8,645 | 8,930 | 285 | 3.3\% | 3.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  |  | 7,496 | 7,542 | 46 | 0.6\% | 0.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | NB Galleria Blvd n/o SB SR 65 | 8,055 | 7,920 | - 135 | ${ }^{-1.7 \%}$ | 1.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | SB Galleria Blvd s/o SB SR 65 NB Galleria Blvd s/o SB SR 65 | 7,601 | 7,650 | 49 | 0.6\% | 0.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 8,835 | 8,978 | 143 | 1.6\% | 1.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | EB Antelope Creek Dr w/o Galleria Blva | 2,174 | 1,568 | -606 | -27.9\% | 14.0 | +-15\% | No | <5 | No |
|  | WB Antelope Creek Dr w/o Galleria Blvd EB Antelope Creek Dr e/o Galleria Blvd | 1,268 | 1,268 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.0 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 1,729 | 1,711 | -18 | -1.0\% | 0.4 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | WB Antelope Creek Dre/o Galleria Blvd | 2,233 | 2,264 | 31 | 1.4\% | 0.6 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | SB Galleria Blvd n/o Antelope Creek Dr NB Galleria Blvd n/o Antelope Creek Dr | 5,692 | 5,706 | 14 | 0.2\% | 0.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 8,167 | 8,262 | 95 | 1.2\% | 1.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | SB Galleria Blvd s/o Antelope Creek Dr NB Galleria Blvd s/o Antelope Creek Dr | 5,838 | 5,547 | -291 | -5.0\% | 3.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 6,903 | 7,010 | 107 | 1.5\% | 1.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | NB Galleria Blvd s/o Antelope Creek Dr <br> EB Roseville Pkwy w/o Galleria Blvd WB Roseville Pkwy w/o Galleria Blvd EB Roseville Pkwy e/o Galleria Blvd | 7,361 | 7,396 | 35 | 0.5\% | 0.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  |  | 7,438 | 7,603 | 165 | 2.2\% | 1.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  |  | 6,337 | 6,253 | -84 | -1.3\% | 1.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |


| WB Roseville Pkwy e/o Galleria Blvd SB Galleria Blvd n/o Roseville Pkwy NB Galleria Blvd n /o Roseville Pkwy SB Galleria Blvd s/o Roseville Pkwy NB Galleria Blvd s/o Roseville Pkwy | 7,876 | 7,764 | -112 | -1.4\% | 1.3 | +/-400 vph | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \hline \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & <5 \\ & \hline<5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Yes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5,990 | 5,795 | -195 | -3.3\% | 2.5 | +/-400 vph |  |  |  |
|  | 6,770 | 6,928 | 158 | 2.3\% | 1.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 4,986 | 4,833 | -153 | -3.1\% | 2.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 4,304 | 4,663 | 359 | 8.3\% | 5.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | No |
| EB Roseville Pkwy w/o Creekside Ridge Dr WB Roseville Pkwy w/o Creekside Ridge Dr SB Creekside Ridge Dr n/o Roseville Pkwy NB Creekside Ridge Dr n/o Roseville Pkwy SB Creekside Ridge Dr s/o Roseville Pkwy NB Creekside Ridge Dr s/o Roseville Pkwy | 6,104 | 5,974 | -130 | -2.1\% | 1.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 8,191 | 8,079 | -112 | -1.4\% | 1.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 1,277 | 1,196 | -81 | -6.3\% | 2.3 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 1,114 | 1,049 | -65 | -5.8\% | 2.0 | +/-15\% | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | 200 | 107 | -93 | -46.6\% | 7.5 | +/-100 vph | Yes | $<5$ | No |
|  | 219 | 180 | -39 | -17.8\% | 2.8 | +/-100 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| NB Creekside Ridge Dr $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{0}$ R Roseville Pkwy | 6,880 | 6,964 | 84 | 1.2\% | 1.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| WB Roseville Pkwy w/o Taylor Rd | 8,785 | 8,885 | 100 | 1.1\% | 1.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| EB Roseville Pkwy e/o Taylor RdWB Rosevile Pkwy e/o Taylor Rd | 7,238 | 7,048 | -190 | -2.6\% | 2.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 9,251 | 8,800 | -451 | -4.9\% | 4.8 | +/-400 vph | No | $<5$ | Yes |
| SB Taylor Rd $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{O}$ Roseville Pkwy | 2,071 | 2,153 | 82 | 3.9\% | 1.8 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| NB Taylor Rd $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{O}$ Roseville Pkwy | 3,106 | 2,834 | -272 | -8.8\% | 5.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| SB Taylor Rd $s / 0$ Rosesille PkwyNB Taylor Rd $s / 0$ Roseville Pkwy | 2,246 | 2,166 | -80 | -3.6\% | 1.7 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 3,173 | 3,017 | -156 | -4.9\% | 2.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 7,106 | 7,018 | -88 | -1.2\% | 1.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| WB Roseville Pkwy w/o Sunrise AveEB Rosevill $\mathrm{Pkwy} \mathrm{e/o} \mathrm{Sunrise} \mathrm{Ave}$ | 9,053 | 8,465 | -589 | -6.5\% | 6.3 | +/-400 vph | No | $<5$ | No |
|  | 6,566 | 6,647 | 81 | 1.2\% | 1.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| EB Roseville Pkwy e/o Sunrise Ave WB Roseville Pkwy e/o Sunrise Ave | 7,019 | 6,617 | -402 | -5.7\% | 4.9 | +/-400 vph | No | <5 | Yes |
| SB Sunrise Ave n/o Rosevill PkwyNB Sunrise Ave $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{o}$ Roseville Pkwy | 1,633 | 1,612 | -21 | -1.3\% | 0.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 840 | 842 | 2 | 0.3\% | 0.1 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| SB Sunrise Ave s/o Roseville Pkwy NB Sunrise Ave s/o Roseville Pkwy | 2,297 | 2,087 | -210 | -9.1\% | 4.5 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 2,998 | 2,794 | -205 | -6.8\% | 3.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
| EB Atlantic St w/o Wills RdWB Atlantic St w/o Wills Rd | 2,932 | 2,955 | 23 | 0.8\% | 0.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | 3,655 | 3,753 | 98 | 2.7\% | 1.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| EB Atlantic St w/o WB I-80 | 2,999 | 3,242 | 243 | 8.1\% | 4.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 3,376 | 3,704 | 328 | 9.7\% | 5.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | No |
|  | 1,580 | 1,554 | -26 | -1.6\% | 0.6 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| $\frac{\text { NB W Wills } \mathrm{Rd} \text { s/ O Atlantic St }}{\text { SB Galleria Blvd } \mathrm{n} / \mathrm{o} \text { Wills } \mathrm{Rd}}$ | 1,926 | 1,884 | -42 | -2.2\% | 1.0 | +/-15\% | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 4,110 | 4,126 | 16 | 0.4\% | 0.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| SB Galleria Blvd n/o Wills Rd NB Galleria Blvd n/o Wills Rd SB Harding Blvd s/o Wills Rd | 4,521 | 4,695 | 174 | 3.8\% | 2.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 3,793 | 3,654 | -139 | -3.7\% | 2.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 4,541 | 4,580 | 39 | 0.9\% | 0.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
| EB Eureka Rd w/o Taylor Rd WB Eureka Rd w/o Taylor Rd EB Eureka Rd e/o Taylor Rd WB Eureka Rd e/o Taylor Rd SB Taylor Rd n/o Eureka Rd NB Taylor Rd n/o Eureka Rd | 4,744 | 4,898 | 154 | 3.2\% | 2.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
|  | 7,602 | 8,335 | 733 | 9.6\% | 8.2 | +/-400 vph | No | $<5$ | No |
|  | 5,485 | 5,641 | 156 | 2.8\% | 2.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 6,615 | 7,145 | 530 | 8.0\% | 6.4 | +/-400 vph | No | $<5$ | No |
|  | 2,455 | 2,320 | -135 | -5.5\% | 2.8 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 3,334 | 3,171 | -163 | -4.9\% | 2.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| EB Eureka Rd w/o Sunrise Ave | 5,440 | 5,569 | 129 | 2.4\% | 1.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| WB Eureka Rd w/o Sunrise AveEB Eureka Rd e/o Sunrise Ave | 6,603 | 6,884 | 281 | 4.2\% | 3.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 4,540 | 4,517 | -23 | -0.5\% | 0.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| WB Eureka Rd e/o Sunrise AveSB Surise Ave $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{o}$ Eureka Rd | 5,199 | 5,669 | 470 | 9.0\% | 6.4 | +/-400 vph | No | $<5$ | No |
|  | 2,573 | 2,172 | -401 | -15.6\% | 8.2 | +/-15\% | No | $<5$ | No |
| NB Sunrise Ave $\mathrm{n} / 0$ Eureka RdSB Sunrise Ave $5 /$ Oureka Rd | 2,887 | 2,854 | -33 | -1.1\% | 0.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 2,968 | 2,571 | -397 | -13.4\% | 7.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | No |
| SB Sunrise Ave s/o Eureka Rd NB Sunrise Ave s/o Eureka Rd | 3,786 | 3,415 | -371 | -9.8\% | 6.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | No |
| EB Douglas Blvd w/o Harding Blvd | 3,619 | 4,160 | 541 | 14.9\% | 8.7 | +/-400 vph | No | <5 | No |
|  | 4,768 | 5,027 | 259 | 5.4\% | 3.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| WB Douglas Blvd w/o Harding Blvd EB Douglas Blve e/o Harding Blvd | 5,056 | 5,665 | 609 | 12.0\% | 8.3 | +/-400 vph | No | <5 | No |
| WB Douglas Blvd e/o Harding Blvd | 5,967 | 5,737 | -230 | -3.9\% | 3.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 3,376 | 2,632 | -744 | -22.0\% | 13.6 | +/-400 vph | No | $<5$ | No |
| NB Harding Blvd $\mathrm{n} / 0$ Douglas BlvdSB Harding Blvd $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{D}$ Douglas Blvd | 2,470 | 1,891 | -579 | -23.4\% | 12.4 | +/-15\% | No | $<5$ | No |
|  | 415 | 454 | 39 | 9.3\% | 1.9 | +/-100 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| NB Harding Blvd s/0 Douglas Blvd | 473 | 508 | 35 | 7.3\% | 1.6 | +/-100 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 7,692 | 7,814 | 122 | 1.6\% | 1.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| WB Douglas Blvd w/o Sunrise Ave | 9,202 | 8,682 | -521 | -5.7\% | 5.5 | +/-400 vph | No | $<5$ | No |
| EB Douglas Blvd e/o Sunrise Ave WB Douglas Blvd e/o Sunrise Ave | 6,883 | 7,007 | 124 | 1.8\% | 1.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 7,717 | 7,699 | -18 | -0.2\% | 0.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| SB Surrise Ave $/ \mathrm{o}$ Douglas BlvdNB Sunrise Ave $/$ /o Douglas Blvd | 3,697 | 3,860 | 163 | 4.4\% | 2.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 3,461 | 3,650 | 189 | 5.4\% | 3.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| SB Sunrise Ave s/o Douglas Blvd | 3,085 | 1,925 | -1160 | -37.6\% | 23.2 | +/-400 vph | No | $<5$ | No |
|  | 3,525 | 3,544 | 19 | 0.5\% | 0.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| NB Sunrise Ave s/o Douglas Blvd <br> EB Woodside Dr e/o Pacific St | 580 | 617 | 37 | 6.4\% | 1.5 | +/-100 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
| WB Woodside Dr e/o Pacific stSB Pacific St $n / 0$ Woodside Dr | 370 | 347 | -23 | -6.3\% | 1.2 | +/-100 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 3,154 | 3,268 | 114 | 3.6\% | 2.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| NB Pacaific St $n$ /o Woodside DrSB Pacific $5 t s / 0$ Woodside Dr | 4,234 | 4,198 | -36 | -0.9\% | 0.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 3,220 | 3,306 | 86 | 2.7\% | 1.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| SB Pacific St s/o Woodside Dr NB Pacific St s/o Woodside Dr | 4,510 | 4,506 | -4 | -0.1\% | 0.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| EB S Sunset Blvd $w / 0$ P Pacific StWB Sunset Blvd w/o Pacific st | 3,589 | 3,923 | 334 | 9.3\% | 5.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | No |
|  | 4,959 | 5,288 | 329 | 6.6\% | 4.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| WB Sunset Blvd w/o Pacific St EB Sunset Blvd e/o Pacific St | 705 | 545 | -160 | -22.8\% | 6.4 | +/-15\% | No | $<5$ | No |
| WB Sunset Blvd e/o Pacific stSB Pacific St $n / 0$ Sunset Blvd | 852 | 761 | -92 | -10.7\% | 3.2 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 3,840 | 3,919 | 79 | 2.1\% | 1.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| NB Pacific St $n / 0$ Sunset BlvdSB Pacific 5 St $/$ Sunset Blvd | 3,656 | 3,656 | -1 | 0.0\% | 0.0 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 3,102 | 3,250 | 148 | 4.8\% | 2.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| SB Pacific St s/o Sunset Blvd NB Pacific St s/o Sunset Blvd | 4,141 | 4,136 | -6 | -0.1\% | 0.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
| EB Rocklin Rd w/o Granite DrWB Rocklin Cd W/o Granite Dr | 3,081 | 3,143 | 62 | 2.0\% | 1.1 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 3,512 | 3,862 | 350 | 10.0\% | 5.8 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | No |
| EB Rocklin Rd e/o Granite Dr | 4,132 | 4,045 | -87 | -2.1\% | 1.4 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 4,491 | 4,579 | 88 | 2.0\% | 1.3 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| WB Rocklin Rd e/o Granite Dr SB Granite Dr n/o Rocklin Rd | 2,645 | 2,362 | -283 | -10.7\% | 5.7 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | No |
| NB Granite Dr $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{o}$ Rocklin Rd | 2,633 | 2,212 | -422 | -16.0\% | 8.6 | +/-15\% | No | <5 | No |
|  | 4,238 | 4,193 | -45 | -1.1\% | 0.7 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| WB Rocklin Rd w/O WB $1-80$EB Rockin Rd e/o WB 180 | 4,736 | 4,774 | 38 | 0.8\% | 0.6 | +/-400 vph | Yes | <5 | Yes |
|  | 2,597 | 2,516 | -81 | -3.1\% | 1.6 | +/-15\% | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| WB Rocklin Rd e// WB 1-80 | 5,911 | 6,059 | 148 | 2.5\% | 1.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 4,246 | 4,236 | -10 | -0.2\% | 0.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| EB Rocklin Rd e/o EB I-80 EB Rocklin Rd e/o EB I-80 | 4,155 | 4,060 | -95 | -2.3\% | 1.5 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
| EB Rocklin Rd e/o EB I-80 <br> EB Rocklin Rd w/o Aguilar Rd WB Rocklin Rd w/o Aguilar Rd EB Rocklin Rd e/o Aguilar Rd WB Rocklin Rd e/o Aguilar Rd | 4,373 | 4,294 | -79 | -1.8\% | 1.2 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 4,217 | 3,843 | -374 | -8.9\% | 5.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | No |
|  | 3,705 | 3,529 | -176 | -4.8\% | 2.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |
|  | 3,722 | 3,546 | -176 | $-4.7 \%$ | 2.9 | +/-400 vph | Yes | $<5$ | Yes |


| SB Aguilar Rd s/o Rocklin Rd | 497 | 446 | -51 | -10.2\% | 2.3 | +/-100 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NB Aguilar Rd s/o Rocklin Rd | 324 | 297 | -27 | -8.3\% | 1.5 | +/-100 vph | Yes | < 5 | Yes |
| Overall | 1,749,267 | 1,748,116 | -1,151 | -0.1\% | 0.9 | +/-5\% | Yes | < 4 | Yes |


| Link Volumes |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Target | $\%$ Met |
| $<700 \mathrm{vph}$ | $>85 \%$ | $96 \%$ |
| $>700 \&<2,700 \mathrm{vph}$ | $>85 \%$ | $96 \%$ |
| $>2,700 \mathrm{vph}$ | $>85 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| GEH Statistic | $>85 \%$ | $86 \%$ |
| Aggregated Volumes |  |  |
|  | Target | Modeled |
|  |  |  |
| Intersections | $>85 \%$ | $93 \%$ |
| Interchanges | $>85 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

VISSIM Metrics
Calibration Comparison
I-80/SR 65 Interchange

## Fehr \& Peers

Travel Time
February 21, 2013

PM Peak Period

|  |  | Measured | Modeled Conditions |  |  | Calibration Targets ${ }^{1}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Path | Time Period | Travel Time (minutes) | Travel Time (minutes) | Difference (minutes) | Percent Difference | Target | Meets Target? |
|  | 4:00-4:15 | 8.17 | 8.27 | 0.10 | 1.3\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 4:30-4:45 | 8.03 | 8.41 | 0.38 | 4.7\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 5:00-5:15 | 8.27 | 8.41 | 0.14 | 1.7\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 5:45-6:00 | 9.03 | 8.20 | -0.83 | -9.2\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
| I-80 WB: Blue Oaks Blvd to Antelope Road | 6:15-6.:30 | 8.05 | 8.05 | 0.00 | 0.0\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 3:45-4:00 | 7.39 | 9.52 | 2.13 | 28.7\% | +/-15\% | No |
|  | 4:15-4:30 | 8.06 | 9.21 | 1.15 | 14.2\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 4:45-5:00 | 8.61 | 10.20 | 1.59 | 18.4\% | +/-15\% | No |
|  | 5:15-5:30 | 12.21 | 9.58 | -2.63 | -21.5\% | +/-15\% | No |
| I-80 EB: Antelope Road to Blue Oaks Blvd | 6:00-6:15 | 9.04 | 8.25 | -0.79 | -8.7\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 4:00-4:15 | 8.75 | 8.07 | -0.68 | -7.8\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 5:00-5:15 | 8.50 | 8.19 | -0.31 | -3.6\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 5:30-5:45 | 7.30 | 8.10 | 0.80 | 11.0\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 6:00-6:15 | 7.77 | 7.98 | 0.22 | 2.8\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
| I-80 WB: Sierra College Blvd to Antelope Road | 6:30-6:45 | 7.68 | 7.94 | 0.26 | 3.3\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 4:15-4:30 | 5.84 | 6.55 | 0.71 | 12.1\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 4:45-5:00 | 6.08 | 6.63 | 0.55 | 9.0\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
|  | 5:15-5:30 | 6.26 | 6.57 | 0.31 | 4.9\% | +/-15\% | Yes |
| I-80 EB: Antelope Road to Sierra College Blvd | 5:45-6:00 | 7.06 | 6.41 | -0.65 | -9.3\% | +/-15\% | Yes |


| Measure | \% Cases |
| :---: | :---: |
| $>85 \%$ | $84 \%$ |
| Not Met |  |


| Mode | Description | Distance <br> (ft) | Volume (vehicles) |  | Travel Time (min.:sec.) |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Speed (mph) } \\ \hline \text { Average } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SOV | SR-65 at Blue Oaks to I-80 at Antelope | 43,109 | 466 | 0 | 08:25 | 00:00 | 23.3 |
|  | $1-80$ at Auburn to SR-65 at Blue Oaks | 32,854 | 1113 | 0 | 09:16 | 00:00 | 16.1 |
|  | I-80 at Sierra College to $\mathrm{I}-80$ at Antelope | 44,492 | 473 | 0 | 08:11 | 00:00 | 24.7 |
|  | I-80 at Auburn to I-80 at Sierra College | 35,359 | 874 | 0 | 06:35 | 00:00 | 24.4 |
| HOV | SR-65 at Blue Oaks to I-80 at Antelope | 43,109 | 131 | 0 | 08:17 | 00:00 | 23.7 |
|  | I-80 at Auburn to SR-65 at Blue Oaks | 32,854 | 246 | 0 | 09:11 | 00:00 | 16.3 |
|  | I-80 at Sierra College to I-80 at Antelope | 44,492 | 160 | 0 | 08:01 | 00:00 | 25.2 |
|  | I-80 at Auburn to I-80 at Sierra College | 35,359 | 156 | 0 | 06:23 | 00:00 | 25.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Network Statistics

I-80/SR 65 Interchange Existing Conditions PM Peak Period

| Network Performance | Vehicle Types | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Vehicles Served | All Vehicles | 198,170 | 39 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | All Vehicles | 730,101 | 1,288 |
| Travel Time [h] | All Vehicles | 16,851 | 93.9 |
| Average Speed [mph] | All Vehicles | 43.3 | 0.2 |
| Total Delay [h] | All Vehicles | 3,946 | 91.1 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | All Vehicles | 71 | 1.6 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | All Vehicles | 0.32 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | HOV | 36,144 | 153 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | HOV | 135,800 | 858 |
| Travel Time [h] | HOV | 3,038 | 20 |
| Average Speed [mph] | HOV | 44.7 | 0.2 |
| Total Delay [h] | HOV | 652 | 16 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | HOV | 64 | 2 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | HOV | 0.29 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | Truck | 2,717 | 49 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | Truck | 13,929 | 276 |
| Travel Time [h] | Truck | 297 | 5 |
| Average Speed [mph] | Truck | 46.9 | 1 |
| Total Delay [h] | Truck | 60 | 3 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | Truck | 78 | 5 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | Truck | 0.26 | 0.02 |


|  | Vehicle Types |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure | HOV | Truck | All |
| Vehicles Served | 36,140 | 2,720 | 198,170 |
| Demand Volume | 35,829 | 2,724 | 195,975 |
| Percent Demand Served | $100.9 \%$ | $99.9 \%$ | $101.1 \%$ |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel | 135,800 | 13,930 | 730,100 |
| Person Miles of Travel | 285,180 | 14,630 | 880,180 |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel | 3,040 | 300 | 16,850 |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay | 650 | 60 | 3,950 |
| VHD \% of VHT | $21.4 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $23.4 \%$ |
| Average Delay per Vehicle $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.08 | 1.32 | 1.20 |
| Person Hours of Delay | 1,370 | 60 | 4,670 |
| Average Travel Speed | 44.7 | 46.9 | 43.3 |


| Location |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 1 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 6,296 | 44 | 101.8\% | 649 | 10 | 92.6\% |  |  |  | 60.1 | 1.4 | 24.2 | 0.6 | C |
| 2 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | Basic | 6,935 | 67 | 100.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55.6 | 2.9 | 39.4 | 2.1 | E |
| 3 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,929 | 75 | 100.6\% |  |  |  | 1,171 | 72 | 102.3\% | 62.2 | 0.3 | 22.3 | 0.4 | C |
| 4 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,760 | 93 | 100.4\% |  |  |  | 410 | 37 | 106.1\% | 62.6 | 1.8 | 18.0 | 1.1 | B |
| 5 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,351 | 79 | 100.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 2.3 | 22.7 | 2.8 | C |
| 6 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 5,349 | 86 | 99.9\% | 1,192 | 45 | 102.4\% |  |  |  | 56.7 | 7.3 | 30.5 | 9.1 | D |
| 7 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,549 | 128 | 100.5\% |  |  |  | 890 | 55 | 94.6\% | 52.0 | 9.2 | 46.4 | 19.6 | F |
| 8 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,670 | 133 | 101.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.0 | 1.7 | 23.3 | 0.8 | C |
| 9 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | 5,670 | 127 | 101.7\% | 297 | 33 | 129.6\% |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.4 | 19.5 | 1.5 | B |
| 10 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd to Taylor Rd | Weave | 5,965 | 124 | 102.7\% | 977 | 55 | 108.7\% | 539 | 37 | 106.0\% | 48.1 | 12.4 | 38.8 | 15.7 | E |
| 11 | I-80 EB - Taylor Rd to SR-65 | Basic | 6,412 | 147 | 103.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 44.4 | 9.8 | 39.5 | 11.3 | E |
| 17 | I-80 EB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,416 | 153 | 103.5\% |  |  |  | 3,181 | 94 | 99.8\% | 44.3 | 6.6 | 51.6 | 13.4 | F |
| 18 | I-80 EB - SR-65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,231 | 108 | 107.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.2 | 16.8 | 0.8 | B |
| 19 | I-80 EB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 3,230 | 108 | 107.4\% | 1,581 | 89 | 100.0\% |  |  |  | 60.8 | 3.8 | 22.4 | 1.6 | C |
| 20 | I-80 EB - SR-65 to Lane Drop | Basic | 4,809 | 150 | 104.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58.5 | 3.3 | 27.5 | 1.5 | D |
| 21 | I-80 EB - Lane Drop to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 4,803 | 150 | 104.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.7 | 0.5 | 26.9 | 0.6 | D |
| 22 | I-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,803 | 151 | 104.6\% |  |  |  | 1,217 | 65 | 107.4\% | 61.0 | 1.0 | 23.8 | 0.7 | C |
| 23 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,586 | 138 | 103.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.4 | 20.2 | 0.8 | C |
| 24 | I-80 EB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,587 | 138 | 103.7\% | 267 | 26 | 104.8\% |  |  |  | 61.5 | 0.7 | 19.0 | 0.9 | B |
| 25 | I-80 EB - Rocklin Rd to Sierra College Blvd | Basic | 3,857 | 147 | 103.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.2 | 20.7 | 0.8 | C |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| Location |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 26 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,857 | 147 | 103.9\% |  |  |  | 374 | 41 | 131.6\% | 62.2 | 1.3 | 21.8 | 0.9 | C |
| 27 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,482 | 138 | 101.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.5 | 19.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 28 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 3,481 | 132 | 101.5\% | 236 | 6 | 107.2\% |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.4 | 18.2 | 0.7 | B |
| 29 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 3,720 | 121 | 101.9\% | 464 | 9 | 102.0\% |  |  |  | 59.7 | 1.1 | 21.0 | 0.9 | C |
| 38 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,241 | 18 | 106.0\% |  |  |  | 490 | 42 | 104.5\% | 60.7 | 0.8 | 16.5 | 0.3 | B |
| 39 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,749 | 52 | 106.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.2 | 16.4 | 0.3 | B |
| 40 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 2,747 | 54 | 106.2\% | 70 | 3 | 100.4\% |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.1 | 14.2 | 0.3 | B |
| 41 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 2,819 | 60 | 106.1\% | 293 | 7 | 122.0\% |  |  |  | 61.5 | 0.6 | 15.3 | 0.4 | B |
| 42 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 3,106 | 60 | 107.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.8 | 0.1 | 16.8 | 0.4 | B |
| 43 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,104 | 63 | 107.2\% |  |  |  | 273 | 28 | 101.3\% | 63.2 | 0.3 | 19.4 | 0.5 | B |
| 44 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,831 | 64 | 107.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.2 | 17.0 | 0.3 | B |
| 45 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 2,829 | 59 | 107.7\% | 1,080 | 60 | 111.2\% |  |  |  | 50.8 | 1.6 | 24.0 | 1.5 | C |
| 46 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd to HOV Lane Start | Basic | 3,912 | 80 | 108.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.4 | 24.2 | 0.6 | C |
| 47 | I-80 WB - HOV Lane Start to SR-65 | Basic | 3,904 | 69 | 108.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.2 | 16.2 | 0.2 | B |
| 48 | I-80 WB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,903 | 67 | 108.4\% |  |  |  | 1,258 | 53 | 107.3\% | 52.6 | 9.9 | 45.9 | 31.7 | F |
| 49 | I-80 WB - SR-65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,632 | 67 | 108.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.8 | 0.2 | 14.9 | 0.3 | B |
| 50 | I-80 WB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 2,740 | 78 | 112.9\% | 2,498 | 96 | 102.3\% |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.1 | 20.6 | 0.6 | C |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane. Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| Location |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 60 | I-80 WB - Taylor Rd On-ramp | Merge | 5,126 | 109 | 105.2\% | 470 | 34 | 104.6\% |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.1 | 23.7 | 0.5 | C |
| 61 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,589 | 122 | 105.1\% |  |  |  | 422 | 46 | 113.0\% | 64.0 | 0.4 | 21.1 | 0.7 | C |
| 62 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,169 | 110 | 104.5\% |  |  |  | 682 | 58 | 103.0\% | 60.3 | 1.8 | 26.8 | 0.9 | C |
| 63 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,489 | 122 | 104.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.3 | 17.7 | 0.6 | B |
| 64 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St On-ramp | Merge | 4,490 | 123 | 104.8\% | 1,126 | 65 | 114.6\% |  |  |  | 61.1 | 1.4 | 21.6 | 0.8 | C |
| 65 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,616 | 145 | 106.6\% |  |  |  | 956 | 71 | 107.0\% | 60.6 | 2.3 | 17.6 | 0.7 | B |
| 66 | I-80 WB - Douglas Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,656 | 105 | 106.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.3 | 1.2 | 25.6 | 0.7 | C |
| 67 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 4,656 | 103 | 106.5\% | 1,029 | 61 | 89.5\% |  |  |  | 49.7 | 3.1 | 33.5 | 3.3 | D |
| 68 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 5,683 | 125 | 102.9\% | 524 | 41 | 113.6\% |  |  |  | 49.5 | 3.6 | 37.1 | 2.6 | E |
| 69 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd to Riverside Ave | Basic | 6,198 | 135 | 103.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.1 | 31.4 | 0.7 | D |
| 70 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,199 | 132 | 103.6\% |  |  |  | 759 | 59 | 101.6\% | 57.3 | 2.8 | 36.1 | 2.4 | E |
| 71 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,446 | 118 | 104.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.5 | 0.6 | 28.4 | 0.7 | D |
| 72 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave NB On-ramp | Merge | 5,443 | 122 | 103.9\% | 199 | 7 | 99.4\% |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.1 | 17.9 | 0.6 | B |
| 73 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave SB On-ramp | Merge | 5,639 | 124 | 103.7\% | 985 | 11 | 110.5\% |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.5 | 21.7 | 0.6 | C |
| 74 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave to Antelope Rd | Basic | 6,612 | 138 | 104.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.1 | 25.9 | 0.6 | C |
| 75 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,604 | 137 | 104.4\% |  |  |  | 959 | 40 | 102.6\% | 56.7 | 2.7 | 31.1 | 1.7 | D |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| Location | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 76 \|1-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,632 | 145 | 104.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 59.7 | 0.8 | 23.4 | 0.6 | C |
| 77 $1-80$ | Merge | 5,633 | 143 | 104.5\% | 321 | 8 | 97.7\% |  |  |  | 60.5 | 0.9 | 22.0 | 1.0 | C |
| 78 1-80 WB - Antelope Rd to Truck Scales | Weave | 5,948 | 138 | 104.0\% | 261 | 5 | 99.7\% | 19 | 10 |  | 62.9 | 0.2 | 22.1 | 0.5 | C |
| 79 1-80 WB - Truck Scales Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,180 | 135 | 103.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.1 | 23.7 | 0.5 | C |
| 80 1-80 WB - Truck Scales On-ramp | Merge | 6,631 | 147 | 110.9\% | 19 | 10 |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.1 | 22.9 | 0.7 | C |
| 81 1-80 WB - Truck Scales to Elkhorn Blvd | Basic | 6,189 | 144 | 103.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.2 | 23.8 | 0.7 | C |
| 82 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,190 | 143 | 103.5\% |  |  |  | 1,011 | 56 | 99.0\% | 58.3 | 1.6 | 26.1 | 1.0 | C |
| 83 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,174 | 150 | 104.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.6 | 0.8 | 20.6 | 0.7 | C |
| 84 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 5,175 | 148 | 104.4\% | 708 | 9 | 106.9\% |  |  |  | 58.8 | 0.7 | 20.7 | 0.7 | C |
| 85 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 5,875 | 152 | 104.5\% | 605 | 9 | 105.6\% |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.7 | 24.0 | 0.5 | C |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane. Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| Location |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 97 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off-ramp | Diverge | 1,745 | 43 | 101.6\% |  |  |  | 210 | 26 | 101.3\% | 63.8 | 0.2 | 12.4 | 0.3 | B |
| 98 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,532 | 38 | 101.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.3 | 12.7 | 0.3 | B |
| 99 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr On-ramp | Merge | 1,532 | 39 | 101.4\% | 388 | 26 | 101.8\% |  |  |  | 57.7 | 0.9 | 14.9 | 0.5 | B |
| 100 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Sunset Blvd | Basic | 1,928 | 53 | 102.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.3 | 15.9 | 0.6 | B |
| 101 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 1,930 | 56 | 102.1\% |  |  |  | 268 | 27 | 109.8\% | 63.3 | 0.3 | 14.7 | 0.4 | B |
| 102 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,660 | 52 | 100.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.3 | 13.4 | 0.5 | B |
| 103 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 1,662 | 53 | 100.9\% | 547 | 24 | 108.1\% |  |  |  | 56.1 | 1.6 | 17.6 | 0.8 | B |
| 104 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 2,210 | 59 | 102.7\% | 617 | 32 | 102.8\% |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.3 | 22.0 | 0.6 | C |
| 105 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Basic | 2,821 | 77 | 102.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.3 | 23.3 | 0.6 | C |
| 106 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,822 | 74 | 102.5\% |  |  |  | 528 | 41 | 97.5\% | 60.7 | 1.6 | 23.8 | 0.8 | C |
| 107 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,294 | 75 | 103.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.6 | 19.4 | 0.8 | C |
| 108 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 2,293 | 74 | 103.7\% | 282 | 24 | 76.1\% |  |  |  | 60.2 | 1.0 | 19.7 | 0.6 | B |
| 109 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | 2,578 | 74 | 99.9\% | 907 | 45 | 97.7\% | 559 | 42 | 99.2\% | 60.8 | 0.3 | 21.1 | 0.6 | C |
| 110 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,922 | 101 | 99.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.9 | 0.8 | 25.0 | 0.8 | C |
| 111 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 2,922 | 97 | 99.1\% | 352 | 25 | 117.6\% |  |  |  | 51.4 | 4.3 | 31.3 | 3.1 | D |
| 112 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 3,276 | 94 | 100.9\% | 620 | 45 | 106.1\% |  |  |  | 47.5 | 3.8 | 38.8 | 4.0 | E |
| 113 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | 3,895 | 104 | 101.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.9 | 0.6 | 32.4 | 1.0 | D |
| 114 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,895 | 104 | 101.7\% |  |  |  | 831 | 52 | 105.6\% | 62.0 | 0.4 | 32.2 | 1.0 | D |
| 115 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off to Lane Add | Basic | 3,060 | 108 | 100.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.4 | 27.1 | 1.0 | D |
| 116 | SR-65 SB - Lane Add to Galleria Blvd On-ramp | Basic | 3,057 | 109 | 100.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.2 | 19.4 | 0.3 | C |
| 117 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 3,057 | 111 | 100.5\% | 1,021 | 70 | 104.0\% |  |  |  | 55.8 | 2.7 | 24.3 | 1.8 | C |
| 118 | SR-65 SB - I-80 WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,079 | 134 | 101.4\% |  |  |  | 2,498 | 96 | 102.3\% | 62.9 | 0.1 | 21.6 | 0.8 | C |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane. Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| Location | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 125 SR-65 NB - I-80 WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,178 | 94 | 99.7\% | 1,232 | 58 | 105.1\% |  |  |  | 20.8 | 1.5 | 95.2 | 3.8 | F |
| 126 SR-65 NB - I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Basic | 4,405 | 94 | 101.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 28.7 | 2.7 | 76.5 | 5.7 | F |
| 127 SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,404 | 94 | 101.0\% |  |  |  | 1,247 | 56 | 108.8\% | 34.4 | 3.4 | 62.4 | 4.8 | F |
| 128 SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,157 | 93 | 98.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58.7 | 4.8 | 27.4 | 2.6 | D |
| 129 SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,156 | 89 | 98.2\% | 961 | 57 | 103.9\% |  |  |  | 48.9 | 10.0 | 39.2 | 8.8 | E |
| 130 SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Basic | 4,118 | 113 | 99.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.8 | 0.4 | 31.5 | 1.1 | D |
| 131 SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,118 | 113 | 99.5\% |  |  |  | 1,109 | 69 | 109.8\% | 62.2 | 0.2 | 27.9 | 0.9 | C |
| 132 SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,010 | 116 | 96.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.2 | 24.2 | 1.1 | C |
| 133 SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Weave | 3,012 | 115 | 96.3\% | 516 | 51 | 94.5\% | 1,061 | 67 | 90.4\% | 63.1 | 0.1 | 21.3 | 0.9 | C |
| 134 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,465 | 99 | 98.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.4 | 20.1 | 1.1 | C |
| 135 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 2,464 | 103 | 98.6\% | 528 | 33 | 110.2\% |  |  |  | 56.2 | 2.7 | 24.5 | 2.2 | C |
| 136 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | 2,991 | 116 | 100.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.2 | 25.3 | 0.9 | C |
| 137 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,988 | 111 | 100.3\% |  |  |  | 651 | 54 | 94.4\% | 62.9 | 0.1 | 22.7 | 0.7 | C |
| 138 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,334 | 97 | 101.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.2 | 19.7 | 0.8 | C |
| 139 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 2,330 | 99 | 101.7\% | 66 | 14 | 93.7\% |  |  |  | 62.3 | 0.3 | 20.0 | 0.8 | C |
| 140 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 2,395 | 94 | 101.5\% | 274 | 24 | 102.2\% |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.3 | 19.5 | 0.8 | B |
| 141 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd to Twelve Bridges Dr | Basic | 2,667 | 92 | 101.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.2 | 23.1 | 0.7 | C |
| 142 SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,657 | 95 | 101.1\% |  |  |  | 508 | 48 | 89.5\% | 61.9 | 0.3 | 23.3 | 0.8 | C |
| 143 SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,146 | 82 | 104.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.1 | 18.6 | 0.5 | C |
| 144 SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr On-ramp | Merge | 2,147 | 81 | 104.2\% | 238 | 23 | 81.1\% |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.4 | 19.6 | 0.5 | B |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 1 | SR-65 /Sterling Parkway |  | Signal | 4,125 | 4,171 | 101.1\% | 18.0 | 2.6 | B |
| 2 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 1,055 | 970 | 91.9\% | 4.6 | 0.5 | A |
| 3 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 1,520 | 1,431 | 94.1\% | 3.0 | 0.3 | A |
| 4 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 2,112 | 2,131 | 100.9\% | 6.0 | 0.2 | A |
| 5 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 2,081 | 2,125 | 102.1\% | 9.3 | 0.4 | A |
| 6 | SR-65 SB Ramps-Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks | Signal | 4,225 | 4,384 | 103.8\% | 32.8 | 3.3 | C |
| 7 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 2,891 | 2,954 | 102.2\% | 22.6 | 1.3 | C |
| 8 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 4,642 | 4,705 | 101.3\% | 7.9 | 0.6 | A |
| 9 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 4,337 | 4,496 | 103.7\% | 14.2 | 1.0 | B |
| 10 | Stanford Ranch Rd/Five Star Blvd | Signal | 4,292 | 4,370 | 101.8\% | 32.0 | 2.0 | C |
| 11 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Stanford Ranch Rd | Signal | 5,088 | 5,350 | 105.1\% | 15.2 | 2.1 | B |
| 12 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd | Signal | 5,081 | 5,279 | 103.9\% | 19.3 | 1.6 | B |
| 13 | Galleria Blvd/Antelope Creek Dr | Signal | 4,480 | 4,526 | 101.0\% | 24.4 | 2.1 | C |
| 14 | Galleria Blvd/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 6,853 | 7,146 | 104.3\% | 36.4 | 1.6 | D |
| 15 | Creekside Ridge Dr/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,484 | 4,508 | 100.5\% | 17.4 | 2.1 | B |
| 16 | Taylor Rd/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 5,875 | 5,808 | 98.9\% | 28.3 | 3.5 | C |
| 17 | North Sunrise Ave/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 5,080 | 5,030 | 99.0\% | 37.3 | 3.1 | D |
| 18 | Wills Rd/Atlantic St | Signal | 2,312 | 2,514 | 108.7\% | 12.3 | 1.2 | B |
| 19 | I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St | Signal | 3,239 | 3,595 | 111.0\% | 10.9 | 0.6 | B |
| 20 | Taylor Rd-I-80 EB Ramps/Eureka Rd | Signal | 4,818 | 5,175 | 107.4\% | 60.6 | 11.0 | E |
| 21 | North Sunrise Ave/Eureka Rd | Signal | 4,692 | 4,869 | 103.8\% | 29.9 | 1.9 | C |
| 22 | Harding Blvd/Wills Rd | Signal | 2,793 | 3,018 | 108.0\% | 13.4 | 1.1 | B |
| 23 | Harding Blvd/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 3,536 | 3,596 | 101.7\% | 27.7 | 1.8 | C |
| 24 | I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 4,479 | 4,480 | 100.0\% | 16.7 | 1.8 | B |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 94,090 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 96,629 |
| Percent Served | $102.7 \%$ |

Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 25 | I-80 EB Ramps/Douglas Blvd |  | Signal | 5,030 | 5,060 | 100.6\% | 5.8 | 0.6 | A |
| 26 | North Sunrise Ave/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 5,999 | 6,144 | 102.4\% | 35.4 | 1.7 | D |
| 27 | Pacific St/Woodside Dr | Signal | 2,211 | 2,202 | 99.6\% | 6.1 | 1.1 | A |
| 28 | Pacific St/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 3,385 | 3,465 | 102.4\% | 28.9 | 2.5 | C |
| 29 | Granite Dr/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,870 | 2,919 | 101.7\% | 36.5 | 2.3 | D |
| 30 | I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,935 | 3,092 | 105.3\% | 16.9 | 1.0 | B |
| 31 | I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,844 | 2,993 | 105.2\% | 20.0 | 1.0 | B |
| 32 | Aguilar Rd/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,132 | 2,137 | 100.2\% | 13.2 | 9.2 | B |
| 253 | Galleria Blvd/Berry St | Signal | 2,522 | 2,726 | 108.1\% | 8.6 | 1.1 | A |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 29,928 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 30,737 |
| Percent Served | $102.7 \%$ |

Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour

# SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements 

Vissim Model Results - Design Year Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane)

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Network Statistics

SR 65 Widening Design Year - HOV Lane Alternative AM Peak Period

| Network Performance | Vehicle Types | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Vehicles Served | All Vehicles | 208,159 | 165 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | All Vehicles | 940,218 | 1,802 |
| Travel Time [h] | All Vehicles | 21,708 | 210.4 |
| Average Speed [mph] | All Vehicles | 43.3 | 0.4 |
| Total Delay [h] | All Vehicles | 5,539 | 208.7 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | All Vehicles | 94 | 3.5 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | All Vehicles | 0.35 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | HOV | 34,962 | 45 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | HOV | 155,430 | 743 |
| Travel Time [h] | HOV | 3,347 | 31 |
| Average Speed [mph] | HOV | 46.4 | 0.4 |
| Total Delay [h] | HOV | 699 | 29 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | HOV | 71 | 3 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | HOV | 0.27 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | Truck | 7,584 | 18 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | Truck | 42,929 | 371 |
| Travel Time [h] | Truck | 972 | 16 |
| Average Speed [mph] | Truck | 44.2 | 1 |
| Total Delay [h] | Truck | 240 | 13 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | Truck | 111 | 6 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | Truck | 0.34 | 0.02 |


| Performance Measure | Vehicle Types |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HOV | Truck | All |
|  | 34,960 | 7,580 | 208,160 |
| Demand Volume | 35,840 | 8,220 | 210,080 |
| Percent Demand Served | $97.5 \%$ | $92.2 \%$ | $99.1 \%$ |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel | 155,430 | 42,930 | 940,220 |
| Person Miles of Travel | 326,400 | 45,080 | $1,113,340$ |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel | 3,350 | 970 | 21,710 |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay | 700 | 240 | 5,540 |
| VHD \% of VHT | $20.9 \%$ | $24.7 \%$ | $25.5 \%$ |
| Average Delay per Vehicle $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.20 | 1.90 | 1.60 |
| Person Hours of Delay | 1,470 | 250 | 6,320 |
| Average Travel Speed | 46.4 | 44.2 | 43.3 |

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Peak Hour Travel Time


VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Network Statistics

SR 65 Widening Design Year - HOV Lane Alternative PM Peak Period

| Network Performance | Vehicle Types | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Vehicles Served | All Vehicles | 300,778 | 400 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | All Vehicles | $1,160,701$ | 2,052 |
| Travel Time [h] | All Vehicles | 30,886 | 216.4 |
| Average Speed [mph] | All Vehicles | 37.6 | 0.3 |
| Total Delay [h] | All Vehicles | 10,468 | 229.4 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | All Vehicles | 123 | 2.8 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | All Vehicles | 0.54 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | HOV | 53,198 | 114 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | HOV | 218,121 | 780 |
| Travel Time [h] | HOV | 5,387 | 36 |
| Average Speed [mph] | HOV | 40.5 | 0.3 |
| Total Delay [h] | HOV | 1,586 | 36 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | HOV | 105 | 2 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | HOV | 0.44 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | Truck | 8,041 | 25 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | Truck | 39,639 | 237 |
| Travel Time [h] | Truck | 971 | 9 |
| Average Speed [mph] | Truck | 40.8 | 0 |
| Total Delay [h] | Truck | 287 | 8 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | Truck | 126 | 3 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | Truck | 0.44 | 0.01 |


| Performance Measure | Vehicle Types |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HOV | Truck | All |
|  | 53,200 | 8,040 | 300,780 |
| Demand Volume | 54,330 | 8,650 | 301,970 |
| Percent Demand Served | $97.9 \%$ | $92.9 \%$ | $99.6 \%$ |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel | 218,120 | 39,640 | $1,160,700$ |
| Person Miles of Travel | 458,050 | 41,620 | $1,402,610$ |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel | 5,390 | 970 | 30,890 |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay | 1,590 | 290 | 10,470 |
| VHD \% of VHT | $29.5 \%$ | $29.9 \%$ | $33.9 \%$ |
| Average Delay per Vehicle $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.79 | 2.16 | 2.09 |
| Person Hours of Delay | 3,340 | 300 | 12,230 |
| Average Travel Speed | 40.5 | 40.8 | 37.6 |

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Peak Hour Travel Time


| VISSIM Post-Processor Average Results from 10 Runs Freeway Operations Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Design Year - HOV Lane Alternative AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 1 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 7,491 | 32 | 110.2\% | 1,243 | 20 | 110.0\% |  |  |  | 58.8 | 3.7 | 34.9 | 2.7 | D |
| 2 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | Basic | 8,727 | 79 | 110.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55.8 | 4.3 | 39.2 | 3.6 | E |
| 3 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,721 | 95 | 110.0\% |  |  |  | 1,391 | 75 | 109.6\% | 59.9 | 2.0 | 30.7 | 1.6 | D |
| 4 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,321 | 114 | 109.9\% |  |  |  | 370 | 34 | 112.1\% | 61.1 | 1.5 | 26.3 | 1.3 | C |
| 5 | 1-80 EB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,949 | 116 | 109.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.4 | 28.0 | 0.5 | D |
| 6 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd | Weave | 6,950 | 132 | 109.8\% | 1,167 | 40 | 95.6\% | 1,788 | 91 | 105.2\% | 62.2 | 0.5 | 27.1 | 0.6 | C |
| 7 | 1-80 EB CD - Eureka Rd to Taylor Rd/SR-65 | Weave | 626 | 43 | 104.3\% | 1,233 | 63 | 105.4\% | 880 | 43 | 102.3\% | 61.3 | 1.0 | 15.8 | 0.6 | B |
| 8 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd to SR-65 | Basic | 6,324 | 129 | 108.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.7 | 1.6 | 30.3 | 1.2 | D |
| 9 | 1-80 EB - HOV Connector Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,325 | 125 | 108.1\% |  |  |  | 585 | 49 | 106.3\% | 58.1 | 2.0 | 30.5 | 1.3 | D |
| 10 | I-80 EB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,742 | 117 | 108.3\% |  |  |  | 3,311 | 114 | 107.8\% | 62.3 | 1.0 | 24.4 | 0.6 | C |
| 11 | I-80 EB - SR-65 Off-ramp to Eureka Rd On-ramp | Basic | 2,434 | 94 | 109.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.3 | 15.1 | 0.4 | B |
| 17 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd On-ramp | Merge | 2,436 | 92 | 109.2\% | 580 | 38 | 101.7\% |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.8 | 15.2 | 0.5 | B |
| 18 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd On-ramp to SR-65 On-ramp | Basic | 3,015 | 95 | 107.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.3 | 16.7 | 0.5 | B |
| 19 | I-80 EB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 3,015 | 97 | 107.7\% | 2,073 | 90 | 109.1\% |  |  |  | 60.2 | 0.3 | 27.5 | 0.8 | C |
| 20 | 1-80 EB - SR-65 to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 5,088 | 124 | 108.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.1 | 25.5 | 0.6 | C |
| 22 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,109 | 133 | 108.7\% |  |  |  | 1,762 | 90 | 106.8\% | 63.5 | 0.1 | 24.9 | 0.4 | C |
| 23 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,360 | 103 | 110.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.2 | 20.6 | 0.5 | C |
| 24 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,363 | 102 | 110.3\% | 183 | 3 | 96.2\% |  |  |  | 60.9 | 1.0 | 22.0 | 0.7 | C |
| 25 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd to Sierra College Blvd | Basic | 3,552 | 105 | 109.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.3 | 21.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 26 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,554 | 107 | 109.7\% |  |  |  | 684 | 46 | 114.1\% | 62.2 | 0.7 | 23.8 | 0.8 | C |
| 27 | 1-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,874 | 99 | 108.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.2 | 17.4 | 0.5 | B |
| 28 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 2,875 | 99 | 108.9\% | 140 | 5 | 93.0\% |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.3 | 17.6 | 0.4 | B |
| 29 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 3,018 | 96 | 108.2\% | 522 | 19 | 106.5\% |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.4 | 20.0 | 0.4 | B |
| 38 | 1-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,376 | 25 | 105.8\% |  |  |  | 1,104 | 66 | 106.1\% | 53.0 | 3.5 | 33.0 | 2.1 | D |
| 39 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,269 | 69 | 105.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.6 | 0.7 | 25.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 40 | 1-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 4,269 | 70 | 105.7\% | 50 | 4 | 83.0\% |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.4 | 23.3 | 0.7 | C |
| 41 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 4,315 | 74 | 105.2\% | 321 | 15 | 103.4\% |  |  |  | 60.9 | 1.1 | 25.1 | 0.8 | C |
| 42 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 4,632 | 84 | 105.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.2 | 26.4 | 0.5 | D |
| 43 | 1-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,632 | 83 | 105.0\% |  |  |  | 270 | 25 | 103.7\% | 62.2 | 0.5 | 27.1 | 0.8 | C |
| 44 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,358 | 86 | 105.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.2 | 24.8 | 0.5 | C |
| 45 | 1-80 WB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 4,356 | 93 | 105.0\% | 980 | 48 | 99.0\% |  |  |  | 59.5 | 0.7 | 29.0 | 0.8 | D |
| 46 | 1-80 WB - Rocklin Rd to HOV Lane Start | Basic | 5,325 | 111 | 103.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.2 | 1.0 | 31.0 | 0.8 | D |
| 47 | I-80 WB - HOV Lane Start to SR-65 | Basic | 5,324 | 117 | 103.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.3 | 23.8 | 0.4 | C |
| 48 | 1-80 WB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,323 | 116 | 103.6\% |  |  |  | 1,699 | 77 | 104.2\% | 63.6 | 0.2 | 22.0 | 0.4 | C |
| 49 | I-80 WB - SR-65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,615 | 98 | 103.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.1 | 19.5 | 0.5 | C |
| 60 | I-80 WB - SR-65 to Atlantic St | Weave | 3,611 | 106 | 102.9\% | 5,772 | 128 | 105.9\% | 518 | 43 | 101.5\% | 57.7 | 0.8 | 27.0 | 0.7 | C |
| 62 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,817 | 153 | 104.3\% |  |  |  | 1,289 | 66 | 103.9\% | 56.9 | 2.9 | 33.4 | 1.8 | D |
| 63 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,527 | 155 | 104.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.5 | 1.0 | 28.8 | 0.6 | D |
| 64 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St On-ramp | Merge | 7,523 | 153 | 104.3\% | 915 | 50 | 108.9\% |  |  |  | 56.2 | 4.0 | 41.1 | 2.9 | E |
| 65 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,431 | 167 | 104.7\% |  |  |  | 1,166 | 70 | 99.6\% | 61.1 | 0.5 | 35.7 | 0.9 | E |
| 66 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,256 | 174 | 105.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.1 | 27.7 | 0.4 | D |
| 67 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 7,256 | 176 | 105.5\% | 937 | 62 | 105.3\% |  |  |  | 57.9 | 1.9 | 33.2 | 1.4 | D |
| 68 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 8,197 | 175 | 105.5\% | 462 | 34 | 110.1\% |  |  |  | 56.3 | 4.2 | 39.1 | 3.5 | E |
| 69 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd to Riverside Ave | Basic | 8,660 | 140 | 105.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.0 | 0.6 | 34.9 | 0.8 | D |
| 70 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,674 | 187 | 105.9\% |  |  |  | 1,077 | 58 | 101.6\% | 62.3 | 0.1 | 35.0 | 0.7 | D |
| 71 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,594 | 170 | 106.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.1 | 30.0 | 0.6 | D |
| 72 | 1-80 WB - Riverside Ave NB On-ramp | Merge | 7,595 | 167 | 106.5\% | 215 | 7 | 85.9\% |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.3 | 27.9 | 0.5 | C |
| 73 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave SB On-ramp | Merge | 7,812 | 157 | 105.8\% | 788 | 12 | 101.0\% |  |  |  | 62.3 | 0.8 | 33.7 | 0.6 | D |
| 74 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave to Antelope Rd | Basic | 8,610 | 162 | 105.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.8 | 1.7 | 34.9 | 1.3 | D |
| 75 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,613 | 174 | 105.6\% |  |  |  | 470 | 34 | 90.4\% | 57.1 | 10.3 | 40.3 | 11.6 | E |
| 76 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 8,146 | 173 | 106.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55.3 | 14.9 | 43.3 | 23.4 | E |
| 77 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 8,153 | 181 | 106.7\% | 525 | 13 | 99.1\% |  |  |  | 52.9 | 14.5 | 47.9 | 26.4 | F |
| 78 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd to Truck Scales | Weave | 8,703 | 202 | 106.5\% | 444 | 14 | 88.7\% | 95 | 18 | 86.1\% | 48.4 | 13.1 | 48.3 | 18.0 | F |
| 79 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales Off to On-ramp | Basic | 9,147 | 240 | 106.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 41.4 | 12.2 | 60.5 | 19.2 | F |
| 80 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales On-ramp | Merge | 9,177 | 277 | 107.2\% | 95 | 18 | 86.5\% |  |  |  | 34.9 | 8.9 | 78.8 | 16.6 | F |
| 81 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales to Elkhorn Blvd | Basic | 9,352 | 262 | 107.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35.1 | 4.1 | 68.0 | 7.1 | F |
| 82 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 9,372 | 263 | 108.1\% |  |  |  | 1,131 | 88 | 109.8\% | 34.9 | 2.6 | 59.7 | 4.3 | F |
| 83 | 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 8,347 | 244 | 109.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26.1 | 0.6 | 90.7 | 1.6 | F |
| 84 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 8,390 | 222 | 109.8\% | 740 | 12 | 93.6\% |  |  |  | 26.6 | 0.7 | 91.4 | 2.9 | F |
| 85 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 9,187 | 214 | 109.0\% | 811 | 18 | 98.9\% |  |  |  | 32.8 | 0.5 | 74.7 | 0.8 | F |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| VISSIM Post-Processor Average Results from 10 Runs Freeway Operations Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SR 65 Widening <br> Design Year - HOV Lane Alternative AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 100 | SR-65 NB - EB I-80 Connector | Basic | 3,312 | 113 | 107.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.3 | 1.7 | 29.1 | 1.1 | D |
| 101 | SR-65 NB - Eureka Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,313 | 113 | 107.9\% | 979 | 52 | 106.4\% |  |  |  | 48.6 | 0.2 | 32.2 | 0.8 | D |
| 102 | SR-65 NB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 1,700 | 78 | 104.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52.9 | 0.2 | 18.1 | 0.8 | C |
| 103 | SR-65 NB - I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Weave | 4,283 | 111 | 107.3\% | 2,284 | 88 | 104.8\% | 850 | 46 | 103.7\% | 59.5 | 0.3 | 27.8 | 0.7 | C |
| 106 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,716 | 149 | 106.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.2 | 30.8 | 0.8 | D |
| 107 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | 5,722 | 155 | 107.0\% | 698 | 25 | 102.7\% | 1,027 | 62 | 96.9\% | 61.7 | 1.1 | 29.6 | 1.1 | D |
| 110 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,403 | 149 | 108.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 57.6 | 4.5 | 31.7 | 2.0 | D |
| 111 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 5,406 | 140 | 108.8\% | 291 | 26 | 100.4\% |  |  |  | 61.5 | 0.7 | 30.6 | 0.7 | D |
| 112 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,698 | 138 | 108.3\% |  |  |  | 2,210 | 84 | 110.5\% | 62.9 | 0.2 | 27.5 | 0.6 | C |
| 114 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,493 | 100 | 107.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.2 | 20.2 | 0.6 | C |
| 115 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 3,490 | 101 | 107.0\% | 643 | 50 | 100.4\% |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.2 | 18.2 | 0.6 | B |
| 116 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | 4,131 | 115 | 105.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.1 | 19.5 | 0.4 | C |
| 118 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,132 | 117 | 105.9\% |  |  |  | 1,448 | 72 | 106.4\% | 63.8 | 0.2 | 19.8 | 0.4 | B |
| 119 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,686 | 88 | 105.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.0 | 0.1 | 14.9 | 0.4 | B |
| 120 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 2,686 | 85 | 105.8\% | 163 | 20 | 101.8\% |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.1 | 15.6 | 0.3 | B |
| 121 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd to Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Weave | 2,852 | 79 | 105.6\% | 285 | 18 | 101.6\% | 795 | 51 | 98.1\% | 63.8 | 0.1 | 14.7 | 0.3 | B |
| 124 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,342 | 72 | 107.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.1 | 0.2 | 13.2 | 0.4 | B |
| 125 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy EB On-ramp | Merge | 2,341 | 69 | 107.9\% | 522 | 36 | 106.5\% |  |  |  | 62.3 | 0.4 | 16.3 | 0.4 | B |
| 126 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | 2,864 | 87 | 107.7\% | 461 | 19 | 107.1\% | 689 | 48 | 93.1\% | 63.6 | 0.1 | 15.4 | 0.4 | B |
| 129 | SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,640 | 81 | 112.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.8 | 0.1 | 16.3 | 0.5 | B |
| 130 | SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Lincoln Blvd | Weave | 2,642 | 79 | 112.4\% | 944 | 49 | 107.3\% | 865 | 59 | 115.3\% | 63.0 | 0.4 | 17.1 | 0.3 | B |
| 133 | SR-65 NB - Lincoln Blvd to Ferrari Ranch Rd | Basic | 2,725 | 93 | 109.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.3 | 21.5 | 0.7 | C |
| 134 | SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,725 | 91 | 109.9\% |  |  |  | 1,156 | 54 | 102.3\% | 63.7 | 0.1 | 18.2 | 0.5 | B |
| 135 | SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,571 | 69 | 116.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.0 | 0.1 | 15.2 | 0.5 | B |
| 136 | SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | 1,573 | 68 | 116.5\% | 181 | 6 | 106.2\% |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.2 | 15.9 | 0.4 | B |
| 150 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,007 | 32 | 107.9\% |  |  |  | 144 | 23 | 102.9\% | 63.1 | 0.2 | 25.9 | 0.3 | C |
| 151 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,864 | 46 | 108.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.2 | 24.5 | 0.5 | C |
| 152 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 1,865 | 44 | 108.4\% | 1,161 | 19 | 104.6\% |  |  |  | 60.6 | 0.3 | 24.8 | 0.3 | C |
| 153 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | 3,027 | 51 | 107.0\% | 1,045 | 24 | 92.4\% |  |  |  | 58.2 | 1.7 | 28.4 | 0.8 | D |
| 154 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd to Lincoln Blvd | Basic | 4,077 | 58 | 103.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.1 | 2.2 | 30.5 | 1.4 | D |
| 156 | SR-65 SB - Lincoln Blvd to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | 4,080 | 65 | 103.0\% | 1,369 | 70 | 119.1\% | 932 | 56 | 107.1\% | 53.9 | 4.3 | 33.8 | 3.5 | D |
| 159 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,517 | 83 | 106.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.8 | 30.1 | 0.6 | D |
| 160 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Placer Pkwy | Weave | 4,518 | 88 | 106.6\% | 1,206 | 51 | 112.7\% | 1,131 | 46 | 112.0\% | 60.2 | 1.2 | 30.1 | 0.8 | D |
| 163 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,597 | 93 | 106.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.1 | 28.0 | 0.4 | D |
| 164 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy WB On-ramp | Merge | 4,601 | 92 | 107.0\% | 415 | 34 | 109.2\% |  |  |  | 61.4 | 0.9 | 31.2 | 0.9 | D |
| 165 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy to Sunset Blvd | Weave | 5,016 | 98 | 107.2\% | 624 | 40 | 109.5\% | 833 | 64 | 105.4\% | 60.5 | 0.6 | 29.3 | 0.6 | D |
| 168 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,798 | 115 | 107.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.4 | 29.3 | 0.8 | D |
| 169 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 4,797 | 116 | 107.6\% | 802 | 33 | 114.6\% |  |  |  | 59.0 | 5.0 | 33.5 | 3.5 | D |
| 170 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Weave | 5,601 | 127 | 108.5\% | 530 | 14 | 96.4\% | 1,097 | 56 | 108.6\% | 61.6 | 0.7 | 28.9 | 0.8 | D |
| 172 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to HOV Lane Start | Basic | 5,033 | 106 | 107.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.1 | 29.2 | 0.7 | D |
| 173 | SR-65 SB - HOV Lane Start to Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Basic | 5,034 | 108 | 107.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.3 | 0.3 | 29.0 | 0.7 | D |
| 174 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 5,033 | 109 | 107.1\% | 624 | 40 | 105.7\% |  |  |  | 58.1 | 2.0 | 31.5 | 1.5 | D |
| 175 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | 5,660 | 107 | 107.0\% | 1,330 | 56 | 100.8\% | 867 | 65 | 107.0\% | 58.9 | 1.8 | 32.6 | 1.4 | D |
| 178 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,128 | 120 | 105.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.5 | 0.8 | 33.8 | 0.7 | D |
| 179 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 6,129 | 117 | 105.7\% | 709 | 36 | 102.7\% |  |  |  | 58.5 | 1.0 | 34.7 | 0.7 | D |
| 180 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 6,839 | 124 | 105.4\% | 824 | 38 | 103.0\% |  |  |  | 53.9 | 4.2 | 32.8 | 3.1 | D |
| 181 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | 7,661 | 144 | 105.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 59.3 | 2.2 | 35.1 | 1.6 | E |
| 182 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,660 | 145 | 105.1\% |  |  |  | 1,348 | 64 | 101.4\% | 60.3 | 3.8 | 33.3 | 2.6 | D |
| 183 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,316 | 126 | 106.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58.5 | 2.2 | 37.4 | 1.8 | E |
| 184 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd to I-80 | Weave | 6,317 | 119 | 106.0\% | 734 | 29 | 102.0\% | 4,992 | 128 | 104.4\% | 60.3 | 0.7 | 29.9 | 0.7 | D |
| 187 | SR-65 SB - EB I-80 Connector | Basic | 2,069 | 90 | 108.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50.8 | 0.8 | 30.4 | 1.6 | D |
| 188 | SR-65 SB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 4,094 | 120 | 101.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 54.0 | 0.6 | 27.2 | 1.0 | D |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| VISSIM Post-Processor Average Results from 10 Runs Freeway Operations Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Design Year - HOV Lane Alternative PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 1 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 8,026 | 45 | 102.0\% | 994 | 10 | 95.5\% |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.7 | 28.9 | 0.4 | D |
| 2 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | Basic | 9,006 | 65 | 101.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.3 | 31.9 | 0.4 | D |
| 3 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,991 | 96 | 100.9\% |  |  |  | 1,137 | 72 | 98.8\% | 61.1 | 1.8 | 29.1 | 1.1 | D |
| 4 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,840 | 117 | 101.0\% |  |  |  | 389 | 32 | 99.6\% | 61.9 | 1.5 | 26.0 | 0.9 | C |
| 5 | 1-80 EB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,455 | 132 | 101.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.5 | 25.9 | 0.4 | C |
| 6 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd | Weave | 7,454 | 143 | 101.1\% | 1,743 | 29 | 92.7\% | 1,710 | 66 | 101.2\% | 62.3 | 0.3 | 26.8 | 0.4 | C |
| 7 | 1-80 EB CD - Eureka Rd to Taylor Rd/SR-65 | Weave | 1,067 | 49 | 103.5\% | 1,602 | 70 | 99.5\% | 1,303 | 70 | 102.6\% | 60.5 | 1.6 | 19.8 | 1.0 | B |
| 8 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd to SR-65 | Basic | 7,482 | 159 | 99.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.9 | 1.1 | 30.7 | 0.7 | D |
| 9 | 1-80 EB - HOV Connector Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,479 | 156 | 98.9\% |  |  |  | 1,065 | 51 | 95.9\% | 56.7 | 1.7 | 32.2 | 1.0 | D |
| 10 | I-80 EB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,412 | 128 | 99.4\% |  |  |  | 3,650 | 94 | 100.8\% | 62.4 | 0.9 | 24.4 | 0.4 | C |
| 11 | I-80 EB - SR-65 Off-ramp to Eureka Rd On-ramp | Basic | 2,757 | 89 | 97.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.2 | 0.1 | 12.8 | 0.6 | B |
| 17 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd On-ramp | Merge | 2,752 | 94 | 97.2\% | 706 | 45 | 103.8\% |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.5 | 14.5 | 0.5 | B |
| 18 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd On-ramp to SR-65 On-ramp | Basic | 3,455 | 100 | 98.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.1 | 15.9 | 0.5 | B |
| 19 | I-80 EB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 3,453 | 98 | 98.4\% | 2,674 | 80 | 99.4\% |  |  |  | 59.4 | 0.7 | 28.1 | 0.4 | D |
| 20 | 1-80 EB - SR-65 to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 6,128 | 126 | 98.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.3 | 25.8 | 0.3 | C |
| 22 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,110 | 107 | 98.6\% |  |  |  | 1,672 | 78 | 98.9\% | 63.5 | 0.2 | 25.4 | 0.5 | C |
| 23 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,432 | 126 | 98.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.3 | 22.1 | 0.7 | C |
| 24 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 4,430 | 122 | 98.2\% | 264 | 27 | 101.7\% |  |  |  | 60.0 | 0.8 | 23.8 | 0.9 | C |
| 25 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd to Sierra College Blvd | Basic | 4,690 | 121 | 98.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.2 | 23.6 | 0.7 | C |
| 26 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,688 | 121 | 98.3\% |  |  |  | 557 | 46 | 88.4\% | 62.8 | 0.5 | 24.5 | 0.9 | C |
| 27 | 1-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,128 | 109 | 99.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.3 | 21.5 | 0.7 | C |
| 28 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 4,126 | 106 | 99.7\% | 324 | 8 | 95.1\% |  |  |  | 60.8 | 0.4 | 22.3 | 0.6 | C |
| 29 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 4,450 | 106 | 99.3\% | 881 | 21 | 102.5\% |  |  |  | 60.1 | 0.4 | 26.3 | 0.7 | C |
| 38 | 1-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,081 | 18 | 106.0\% |  |  |  | 758 | 51 | 103.9\% | 60.2 | 0.6 | 20.2 | 0.4 | C |
| 39 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,318 | 55 | 106.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.3 | 17.7 | 0.4 | B |
| 40 | 1-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 3,319 | 57 | 106.4\% | 407 | 11 | 101.6\% |  |  |  | 62.3 | 0.4 | 18.0 | 0.6 | B |
| 41 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 3,725 | 62 | 105.8\% | 433 | 9 | 100.8\% |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.6 | 20.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 42 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 4,155 | 67 | 105.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.2 | 21.2 | 0.5 | C |
| 43 | 1-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,156 | 66 | 105.2\% |  |  |  | 302 | 29 | 108.0\% | 63.0 | 0.4 | 22.3 | 0.7 | C |
| 44 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,851 | 76 | 104.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.2 | 19.7 | 0.4 | C |
| 45 | 1-80 WB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,850 | 77 | 104.9\% | 1,629 | 45 | 103.1\% |  |  |  | 58.5 | 1.3 | 27.8 | 1.1 | C |
| 46 | 1-80 WB - Rocklin Rd to HOV Lane Start | Basic | 5,475 | 79 | 104.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.4 | 1.0 | 29.7 | 1.0 | D |
| 47 | I-80 WB - HOV Lane Start to SR-65 | Basic | 5,469 | 104 | 104.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.5 | 22.4 | 0.4 | C |
| 48 | 1-80 WB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,466 | 107 | 104.1\% |  |  |  | 2,324 | 77 | 102.8\% | 63.8 | 0.2 | 20.5 | 0.2 | C |
| 49 | I-80 WB - SR-65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,137 | 83 | 104.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.1 | 16.5 | 0.5 | B |
| 60 | I-80 WB - SR-65 to Atlantic St | Weave | 3,140 | 83 | 105.0\% | 5,072 | 116 | 99.8\% | 536 | 53 | 101.1\% | 59.5 | 0.4 | 23.0 | 0.5 | C |
| 62 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,774 | 185 | 103.1\% |  |  |  | 1,277 | 77 | 100.5\% | 61.0 | 1.5 | 26.9 | 1.0 | C |
| 63 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,493 | 164 | 103.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.2 | 24.2 | 0.8 | C |
| 64 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St On-ramp | Merge | 6,495 | 163 | 103.6\% | 1,232 | 60 | 99.4\% |  |  |  | 59.0 | 1.4 | 37.0 | 1.1 | E |
| 65 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,726 | 184 | 102.9\% |  |  |  | 1,216 | 75 | 101.3\% | 61.8 | 0.3 | 33.7 | 1.1 | D |
| 66 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,508 | 143 | 103.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.1 | 24.1 | 0.7 | C |
| 67 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 6,507 | 135 | 103.1\% | 1,129 | 90 | 83.6\% |  |  |  | 58.0 | 1.8 | 29.1 | 1.0 | D |
| 68 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 7,637 | 154 | 99.7\% | 742 | 29 | 101.7\% |  |  |  | 60.3 | 0.8 | 33.5 | 0.6 | D |
| 69 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd to Riverside Ave | Basic | 8,379 | 128 | 99.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.3 | 0.6 | 32.3 | 0.6 | D |
| 70 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,378 | 145 | 99.9\% |  |  |  | 1,299 | 61 | 103.1\% | 62.5 | 0.2 | 33.5 | 0.7 | D |
| 71 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,079 | 144 | 99.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.3 | 26.2 | 0.9 | D |
| 72 | 1-80 WB - Riverside Ave NB On-ramp | Merge | 7,077 | 141 | 99.2\% | 200 | 1 | 100.0\% |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.1 | 23.9 | 0.9 | C |
| 73 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave SB On-ramp | Merge | 7,272 | 131 | 99.2\% | 524 | 13 | 98.8\% |  |  |  | 60.9 | 1.1 | 27.6 | 1.3 | C |
| 74 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave to Antelope Rd | Basic | 7,790 | 146 | 99.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.9 | 0.5 | 28.7 | 0.9 | D |
| 75 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,787 | 156 | 99.1\% |  |  |  | 1,154 | 60 | 100.4\% | 62.3 | 1.2 | 30.9 | 1.1 | D |
| 76 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,633 | 146 | 98.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.6 | 24.1 | 0.9 | C |
| 77 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 6,636 | 147 | 98.9\% | 342 | 3 | 97.6\% |  |  |  | 60.4 | 0.9 | 24.1 | 0.8 | C |
| 78 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd to Truck Scales | Weave | 6,978 | 152 | 98.8\% | 528 | 17 | 99.5\% | 76 | 20 | 69.5\% | 62.0 | 0.4 | 25.8 | 0.7 | C |
| 79 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,429 | 151 | 99.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.1 | 27.0 | 0.8 | D |
| 80 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales On-ramp | Merge | 7,425 | 158 | 99.3\% | 76 | 17 | 69.5\% |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.2 | 27.5 | 0.8 | C |
| 81 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales to Elkhorn Blvd | Basic | 7,506 | 153 | 98.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.7 | 0.4 | 28.7 | 0.8 | D |
| 82 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,501 | 161 | 98.8\% |  |  |  | 1,208 | 62 | 96.6\% | 61.8 | 0.7 | 28.0 | 0.7 | D |
| 83 | 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,294 | 143 | 99.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.4 | 23.1 | 0.7 | C |
| 84 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 6,294 | 145 | 99.3\% | 898 | 5 | 99.8\% |  |  |  | 55.6 | 1.3 | 27.5 | 1.3 | C |
| 85 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 7,200 | 152 | 99.4\% | 582 | 10 | 100.3\% |  |  |  | 61.0 | 1.4 | 29.1 | 0.9 | D |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.


Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 1 | Lincoln Blvd/Sterling Pkwy |  | Signal | 3,125 | 3,430 | 109.8\% | 14.7 | 1.3 | B |
| 2 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 2,655 | 2,880 | 108.5\% | 14.8 | 0.6 | B |
| 3 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 2,655 | 2,823 | 106.3\% | 21.9 | 2.5 | C |
| 4 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 3,735 | 4,073 | 109.1\% | 32.4 | 10.6 | C |
| 5 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 4,055 | 4,439 | 109.5\% | 12.3 | 1.0 | B |
| 6 | SR-65 SB Ramps-Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 5,560 | 5,816 | 104.6\% | 56.5 | 7.9 | E |
| 7 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 3,535 | 3,778 | 106.9\% | 16.9 | 0.8 | B |
| 8 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 4,585 | 4,715 | 102.8\% | 8.6 | 0.9 | A |
| 9 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 3,550 | 3,572 | 100.6\% | 15.7 | 0.9 | B |
| 10 | Stanford Ranch Rd/Five Star Blvd | Signal | 2,755 | 2,863 | 103.9\% | 27.2 | 2.8 | C |
| 11 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Stanford Ranch Rd | Signal | 3,115 | 3,243 | 104.1\% | 11.0 | 0.6 | B |
| 12 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd | Signal | 3,490 | 3,596 | 103.0\% | 18.6 | 3.5 | B |
| 13 | Galleria Blvd/Antelope Creek Dr | Signal | 2,701 | 2,794 | 103.4\% | 9.6 | 1.6 | A |
| 14 | Galleria Blvd/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 5,336 | 5,735 | 107.5\% | 46.9 | 5.8 | D |
| 15 | Creekside Ridge Dr/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 3,470 | 3,685 | 106.2\% | 8.4 | 2.7 | A |
| 16 | Taylor Rd/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,880 | 5,261 | 107.8\% | 70.0 | 11.6 | E |
| 17 | North Sunrise Ave/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,810 | 5,175 | 107.6\% | 32.7 | 3.6 | C |
| 18 | Wills Rd/Atlantic St | Signal | 2,295 | 2,473 | 107.8\% | 22.7 | 2.6 | C |
| 19 | I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St | Signal | 3,830 | 4,073 | 106.3\% | 10.9 | 2.1 | B |
| 20 | Taylor Rd-I-80 EB Ramps/Eureka Rd | Signal | 5,400 | 5,658 | 104.8\% | 30.2 | 2.5 | C |
| 21 | North Sunrise Ave/Eureka Rd | Signal | 5,110 | 5,380 | 105.3\% | 40.6 | 3.9 | D |
| 22 | Harding Blvd/Wills Rd | Signal | 2,145 | 2,294 | 106.9\% | 16.1 | 2.2 | B |
| 23 | Harding Blvd/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 2,710 | 2,954 | 109.0\% | 26.4 | 3.5 | C |
| 24 | I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 3,935 | 4,177 | 106.2\% | 20.9 | 5.8 | C |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 89,437 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 94,888 |
| Percent Served | $106.1 \%$ |

Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 25 | I-80 EB Ramps/Douglas Blvd |  | Signal | 4,239 | 4,533 | 106.9\% | 27.6 | 13.6 | C |
| 26 | North Sunrise Ave/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 4,580 | 4,833 | 105.5\% | 53.5 | 21.2 | D |
| 27 | Pacific St/Woodside Dr | Signal | 2,283 | 2,448 | 107.3\% | 7.6 | 1.1 | A |
| 28 | Pacific St/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 3,514 | 3,654 | 104.0\% | 25.8 | 1.5 | C |
| 29 | Granite Dr/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,974 | 2,986 | 100.4\% | 28.5 | 2.4 | C |
| 30 | I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,078 | 3,107 | 101.0\% | 22.6 | 1.2 | C |
| 31 | I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,240 | 3,415 | 105.4\% | 29.8 | 16.0 | C |
| 32 | Aguilar Rd/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,315 | 2,513 | 108.6\% | 9.8 | 0.8 | A |
| 33 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 NB Off-Ramp | Signal | 2,761 | 3,179 | 115.1\% | 9.6 | 0.8 | A |
| 34 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 SB On-Ramp | Signal | 2,030 | 2,302 | 113.4\% | 21.8 | 3.5 | C |
| 35 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy | Signal | 3,851 | 4,401 | 114.3\% | 24.1 | 7.0 | C |
| 36 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Signal | 3,586 | 3,946 | 110.0\% | 16.0 | 5.7 | B |
| 40 | Galleria Blvd/Berry St | Signal | 2,005 | 2,139 | 106.7\% | 10.2 | 1.7 | B |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 40,455 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 43,456 |
| Percent Served | $107.4 \%$ |

[^7]| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 1 | Lincoln Blvd/Sterling Pkwy |  | Signal | 3,670 | 3,666 | 99.9\% | 22.7 | 1.2 | C |
| 2 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 2,655 | 2,588 | 97.5\% | 26.8 | 13.3 | C |
| 3 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 2,870 | 2,839 | 98.9\% | 20.2 | 2.0 | C |
| 4 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 4,950 | 5,092 | 102.9\% | 9.9 | 0.8 | A |
| 5 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 4,750 | 4,919 | 103.6\% | 15.5 | 3.6 | B |
| 6 | SR-65 SB Ramps-Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 7,155 | 7,248 | 101.3\% | 140.1 | 24.3 | F |
| 7 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 4,665 | 4,794 | 102.8\% | 45.0 | 36.3 | D |
| 8 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 6,285 | 6,291 | 100.1\% | 9.2 | 0.7 | A |
| 9 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 5,450 | 5,470 | 100.4\% | 14.8 | 0.9 | B |
| 10 | Stanford Ranch Rd/Five Star Blvd | Signal | 4,390 | 4,355 | 99.2\% | 82.0 | 24.7 | F |
| 11 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Stanford Ranch Rd | Signal | 5,570 | 5,566 | 99.9\% | 36.4 | 41.0 | D |
| 12 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd | Signal | 5,925 | 5,963 | 100.6\% | 25.1 | 22.1 | C |
| 13 | Galleria Blvd/Antelope Creek Dr | Signal | 4,490 | 4,468 | 99.5\% | 28.2 | 2.3 | C |
| 14 | Galleria Blvd/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 8,005 | 7,644 | 95.5\% | 93.3 | 18.0 | F |
| 15 | Creekside Ridge Dr/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,655 | 4,407 | 94.7\% | 50.4 | 7.5 | D |
| 16 | Taylor Rd/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 6,710 | 6,460 | 96.3\% | 51.5 | 6.5 | D |
| 17 | North Sunrise Ave/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 6,325 | 6,361 | 100.6\% | 70.3 | 69.5 | E |
| 18 | Wills Rd/Atlantic St | Signal | 3,210 | 3,303 | 102.9\% | 24.1 | 2.6 | C |
| 19 | I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St | Signal | 4,860 | 4,942 | 101.7\% | 13.3 | 2.1 | B |
| 20 | Taylor Rd-I-80 EB Ramps/Eureka Rd | Signal | 6,575 | 6,688 | 101.7\% | 75.0 | 15.4 | E |
| 21 | North Sunrise Ave/Eureka Rd | Signal | 6,790 | 7,077 | 104.2\% | 93.8 | 25.7 | F |
| 22 | Harding Blvd/Wills Rd | Signal | 2,915 | 2,991 | 102.6\% | 16.5 | 1.5 | B |
| 23 | Harding Blvd/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 3,910 | 3,831 | 98.0\% | 91.1 | 12.9 | F |
| 24 | I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 4,705 | 4,429 | 94.1\% | 27.5 | 19.9 | C |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 121,485 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 121,392 |
| Percent Served | $99.9 \%$ |

Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 25 | I-80 EB Ramps/Douglas Blvd |  | Signal | 5,445 | 4,985 | 91.6\% | 37.3 | 29.2 | D |
| 26 | North Sunrise Ave/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 6,275 | 5,566 | 88.7\% | 254.2 | 27.1 | F |
| 27 | Pacific St/Woodside Dr | Signal | 3,350 | 3,349 | 100.0\% | 9.8 | 1.7 | A |
| 28 | Pacific St/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 5,105 | 5,108 | 100.1\% | 32.5 | 1.4 | C |
| 29 | Granite Dr/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,990 | 4,126 | 103.4\% | 94.8 | 27.0 | F |
| 30 | I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,850 | 3,949 | 102.6\% | 67.5 | 15.4 | E |
| 31 | I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,825 | 3,874 | 101.3\% | 20.6 | 2.1 | C |
| 32 | Aguilar Rd/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,010 | 3,051 | 101.3\% | 31.5 | 11.7 | C |
| 33 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 NB Off-Ramp | Signal | 3,240 | 3,254 | 100.4\% | 12.2 | 1.2 | B |
| 34 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 SB On-Ramp | Signal | 1,600 | 1,606 | 100.4\% | 17.0 | 1.1 | B |
| 35 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy | Signal | 4,860 | 4,933 | 101.5\% | 18.5 | 1.8 | B |
| 36 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Signal | 4,630 | 4,711 | 101.7\% | 21.8 | 2.2 | C |
| 40 | Galleria Blvd/Berry St | Signal | 2,930 | 2,960 | 101.0\% | 12.0 | 1.2 | B |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 52,110 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 51,472 |
| Percent Served | $98.8 \%$ |

[^8]Intersection 2
SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 440 | 41 | 13 | 230 | 39 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,500 | 36 | 14 | 226 | 39 | NO |

Intersection 3
SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 700 | 25 | 23 | 177 | 35 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,500 | 25 | 23 | 177 | 35 | NO |

Intersection 4
SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 360 | 67 | 6 | 260 | 38 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,330 | 69 | 6 | 263 | 38 | NO |

Intersection 5
SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd
Signalized

| Direction |  | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exceeds |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,400 | 52 | 3 | 224 | 45 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,400 | 27 | 3 | 172 | 39 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (ft) | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 200 | 39 | 9 | 199 | 113 | NO |
|  | Through | 2,260 | 219 | 150 | 1,420 | 333 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 200 | 79 | 117 | 1,231 | 421 | MAX |

## Intersection 7

SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 400 | 50 | 22 | 318 | 37 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,100 | 49 | 22 | 317 | 37 | NO |

Intersection 8
SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 430 | 33 | 4 | 190 | 31 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,130 | 36 | 4 | 192 | 31 | NO |

Intersection 9
SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd
Signalized

| Direction |  | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exceeds |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,420 | 47 | 8 | 196 | 23 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,420 | 46 | 8 | 196 | 23 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

| Direction | Movement | Storage(ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| EB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,800 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 15 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,170 | 31 | 3 | 176 | 20 | NO |

Intersection 12
SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| EB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,130 | 66 | 5 | 362 | 72 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,780 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 28 | NO |

Intersection 19
I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,150 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 128 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,430 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 21 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

| Direction | Movement | Storage (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 180 | 137 | 71 | 693 | 576 | MAX |
|  | Through | 1,700 | 104 | 44 | 610 | 489 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 1,700 | 58 | 68 | 616 | 763 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn | 550 | 31 | 5 | 103 | 27 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 550 | 34 | 4 | 176 | 57 | NO |
| EB | Left Turn | 1,120 | 36 | 7 | 132 | 18 | NO |
|  | Through | 1,120 | 110 | 35 | 722 | 62 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 810 | 13 | 11 | 320 | 52 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through | 1,370 | 90 | 25 | 587 | 72 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 280 | 1 | 0 | 38 | 25 | NO |

Intersection 24
I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas BIvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (ft) | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 1,530 | 80 | 80 | 392 | 89 | NO |
|  | Through | 1,530 | 80 | 80 | 392 | 89 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 730 | 80 | 80 | 392 | NO |  |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

| Direction | Movement | Storage(ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,400 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 114 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,250 | 15 | 2 | 99 | 20 | NO |

Intersection 30
I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 700 | 21 | 2 | 136 | 61 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,230 | 29 | 4 | 156 | 61 | NO |

Intersection 31
I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd
Signalized

| Direction |  | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exceeds |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,080 | 59 | 5 | 286 | 47 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,080 | 48 | 12 | 302 | 47 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| WB | Left Turn | 1,940 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,940 | 25 | 8 | 178 | 44 | NO |

Intersection 35
SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy
Signalized

| Direction |  | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exceeds |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 1,650 | 172 | 150 | 971 | 253 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,650 | 173 | 150 | 972 | 253 | NO |

Intersection 36
SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy
Signalized

| Direction |  | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average | Std. Dev. |  | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |  |
|  | Left Turn | 1,620 | 61 | 7 | 283 | 35 | NO |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,620 | 61 | 7 | 283 | 35 | NO |  |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

Intersection 2
SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 440 | 52 | 5 | 211 | 33 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,500 | 48 | 6 | 207 | 33 | NO |

Intersection 3
SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage(ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 700 | 26 | 3 | 103 | 18 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,500 | 26 | 3 | 103 | 18 | NO |

Intersection 4
SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (ft) | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 360 | 59 | 3 | 200 | 34 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,330 | 61 | 3 | 202 | NO |  |

Intersection 5
SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd
Signalized

| Direction |  | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exceeds |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,400 | 63 | 1 | 243 | 41 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,400 | 16 | 4 | 139 | 67 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (ft) | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 200 | 99 | 37 | 496 | 401 | MAX |
|  | Through | 2,260 | 145 | 86 | 880 | 313 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 200 | 28 | 37 | 600 | 313 | MAX |

## Intersection 7

SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 400 | 49 | 7 | 236 | 50 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,100 | 49 | 7 | 236 | 50 | NO |

Intersection 8
SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 430 | 32 | 5 | 137 | 28 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,130 | 35 | 5 | 139 | 28 | NO |

Intersection 9
SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,420 | 52 | 2 | 214 | 42 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,420 | 52 | 2 | 214 | 42 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

Average Results from 10 Runs Design Year - HOV Lane Alternative Queue Length

PM Peak Hour

Intersection 11
SR-65 NB Ramps/Stanford Ranch Rd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| EB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,800 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 18 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,170 | 145 | 85 | 471 | 487 | NO |

Intersection 12
SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| EB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,130 | 80 | 4 | 386 | 87 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,780 | 78 | 81 | 320 | 476 | NO |

Intersection 19
I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,150 | 5 | 5 | 227 | 392 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,430 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 44 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

Average Results from 10 Runs

| Direction | Movement | Storage (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 180 | 80 | 4 | 339 | 146 | MAX |
|  | Through | 1,700 | 27 | 9 | 158 | 43 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 1,700 | 1 | 1 | 71 | 156 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn | 550 | 31 | 13 | 123 | 17 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 550 | 104 | 54 | 580 | 126 | MAX |
| EB | Left Turn | 1,120 | 56 | 8 | 198 | 48 | NO |
|  | Through | 1,120 | 202 | 25 | 783 | 50 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 810 | 38 | 9 | 370 | 47 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through | 1,370 | 654 | 190 | 1,456 | 119 | MAX |
|  | Right Turn | 280 | 16 | 17 | 296 | 364 | MAX |

Intersection 24
I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas BIvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (ft) | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 1,530 | 158 | 166 | 509 | 416 | NO |
|  | Through | 1,530 | 158 | 166 | 509 | 416 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 730 | 159 | 166 | 509 | 416 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,400 | 176 | 269 | 1,128 | 737 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,250 | 22 | 2 | 171 | 112 | NO |

Intersection 30
I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 700 | 87 | 80 | 418 | 165 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,230 | 101 | 82 | 437 | 165 | NO |

Intersection 31
I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd
Signalized

| Direction |  | Movement | Storage |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |  |  |
|  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,080 | 76 | 6 | 300 | 66 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,080 | 59 | 5 | 310 | NO |  |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

Average Results from 10 Runs

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| WB | Left Turn | 1,940 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,940 | 82 | 3 | 402 | 62 | NO |

Intersection 35
SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 1,650 | 82 | 9 | 373 | 70 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,650 | 83 | 9 | 374 | 70 | NO |

Intersection 36
SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,620 | 127 | 23 | 480 | 88 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,620 | 127 | 23 | 480 | 88 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

# SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements 

> Vissim Model Results - Design Year Alternative 2 (General Purpose Lane)

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs Network Statistics

SR 65 Widening

## Design Year - GP Lane Alternative

 AM Peak Period| Network Performance | Vehicle Types | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Vehicles Served | All Vehicles | 207,465 | 65 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | All Vehicles | 950,657 | 1,683 |
| Travel Time [h] | All Vehicles | 21,965 | 78.4 |
| Average Speed [mph] | All Vehicles | 43.3 | 0.1 |
| Total Delay [h] | All Vehicles | 5,623 | 69.4 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | All Vehicles | 95 | 1.2 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | All Vehicles | 0.35 | 0.00 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | HOV | 34,600 | 49 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | HOV | 164,213 | 803 |
| Travel Time [h] | HOV | 3,575 | 17 |
| Average Speed [mph] | HOV | 45.9 | 0.1 |
| Total Delay [h] | HOV | 775 | 9 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | HOV | 79 | 1 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | HOV | 0.28 | 0.00 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | Truck | 7,555 | 20 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | Truck | 43,490 | 383 |
| Travel Time [h] | Truck | 970 | 9 |
| Average Speed [mph] | Truck | 44.8 | 0 |
| Total Delay [h] | Truck | 231 | 5 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | Truck | 107 | 2 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | Truck | 0.32 | 0.01 |


| Performance Measure | Vehicle Types |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HOV | Truck | All |
| Demand Volume | 34,600 | 7,560 | 207,470 |
| Percent Demand Served | 35,900 | 8,200 | 210,070 |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel | $96.4 \%$ | $92.2 \%$ | $98.8 \%$ |
| Person Miles of Travel | 164,210 | 43,490 | 950,660 |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel | 344,850 | 45,660 | $1,133,470$ |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay | 7880 | 970 | 21,960 |
| VHD \% of VHT | $21.8 \%$ | 230 | 5,620 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.35 | $23.7 \%$ | $25.6 \%$ |
| Person Hours of Delay | 1,640 | 1.83 | 1.63 |
| Average Travel Speed | 45.9 | 240 | 6,490 |

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Peak Hour Travel Time


VISSIM Post-Processor
SR 65 Widening
Average Values from 10 Runs
Network Statistics

Design Year - General Purpose Lane Alternative
PM Peak Period

| Network Performance | Vehicle Types | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Vehicles Served | All Vehicles | 300,817 | 277 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | All Vehicles | $1,166,400$ | 1,721 |
| Travel Time [h] | All Vehicles | 30,922 | 354.6 |
| Average Speed [mph] | All Vehicles | 37.7 | 0.4 |
| Total Delay [h] | All Vehicles | 10,428 | 343.5 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | All Vehicles | 123 | 4.1 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | All Vehicles | 0.54 | 0.02 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | HOV | 53,306 | 89 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | HOV | 212,655 | 607 |
| Travel Time [h] | HOV | 5,269 | 55 |
| Average Speed [mph] | HOV | 40.4 | 0.3 |
| Total Delay [h] | HOV | 1,558 | 49 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | HOV | 103 | 3 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | HOV | 0.44 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | Truck | 8,051 | 23 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | Truck | 40,271 | 346 |
| Travel Time [h] | Truck | 988 | 16 |
| Average Speed [mph] | Truck | 40.8 | 0 |
| Total Delay [h] | Truck | 294 | 12 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | Truck | 129 | 5 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | Truck | 0.44 | 0.02 |


| Performance Measure | Vehicle Types |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HOV | Truck | All |
|  | 53,310 | 8,050 | 300,820 |
| Demand Volume | 54,550 | 8,640 | 301,760 |
| Percent Demand Served | $97.7 \%$ | $93.2 \%$ | $99.7 \%$ |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel | 212,650 | 40,270 | $1,166,400$ |
| Person Miles of Travel | 446,570 | 42,280 | $1,402,330$ |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel | 5,270 | 990 | 30,920 |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay | 1,560 | 290 | 10,430 |
| VHD \% of VHT | $29.6 \%$ | $29.3 \%$ | $33.7 \%$ |
| Average Delay per Vehicle $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.76 | 2.16 | 2.08 |
| Person Hours of Delay | 3,280 | 300 | 12,160 |
| Average Travel Speed | 40.4 | 40.8 | 37.7 |



| VISSIM Post-Processor Average Results from 10 Runs Freeway Operations Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Design Year - GP Lane Alternative AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
|  | Location | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 1 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 7,491 | 44 | 110.2\% | 1,242 | 18 | 109.9\% |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.5 | 29.7 | 0.3 | D |
| 2 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | Basic | 8,726 | 89 | 110.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.4 | 0.5 | 32.2 | 0.4 | D |
| 3 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,714 | 117 | 109.9\% |  |  |  | 1,383 | 51 | 108.0\% | 61.0 | 2.9 | 28.8 | 1.8 | D |
| 4 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,327 | 133 | 110.2\% |  |  |  | 355 | 27 | 110.9\% | 62.5 | 1.1 | 24.2 | 0.6 | C |
| 5 | 1-80 EB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,969 | 128 | 110.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.3 | 24.9 | 0.3 | C |
| 6 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd | Weave | 6,968 | 127 | 110.1\% | 1,186 | 29 | 97.2\% | 1,764 | 71 | 104.4\% | 62.5 | 0.3 | 23.4 | 0.3 | C |
| 7 | 1-80 EB CD - Eureka Rd to Taylor Rd/SR-65 | Weave | 613 | 39 | 102.2\% | 1,268 | 65 | 105.7\% | 876 | 39 | 103.0\% | 61.6 | 1.2 | 14.8 | 0.7 | B |
| 8 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd to SR-65 | Basic | 6,388 | 105 | 109.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.2 | 27.2 | 0.4 | D |
| 9 | 1-80 EB - HOV Connector Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,386 | 109 | 109.0\% |  |  |  | 586 | 43 | 108.4\% | 60.2 | 0.7 | 27.2 | 0.6 | C |
| 10 | I-80 EB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,804 | 98 | 109.1\% |  |  |  | 3,365 | 101 | 108.6\% | 63.3 | 0.4 | 22.2 | 0.3 | C |
| 11 | I-80 EB - SR-65 Off-ramp to Eureka Rd On-ramp | Basic | 2,440 | 65 | 109.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.0 | 0.2 | 13.5 | 0.5 | B |
| 17 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd On-ramp | Merge | 2,442 | 72 | 110.0\% | 578 | 29 | 103.2\% |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.2 | 14.1 | 0.7 | B |
| 18 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd On-ramp to SR-65 On-ramp | Basic | 3,021 | 84 | 108.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.8 | 0.2 | 15.3 | 0.6 | B |
| 19 | I-80 EB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 3,021 | 85 | 108.7\% | 2,084 | 77 | 109.1\% |  |  |  | 60.7 | 0.6 | 27.7 | 0.6 | C |
| 20 | 1-80 EB - SR-65 to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 5,104 | 112 | 108.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.1 | 23.5 | 0.4 | C |
| 22 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,118 | 112 | 109.1\% |  |  |  | 1,780 | 74 | 107.9\% | 63.3 | 0.6 | 22.1 | 0.4 | C |
| 23 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,349 | 102 | 110.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.5 | 19.4 | 0.7 | C |
| 24 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,351 | 104 | 110.2\% | 182 | 3 | 95.5\% |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.3 | 19.3 | 0.6 | B |
| 25 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd to Sierra College Blvd | Basic | 3,535 | 112 | 109.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.3 | 19.7 | 0.7 | C |
| 26 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,537 | 113 | 109.5\% |  |  |  | 659 | 48 | 109.9\% | 62.5 | 1.0 | 20.8 | 0.7 | C |
| 27 | 1-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,882 | 100 | 109.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.4 | 16.8 | 0.6 | B |
| 28 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 2,883 | 98 | 109.6\% | 139 | 5 | 92.5\% |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.3 | 15.6 | 0.6 | B |
| 29 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 3,021 | 96 | 108.7\% | 523 | 19 | 106.8\% |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.2 | 17.6 | 0.7 | B |
| 38 | 1-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,378 | 27 | 105.9\% |  |  |  | 1,115 | 57 | 107.2\% | 56.0 | 2.1 | 28.3 | 1.0 | D |
| 39 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,259 | 68 | 105.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.6 | 23.8 | 0.3 | C |
| 40 | 1-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 4,259 | 68 | 105.4\% | 50 | 4 | 82.8\% |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.2 | 21.0 | 0.5 | C |
| 41 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 4,305 | 70 | 105.0\% | 335 | 13 | 101.5\% |  |  |  | 61.6 | 0.5 | 22.4 | 0.6 | C |
| 42 | 1-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 4,636 | 71 | 104.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.3 | 25.4 | 0.5 | C |
| 43 | 1-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,635 | 75 | 104.6\% |  |  |  | 292 | 31 | 104.2\% | 61.7 | 0.6 | 26.0 | 0.9 | C |
| 44 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,338 | 89 | 104.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.2 | 23.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 45 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 4,337 | 91 | 104.5\% | 976 | 49 | 98.6\% |  |  |  | 61.0 | 0.7 | 24.7 | 0.7 | C |
| 46 | 1-80 WB - Rocklin Rd to HOV Lane Start | Basic | 5,307 | 115 | 103.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.7 | 27.3 | 0.8 | D |
| 47 | I-80 WB - HOV Lane Start to SR-65 | Basic | 5,305 | 129 | 103.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.4 | 22.1 | 0.4 | C |
| 48 | I-80 WB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,303 | 130 | 103.2\% |  |  |  | 1,700 | 92 | 103.7\% | 63.5 | 0.3 | 20.4 | 0.3 | C |
| 49 | I-80 WB - SR-65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,598 | 127 | 102.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.8 | 0.1 | 17.9 | 0.3 | B |
| 60 | I-80 WB - SR-65 to Atlantic St | Weave | 3,593 | 119 | 102.7\% | 5,765 | 164 | 105.6\% | 490 | 41 | 102.1\% | 58.8 | 0.6 | 23.8 | 0.6 | C |
| 62 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,805 | 199 | 103.8\% |  |  |  | 1,297 | 68 | 103.7\% | 60.1 | 1.6 | 29.6 | 1.6 | D |
| 63 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,502 | 170 | 103.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.3 | 0.6 | 26.5 | 1.0 | D |
| 64 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St On-ramp | Merge | 7,501 | 169 | 103.8\% | 885 | 37 | 106.6\% |  |  |  | 59.9 | 1.5 | 35.8 | 1.1 | E |
| 65 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,383 | 175 | 104.0\% |  |  |  | 1,167 | 61 | 98.9\% | 61.2 | 0.4 | 32.0 | 0.7 | D |
| 66 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,213 | 172 | 104.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.2 | 26.7 | 0.5 | D |
| 67 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 7,213 | 170 | 104.8\% | 952 | 58 | 105.7\% |  |  |  | 61.0 | 0.4 | 27.2 | 0.7 | C |
| 68 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 8,167 | 173 | 105.0\% | 460 | 43 | 109.4\% |  |  |  | 61.3 | 0.7 | 31.3 | 0.9 | D |
| 69 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd to Riverside Ave | Basic | 8,627 | 133 | 105.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.4 | 31.5 | 0.7 | D |
| 70 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,637 | 167 | 105.3\% |  |  |  | 1,061 | 70 | 100.1\% | 62.6 | 0.1 | 32.8 | 0.5 | D |
| 71 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,575 | 165 | 106.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.1 | 27.1 | 0.6 | D |
| 72 | 1-80 WB - Riverside Ave NB On-ramp | Merge | 7,578 | 164 | 106.1\% | 208 | 9 | 83.2\% |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.2 | 26.1 | 0.6 | C |
| 73 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave SB On-ramp | Merge | 7,787 | 166 | 105.4\% | 772 | 9 | 100.2\% |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.3 | 32.2 | 0.9 | D |
| 74 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave to Antelope Rd | Basic | 8,567 | 172 | 105.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.6 | 0.3 | 32.1 | 0.7 | D |
| 75 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,572 | 167 | 105.0\% |  |  |  | 460 | 40 | 88.5\% | 59.1 | 5.9 | 35.6 | 4.9 | E |
| 76 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 8,127 | 151 | 106.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 54.8 | 9.3 | 36.6 | 10.3 | E |
| 77 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 8,148 | 164 | 106.7\% | 552 | 2 | 104.1\% |  |  |  | 43.9 | 13.4 | 53.0 | 20.3 | F |
| 78 | 1-80 WB - Antelope Rd to Truck Scales | Weave | 8,748 | 183 | 107.1\% | 443 | 16 | 88.6\% | 93 | 19 | 84.8\% | 35.9 | 7.1 | 58.9 | 10.5 | F |
| 79 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales Off to On-ramp | Basic | 9,245 | 163 | 108.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31.8 | 3.0 | 77.3 | 7.2 | F |
| 80 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales On-ramp | Merge | 9,295 | 173 | 108.6\% | 94 | 19 | 85.5\% |  |  |  | 27.1 | 1.0 | 87.9 | 3.8 | F |
| 81 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales to Elkhorn Blvd | Basic | 9,471 | 169 | 109.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 39.7 | 1.0 | 58.6 | 1.4 | F |
| 82 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 9,479 | 168 | 109.3\% |  |  |  | 1,134 | 66 | 110.1\% | 55.3 | 2.6 | 34.4 | 1.4 | D |
| 83 | 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 8,367 | 193 | 109.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50.9 | 15.4 | 46.5 | 22.9 | F |
| 84 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 8,388 | 184 | 109.8\% | 753 | 7 | 95.3\% |  |  |  | 46.5 | 16.7 | 53.8 | 28.6 | F |
| 85 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 9,174 | 199 | 108.8\% | 810 | 18 | 98.8\% |  |  |  | 47.2 | 15.5 | 55.6 | 19.3 | F |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| VISSIM Post-Processor <br> Average Results from 10 Runs <br> Freeway Operations Summary $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Design Year-GP Lane Alternative AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
|  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 100 SR-65 NB - EB I-80 Connector | Basic | 3,363 | 106 | 108.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.3 | 28.6 | 1.0 | D |
| 101 SR-65 NB - Eureka Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,364 | 104 | 108.5\% | 1,007 | 69 | 105.9\% |  |  |  | 48.7 | 0.2 | 32.4 | 1.1 | D |
| 102 SR-65 NB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 1,700 | 89 | 103.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 53.1 | 0.1 | 18.1 | 0.9 | C |
| 103 SR-65 NB - I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Weave | 4,367 | 121 | 107.8\% | 2,286 | 98 | 104.9\% | 836 | 63 | 103.2\% | 59.5 | 0.6 | 27.7 | 0.8 | C |
| 106 SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,819 | 123 | 107.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.1 | 30.4 | 0.8 | D |
| 107 SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | 5,822 | 123 | 107.4\% | 754 | 36 | 104.7\% | 1,054 | 57 | 98.5\% | 61.3 | 1.2 | 29.9 | 1.1 | D |
| 110 SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,536 | 142 | 109.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 56.7 | 3.1 | 32.2 | 1.5 | D |
| 111 SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 5,539 | 143 | 109.2\% | 282 | 27 | 97.4\% |  |  |  | 61.0 | 1.3 | 31.1 | 0.9 | D |
| 112 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,821 | 140 | 108.6\% |  |  |  | 2,341 | 78 | 111.5\% | 62.8 | 0.4 | 27.5 | 0.7 | C |
| 114 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,481 | 120 | 106.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.3 | 20.0 | 1.0 | C |
| 115 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 3,479 | 121 | 106.7\% | 626 | 41 | 100.9\% |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.2 | 17.8 | 0.5 | B |
| 116 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | 4,104 | 122 | 105.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.2 | 19.2 | 0.5 | C |
| 118 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,103 | 123 | 105.8\% |  |  |  | 1,449 | 70 | 108.1\% | 63.8 | 0.2 | 19.5 | 0.4 | B |
| 119 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,659 | 108 | 104.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.0 | 0.1 | 14.6 | 0.4 | B |
| 120 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 2,659 | 105 | 104.7\% | 159 | 23 | 99.3\% |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.3 | 15.2 | 0.4 | B |
| 121 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd to Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Weave | 2,816 | 105 | 104.3\% | 292 | 19 | 108.3\% | 789 | 61 | 97.4\% | 63.8 | 0.1 | 14.2 | 0.3 | B |
| 124 SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,317 | 84 | 107.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.0 | 0.1 | 13.3 | 0.4 | B |
| 125 SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy EB On-ramp | Merge | 2,317 | 86 | 107.3\% | 522 | 26 | 106.6\% |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.4 | 15.9 | 0.6 | B |
| 126 SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | 2,837 | 95 | 107.0\% | 467 | 16 | 108.5\% | 672 | 54 | 89.6\% | 63.6 | 0.2 | 15.5 | 0.4 | B |
| 129 SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,640 | 85 | 113.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.8 | 0.1 | 16.3 | 0.4 | B |
| 130 SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Lincoln Blvd | Weave | 2,641 | 87 | 113.3\% | 942 | 36 | 107.1\% | 861 | 51 | 113.3\% | 63.2 | 0.3 | 17.2 | 0.5 | B |
| 133 SR-65 NB - Lincoln Blvd to Ferrari Ranch Rd | Basic | 2,719 | 94 | 111.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.3 | 21.5 | 0.9 | C |
| 134 SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,720 | 94 | 111.0\% |  |  |  | 1,186 | 76 | 105.0\% | 63.7 | 0.2 | 18.4 | 0.7 | B |
| 135 SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,541 | 68 | 116.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.0 | 0.2 | 15.1 | 0.5 | B |
| 136 SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | 1,543 | 69 | 116.9\% | 181 | 5 | 106.2\% |  |  |  | 61.9 | 0.7 | 15.6 | 0.5 | B |
| 150 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,145 | 44 | 114.7\% |  |  |  | 143 | 20 | 102.0\% | 62.7 | 0.3 | 27.2 | 0.4 | C |
| 151 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,003 | 49 | 115.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.2 | 25.8 | 0.4 | C |
| 152 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 2,004 | 55 | 115.9\% | 1,162 | 20 | 104.7\% |  |  |  | 60.5 | 0.4 | 25.7 | 0.4 | C |
| 153 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | 3,167 | 55 | 111.5\% | 1,044 | 26 | 92.4\% |  |  |  | 58.1 | 1.7 | 29.3 | 1.0 | D |
| 154 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd to Lincoln Blvd | Basic | 4,217 | 75 | 106.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.3 | 30.9 | 0.5 | D |
| 156 SR-65 SB - Lincoln Blvd to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | 4,219 | 73 | 106.3\% | 1,237 | 69 | 107.6\% | 948 | 50 | 108.9\% | 55.2 | 2.7 | 32.8 | 2.0 | D |
| 159 SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,509 | 112 | 106.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.7 | 0.8 | 29.9 | 0.5 | D |
| 160 SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Placer Pkwy | Weave | 4,508 | 116 | 106.1\% | 1,212 | 52 | 113.2\% | 1,119 | 77 | 110.8\% | 61.0 | 0.5 | 29.1 | 0.3 | D |
| 163 SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,601 | 109 | 106.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.1 | 28.1 | 0.5 | D |
| 164 SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy WB On-ramp | Merge | 4,601 | 111 | 106.7\% | 413 | 30 | 108.6\% |  |  |  | 60.7 | 1.4 | 31.8 | 1.0 | D |
| 165 SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy to Sunset Blvd | Weave | 5,017 | 126 | 107.0\% | 635 | 28 | 111.4\% | 843 | 57 | 108.1\% | 60.6 | 0.5 | 29.3 | 0.7 | D |
| 168 SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,805 | 106 | 107.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.3 | 1.0 | 29.3 | 1.0 | D |
| 169 SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 4,805 | 113 | 107.3\% | 767 | 27 | 112.8\% |  |  |  | 57.7 | 6.8 | 34.4 | 5.3 | D |
| 170 SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Weave | 5,576 | 117 | 108.1\% | 543 | 17 | 98.6\% | 1,115 | 54 | 109.4\% | 61.9 | 0.4 | 28.8 | 0.7 | D |
| 173 SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,996 | 126 | 106.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.2 | 29.4 | 0.7 | D |
| 174 SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 4,996 | 121 | 106.5\% | 578 | 33 | 109.1\% |  |  |  | 58.8 | 2.2 | 31.9 | 1.5 | D |
| 175 SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB to EB On-ramp | Basic | 5,579 | 117 | 106.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.3 | 32.0 | 0.7 | D |
| 176 SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 5,579 | 116 | 106.9\% | 1,375 | 53 | 102.6\% |  |  |  | 60.8 | 0.4 | 31.5 | 0.8 | D |
| 177 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,957 | 120 | 106.0\% |  |  |  | 863 | 55 | 110.6\% | 59.4 | 2.8 | 32.3 | 2.1 | D |
| 178 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,096 | 111 | 105.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58.3 | 6.0 | 29.6 | 5.1 | D |
| 179 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 6,094 | 105 | 105.4\% | 765 | 45 | 103.4\% |  |  |  | 42.4 | 10.3 | 46.3 | 11.1 | F |
| 180 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 6,860 | 130 | 105.2\% | 839 | 43 | 103.6\% |  |  |  | 43.0 | 10.1 | 46.1 | 11.6 | F |
| 181 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | 7,701 | 171 | 105.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58.2 | 1.4 | 36.4 | 1.2 | E |
| 182 SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,700 | 169 | 105.0\% |  |  |  | 1,389 | 62 | 102.9\% | 60.3 | 2.7 | 33.2 | 1.7 | D |
| 183 SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,308 | 155 | 105.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.0 | 1.8 | 36.0 | 1.1 | E |
| 184 SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd to I-80 | Weave | 6,307 | 151 | 105.5\% | 731 | 33 | 101.6\% | 4,971 | 152 | 103.8\% | 60.7 | 1.2 | 29.2 | 0.8 | D |
| 187 SR-65 SB - EB I-80 Connector | Basic | 2,080 | 77 | 108.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51.1 | 1.1 | 29.8 | 1.2 | D |
| 188 SR-65 SB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 4,091 | 139 | 100.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 54.0 | 0.8 | 27.8 | 1.5 | D |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| VISSIM Post-Processor <br> Average Results from 10 Runs Freeway Operations Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SR 65 Widening <br> Design Year - General Purpose Lane Alternative <br> PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
|  | Location | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 1 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 8,072 | 52 | 102.0\% | 1,043 | 10 | 99.3\% |  |  |  | 61.4 | 1.2 | 30.5 | 0.8 | D |
| 2 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | Basic | 9,095 | 65 | 101.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58.5 | 6.3 | 35.6 | 6.1 | E |
| 3 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 9,075 | 100 | 101.3\% |  |  |  | 1,146 | 86 | 99.6\% | 54.6 | 8.7 | 41.7 | 18.3 | E |
| 4 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,920 | 111 | 101.4\% |  |  |  | 387 | 41 | 99.3\% | 62.1 | 0.8 | 26.7 | 0.7 | C |
| 5 | 1-80 EB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,532 | 124 | 101.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.3 | 27.1 | 0.4 | D |
| 6 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd | Weave | 7,533 | 140 | 101.5\% | 1,751 | 46 | 92.6\% | 1,748 | 68 | 101.6\% | 62.0 | 0.4 | 26.6 | 0.4 | C |
| 7 | I-80 EB CD - Eureka Rd to Taylor Rd/SR-65 | Weave | 1,072 | 53 | 104.0\% | 1,572 | 88 | 97.6\% | 1,303 | 49 | 101.8\% | 60.3 | 1.0 | 20.7 | 0.5 | C |
| 8 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd to SR-65 | Basic | 7,537 | 153 | 99.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.0 | 2.3 | 32.2 | 1.3 | D |
| 9 | 1-80 EB - HOV Connector Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,533 | 141 | 99.3\% |  |  |  | 1,070 | 63 | 97.3\% | 54.3 | 4.6 | 34.9 | 3.8 | D |
| 10 | I-80 EB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,461 | 130 | 99.6\% |  |  |  | 3,701 | 104 | 101.7\% | 61.2 | 1.2 | 25.2 | 0.8 | C |
| 11 | I-80 EB - SR-65 Off-ramp to Eureka Rd On-ramp | Basic | 2,755 | 102 | 96.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.2 | 16.1 | 0.5 | B |
| 17 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd On-ramp | Merge | 2,752 | 111 | 96.6\% | 707 | 43 | 102.4\% |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.2 | 15.3 | 0.7 | B |
| 18 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd On-ramp to SR-65 On-ramp | Basic | 3,455 | 120 | 97.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.1 | 17.0 | 0.7 | B |
| 19 | 1-80 EB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 3,455 | 117 | 97.6\% | 2,672 | 94 | 99.3\% |  |  |  | 58.2 | 1.0 | 32.3 | 0.9 | D |
| 20 | 1-80 EB - SR-65 to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 6,127 | 137 | 98.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.3 | 27.0 | 0.4 | D |
| 22 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,111 | 142 | 98.1\% |  |  |  | 1,678 | 81 | 99.3\% | 62.9 | 0.4 | 26.4 | 0.5 | C |
| 23 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,431 | 123 | 97.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.4 | 26.2 | 0.6 | D |
| 24 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 4,427 | 114 | 97.5\% | 261 | 25 | 100.2\% |  |  |  | 59.0 | 1.3 | 26.3 | 0.9 | C |
| 25 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd to Sierra College Blvd | Basic | 4,683 | 113 | 97.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.3 | 27.0 | 0.6 | D |
| 26 | 1-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,684 | 114 | 97.6\% |  |  |  | 551 | 39 | 87.4\% | 59.7 | 2.3 | 28.9 | 1.3 | D |
| 27 | 1-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,121 | 115 | 98.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.4 | 23.5 | 0.7 | C |
| 28 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 4,121 | 117 | 98.8\% | 324 | 8 | 95.3\% |  |  |  | 59.7 | 0.9 | 22.8 | 1.0 | C |
| 29 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 4,445 | 112 | 98.6\% | 884 | 18 | 102.7\% |  |  |  | 57.0 | 2.4 | 28.9 | 1.9 | D |
| 38 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,080 | 23 | 106.0\% |  |  |  | 760 | 43 | 102.7\% | 59.6 | 0.8 | 22.2 | 0.5 | C |
| 39 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,313 | 58 | 106.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.4 | 20.5 | 0.4 | C |
| 40 | 1-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 3,314 | 60 | 106.6\% | 403 | 10 | 100.6\% |  |  |  | 61.9 | 0.5 | 19.5 | 0.6 | B |
| 41 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 3,717 | 63 | 105.9\% | 438 | 9 | 97.4\% |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.5 | 21.7 | 0.7 | C |
| 42 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 4,153 | 64 | 104.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.2 | 23.9 | 0.8 | C |
| 43 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,151 | 63 | 104.8\% |  |  |  | 302 | 31 | 104.2\% | 62.3 | 0.6 | 24.7 | 0.9 | C |
| 44 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,847 | 68 | 104.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.1 | 22.3 | 0.6 | C |
| 45 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,847 | 70 | 104.8\% | 1,645 | 46 | 103.5\% |  |  |  | 57.9 | 0.9 | 28.8 | 0.6 | D |
| 46 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd to HOV Lane Start | Basic | 5,489 | 84 | 104.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 57.1 | 3.8 | 33.4 | 2.8 | D |
| 47 | 1-80 WB - HOV Lane Start to SR-65 | Basic | 5,482 | 88 | 104.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 59.9 | 0.8 | 23.6 | 0.3 | C |
| 48 | 1-80 WB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,479 | 87 | 104.2\% |  |  |  | 2,349 | 69 | 102.6\% | 63.7 | 0.2 | 21.3 | 0.4 | C |
| 49 | I-80 WB - SR-65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,129 | 83 | 105.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.8 | 0.1 | 18.1 | 0.5 | C |
| 60 | 1-80 WB - SR-65 to Atlantic St | Weave | 3,127 | 82 | 105.3\% | 5,159 | 128 | 98.6\% | 518 | 47 | 97.7\% | 59.1 | 0.6 | 23.9 | 0.5 | C |
| 62 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,874 | 163 | 102.7\% |  |  |  | 1,315 | 73 | 102.0\% | 59.3 | 2.7 | 29.7 | 4.5 | D |
| 63 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,561 | 149 | 102.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.4 | 25.0 | 0.5 | C |
| 64 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St On-ramp | Merge | 6,560 | 148 | 102.8\% | 1,257 | 59 | 103.9\% |  |  |  | 57.0 | 3.5 | 38.0 | 2.7 | E |
| 65 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,812 | 169 | 102.9\% |  |  |  | 1,229 | 63 | 102.4\% | 59.4 | 2.9 | 32.2 | 2.7 | D |
| 66 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,583 | 166 | 103.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.4 | 26.2 | 0.7 | D |
| 67 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 6,583 | 163 | 103.0\% | 1,208 | 65 | 89.4\% |  |  |  | 58.6 | 2.3 | 28.2 | 1.9 | D |
| 68 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 7,796 | 171 | 100.7\% | 752 | 39 | 101.6\% |  |  |  | 58.8 | 4.5 | 35.2 | 4.1 | E |
| 69 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd to Riverside Ave | Basic | 8,548 | 133 | 100.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.0 | 0.4 | 33.7 | 0.8 | D |
| 70 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,542 | 178 | 100.7\% |  |  |  | 1,311 | 77 | 103.2\% | 62.4 | 0.6 | 34.5 | 1.1 | D |
| 71 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,226 | 177 | 100.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.3 | 27.5 | 0.8 | D |
| 72 | 1-80 WB - Riverside Ave NB On-ramp | Merge | 7,221 | 173 | 100.1\% | 200 | 0 | 100.0\% |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.1 | 24.6 | 0.8 | C |
| 73 | 1-80 WB - Riverside Ave SB On-ramp | Merge | 7,416 | 168 | 100.1\% | 526 | 8 | 99.3\% |  |  |  | 60.1 | 1.2 | 29.4 | 0.6 | D |
| 74 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave to Antelope Rd | Basic | 7,948 | 156 | 100.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.5 | 0.4 | 30.6 | 0.7 | D |
| 75 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,947 | 156 | 100.1\% |  |  |  | 1,147 | 59 | 100.6\% | 61.5 | 1.1 | 31.7 | 0.8 | D |
| 76 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,799 | 154 | 100.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.4 | 26.4 | 0.4 | D |
| 77 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 6,800 | 157 | 100.0\% | 341 | 4 | 97.5\% |  |  |  | 60.7 | 0.8 | 24.3 | 1.0 | C |
| 78 | 1-80 WB - Antelope Rd to Truck Scales | Weave | 7,138 | 161 | 99.8\% | 528 | 13 | 99.6\% | 78 | 16 | 70.9\% | 62.0 | 0.2 | 25.9 | 0.5 | C |
| 79 | I-80 WB - Truck Scales Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,585 | 154 | 100.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.1 | 28.6 | 0.5 | D |
| 80 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales On-ramp | Merge | 7,584 | 150 | 100.2\% | 78 | 14 | 71.0\% |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.6 | 29.0 | 0.7 | D |
| 81 | I-80 WB - Truck Scales to Elkhorn Blvd | Basic | 7,661 | 138 | 99.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.0 | 1.6 | 31.2 | 0.9 | D |
| 82 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,663 | 134 | 99.8\% |  |  |  | 1,222 | 58 | 97.8\% | 60.9 | 1.6 | 28.2 | 1.0 | D |
| 83 | 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,440 | 118 | 100.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.3 | 1.0 | 25.4 | 0.5 | C |
| 84 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 6,442 | 123 | 100.2\% | 898 | 5 | 99.8\% |  |  |  | 55.7 | 1.4 | 28.0 | 1.1 | C |
|  | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 7,345 | 127 | 100.2\% | 581 | 10 | 100.1\% |  |  |  | 61.6 | 0.6 | 29.5 | 0.6 | D |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average Results from 10 Runs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | gn Ye | - Genera | Purpos | Lane Al | rnative |
| Freeway Operations Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM P | k Hour |
|  | Facility | Main | ne Volum | (vph) | On-r | p Volum | (vph) | Off- | mp Volum | (vph) | Spee | (mph) | Densi | (vplpm) |  |
| Location | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. | LOS |
| 100 SR-65 NB - EB l-80 Connector | Basic | 3,702 | 103 | 101.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.8 | 31.7 | 0.9 | D |
| 101 SR-65 NB - Eureka Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,701 | 105 | 101.7\% | 1,337 | 80 | 96.9\% |  |  |  | 48.4 | 0.1 | 36.0 | 0.8 | E |
| 102 SR-65 NB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 2,348 | 71 | 102.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52.1 | 0.3 | 24.1 | 0.7 | C |
| 103 SR-65 NB - I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Weave | 5,041 | 144 | 100.4\% | 3,418 | 79 | 100.8\% | 1,440 | 73 | 100.0\% | 56.4 | 1.4 | 32.5 | 1.3 | D |
| 106 SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,018 | 143 | 100.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.2 | 32.6 | 0.6 | D |
| 107 SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | 7,021 | 146 | 100.7\% | 1,433 | 60 | 100.9\% | 1,597 | 69 | 101.1\% | 59.1 | 1.9 | 34.4 | 1.4 | D |
| 110 SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,858 | 144 | 100.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58.0 | 3.3 | 34.4 | 1.7 | D |
| 111 SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 6,861 | 143 | 100.7\% | 548 | 30 | 99.7\% |  |  |  | 59.0 | 2.7 | 34.7 | 2.1 | D |
| 112 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,416 | 157 | 100.8\% |  |  |  | 2,551 | 88 | 98.9\% | 62.2 | 0.4 | 31.9 | 0.4 | D |
| 114 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,865 | 120 | 101.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.3 | 26.8 | 0.6 | D |
| 115 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 4,866 | 122 | 101.8\% | 1,030 | 64 | 103.0\% |  |  |  | 61.9 | 0.4 | 24.4 | 0.5 | C |
| 116 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | 5,891 | 141 | 101.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.3 | 25.9 | 0.6 | C |
| 118 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,888 | 151 | 101.9\% |  |  |  | 1,285 | 71 | 102.8\% | 63.1 | 0.1 | 26.1 | 0.6 | C |
| 119 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,597 | 148 | 101.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.1 | 25.0 | 0.7 | C |
| 120 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 4,594 | 146 | 101.4\% | 430 | 27 | 102.4\% |  |  |  | 61.1 | 0.9 | 27.2 | 0.9 | C |
| 121 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd to Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Weave | 5,027 | 130 | 101.6\% | 522 | 45 | 106.5\% | 1,196 | 63 | 102.2\% | 61.9 | 0.7 | 25.8 | 0.8 | C |
| 124 SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,348 | 128 | 101.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.2 | 24.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 125 SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy EB On-ramp | Merge | 4,346 | 131 | 101.8\% | 430 | 35 | 99.9\% |  |  |  | 62.3 | 0.8 | 26.2 | 0.8 | C |
| 126 SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | 4,769 | 119 | 101.5\% | 702 | 38 | 103.3\% | 1,101 | 58 | 101.9\% | 62.6 | 0.3 | 24.1 | 0.6 | C |
| 129 SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,353 | 126 | 101.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.1 | 24.7 | 0.7 | C |
| 130 SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Lincoln Blvd | Weave | 4,350 | 115 | 101.2\% | 991 | 53 | 96.2\% | 1,446 | 78 | 101.8\% | 62.4 | 0.4 | 23.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 133 SR-65 NB - Lincoln Blvd to Ferrari Ranch Rd | Basic | 3,892 | 106 | 99.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.5 | 1.1 | 28.3 | 0.9 | D |
| 134 SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,889 | 110 | 99.5\% |  |  |  | 2,018 | 85 | 98.9\% | 62.9 | 0.2 | 23.8 | 0.7 | C |
| 135 SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,865 | 89 | 99.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.0 | 0.2 | 15.3 | 0.9 | B |
| 136 SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | 1,865 | 86 | 99.7\% | 212 | 11 | 100.7\% |  |  |  | 61.6 | 0.9 | 16.0 | 0.9 | B |
| 150 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,071 | 56 | 100.5\% |  |  |  | 264 | 26 | 97.9\% | 63.6 | 0.1 | 18.4 | 0.4 | B |
| 151 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,806 | 63 | 100.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.0 | 0.1 | 15.6 | 0.5 | B |
| 152 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 1,806 | 62 | 100.9\% | 697 | 17 | 98.1\% |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.2 | 15.5 | 0.4 | B |
| 153 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | 2,503 | 62 | 100.1\% | 668 | 19 | 98.2\% |  |  |  | 61.6 | 0.2 | 16.2 | 0.4 | B |
| 154 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd to Lincoln Blvd | Basic | 3,170 | 68 | 99.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.0 | 0.1 | 18.0 | 0.3 | B |
| 156 SR-65 SB - Lincoln Blvd to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | 3,173 | 71 | 99.8\% | 762 | 50 | 99.0\% | 869 | 51 | 99.9\% | 62.2 | 0.7 | 17.2 | 0.3 | B |
| 159 SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,067 | 76 | 99.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.6 | 17.0 | 0.4 | B |
| 160 SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Placer Pkwy | Weave | 3,070 | 79 | 99.7\% | 876 | 36 | 93.2\% | 1,067 | 63 | 97.0\% | 61.0 | 1.0 | 21.7 | 0.9 | C |
| 163 SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,876 | 100 | 98.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.8 | 0.2 | 15.5 | 0.7 | B |
| 164 SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy WB On-ramp | Merge | 2,877 | 101 | 98.5\% | 413 | 32 | 103.1\% |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.3 | 18.6 | 0.8 | B |
| 165 SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy to Sunset Blvd | Weave | 3,292 | 102 | 99.1\% | 759 | 57 | 101.2\% | 626 | 44 | 97.8\% | 62.8 | 0.1 | 18.7 | 0.7 | B |
| 168 SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,425 | 111 | 99.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.1 | 18.7 | 0.7 | C |
| 169 SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,425 | 110 | 99.9\% | 1,016 | 42 | 105.8\% |  |  |  | 60.7 | 0.5 | 24.0 | 0.5 | C |
| 170 SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Weave | 4,439 | 117 | 101.1\% | 1,134 | 39 | 101.2\% | 877 | 60 | 98.6\% | 62.6 | 0.2 | 24.7 | 0.6 | C |
| 173 SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,685 | 117 | 101.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.1 | 26.2 | 0.7 | D |
| 174 SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 4,684 | 116 | 101.4\% | 375 | 23 | 98.8\% |  |  |  | 61.5 | 0.2 | 27.5 | 0.8 | C |
| 175 SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB to EB On-ramp | Basic | 5,055 | 116 | 101.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.2 | 27.5 | 0.7 | D |
| 176 SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 5,056 | 118 | 101.1\% | 1,414 | 41 | 98.9\% |  |  |  | 61.7 | 0.2 | 28.2 | 0.3 | D |
| 177 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,474 | 120 | 100.7\% |  |  |  | 626 | 43 | 96.3\% | 59.9 | 2.6 | 29.2 | 1.3 | D |
| 178 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,857 | 99 | 101.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.9 | 24.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 179 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 5,855 | 103 | 101.3\% | 652 | 45 | 101.8\% |  |  |  | 59.7 | 1.3 | 30.3 | 1.0 | D |
| 180 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 6,508 | 117 | 101.4\% | 1,198 | 52 | 99.9\% |  |  |  | 53.1 | 6.1 | 33.5 | 4.6 | D |
| 181 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | 7,705 | 109 | 101.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.6 | 0.5 | 33.5 | 0.5 | D |
| 182 SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,705 | 108 | 101.1\% |  |  |  | 1,650 | 70 | 100.6\% | 62.4 | 0.3 | 31.7 | 0.4 | D |
| 183 SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,051 | 121 | 101.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.3 | 0.6 | 34.4 | 0.7 | D |
| 184 SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd to I-80 | Weave | 6,054 | 115 | 101.2\% | 1,185 | 58 | 96.3\% | 4,563 | 115 | 101.0\% | 60.5 | 1.2 | 28.3 | 0.8 | D |
| 187 SR-65 SB - EB I-80 Connector | Basic | 2,674 | 86 | 99.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 47.6 | 0.9 | 38.6 | 1.3 | E |
| 188 SR-65 SB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 3,921 | 112 | 98.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 54.2 | 0.6 | 25.1 | 0.8 | C |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 1 | Lincoln Blvd/Sterling Pkwy |  | Signal | 2,990 | 3,296 | 110.2\% | 14.4 | 0.9 | B |
| 2 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 2,660 | 2,892 | 108.7\% | 15.8 | 1.1 | B |
| 3 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 2,655 | 2,819 | 106.2\% | 23.3 | 4.0 | C |
| 4 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 3,730 | 4,082 | 109.4\% | 27.0 | 9.2 | C |
| 5 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 4,005 | 4,412 | 110.2\% | 12.2 | 1.4 | B |
| 6 | SR-65 SB Ramps-Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 5,480 | 5,743 | 104.8\% | 59.1 | 8.8 | E |
| 7 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 3,515 | 3,762 | 107.0\% | 15.6 | 1.7 | B |
| 8 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 4,615 | 4,763 | 103.2\% | 7.6 | 0.6 | A |
| 9 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 3,620 | 3,653 | 100.9\% | 16.3 | 0.9 | B |
| 10 | Stanford Ranch Rd/Five Star Blvd | Signal | 2,755 | 2,874 | 104.3\% | 25.9 | 1.5 | C |
| 11 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Stanford Ranch Rd | Signal | 3,145 | 3,308 | 105.2\% | 11.7 | 1.1 | B |
| 12 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd | Signal | 3,545 | 3,692 | 104.1\% | 17.2 | 0.6 | B |
| 13 | Galleria Blvd/Antelope Creek Dr | Signal | 2,805 | 2,890 | 103.0\% | 9.8 | 1.4 | A |
| 14 | Galleria Blvd/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 5,326 | 5,725 | 107.5\% | 45.2 | 2.8 | D |
| 15 | Creekside Ridge Dr/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 3,355 | 3,632 | 108.2\% | 8.2 | 2.2 | A |
| 16 | Taylor Rd/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,825 | 5,212 | 108.0\% | 65.8 | 15.6 | E |
| 17 | North Sunrise Ave/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,785 | 5,164 | 107.9\% | 34.9 | 3.3 | C |
| 18 | Wills Rd/Atlantic St | Signal | 2,265 | 2,445 | 108.0\% | 21.1 | 2.7 | C |
| 19 | I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St | Signal | 3,790 | 4,024 | 106.2\% | 14.3 | 4.1 | B |
| 20 | Taylor Rd-I-80 EB Ramps/Eureka Rd | Signal | 5,375 | 5,648 | 105.1\% | 30.0 | 5.3 | C |
| 21 | North Sunrise Ave/Eureka Rd | Signal | 5,125 | 5,417 | 105.7\% | 40.7 | 5.0 | D |
| 22 | Harding Blvd/Wills Rd | Signal | 2,135 | 2,248 | 105.3\% | 14.8 | 2.5 | B |
| 23 | Harding Blvd/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 2,720 | 2,974 | 109.3\% | 28.1 | 5.2 | C |
| 24 | I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 3,955 | 4,224 | 106.8\% | 18.7 | 3.5 | B |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 89,176 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 94,897 |
| Percent Served | $106.4 \%$ |

Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 25 | I-80 EB Ramps/Douglas Blvd |  | Signal | 4,270 | 4,582 | 107.3\% | 24.0 | 10.9 | C |
| 26 | North Sunrise Ave/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 4,595 | 4,871 | 106.0\% | 44.3 | 20.5 | D |
| 27 | Pacific St/Woodside Dr | Signal | 2,230 | 2,459 | 110.3\% | 7.7 | 0.6 | A |
| 28 | Pacific St/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 3,305 | 3,641 | 110.2\% | 25.6 | 1.5 | C |
| 29 | Granite Dr/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,885 | 3,013 | 104.4\% | 27.5 | 1.1 | C |
| 30 | I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,000 | 3,139 | 104.6\% | 23.5 | 1.9 | C |
| 31 | I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,195 | 3,446 | 107.9\% | 26.2 | 4.6 | C |
| 32 | Aguilar Rd/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,305 | 2,512 | 109.0\% | 9.6 | 1.2 | A |
| 33 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 NB Off-Ramp | Signal | 2,755 | 3,043 | 110.5\% | 9.4 | 1.2 | A |
| 34 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 SB On-Ramp | Signal | 1,995 | 2,177 | 109.1\% | 20.1 | 2.5 | C |
| 35 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy | Signal | 4,010 | 4,395 | 109.6\% | 20.0 | 5.7 | B |
| 36 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Signal | 3,720 | 3,944 | 106.0\% | 14.9 | 3.0 | B |
| 40 | Galleria Blvd/Berry St-Cattlemens Drwy | Signal | 2,020 | 2,128 | 105.3\% | 10.1 | 1.8 | B |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 40,285 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 43,351 |
| Percent Served | $107.6 \%$ |

Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.

[^9]
## Average Results from 10 Runs

Intersection Volume and Delay

## Design Year - General Purpose Lane Alternative

PM Peak Hour

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 1 | Lincoln Blvd/Sterling Pkwy |  | Signal | 3,430 | 3,452 | 100.6\% | 17.2 | 0.9 | B |
| 2 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 2,655 | 2,582 | 97.3\% | 28.0 | 13.1 | C |
| 3 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 2,880 | 2,858 | 99.2\% | 19.6 | 1.1 | B |
| 4 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 4,970 | 5,112 | 102.9\% | 15.0 | 3.8 | B |
| 5 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 4,735 | 4,929 | 104.1\% | 11.4 | 0.8 | B |
| 6 | SR-65 SB Ramps-Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 7,110 | 7,193 | 101.2\% | 153.1 | 19.8 | F |
| 7 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 4,755 | 4,879 | 102.6\% | 49.2 | 39.8 | D |
| 8 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 6,360 | 6,377 | 100.3\% | 8.1 | 0.6 | A |
| 9 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 5,380 | 5,412 | 100.6\% | 13.8 | 0.6 | B |
| 10 | Stanford Ranch Rd/Five Star Blvd | Signal | 4,355 | 4,337 | 99.6\% | 56.7 | 12.2 | E |
| 11 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Stanford Ranch Rd | Signal | 5,590 | 5,609 | 100.3\% | 18.6 | 1.7 | B |
| 12 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd | Signal | 6,015 | 5,993 | 99.6\% | 19.0 | 2.0 | B |
| 13 | Galleria Blvd/Antelope Creek Dr | Signal | 4,590 | 4,476 | 97.5\% | 29.4 | 2.0 | C |
| 14 | Galleria Blvd/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 8,000 | 7,662 | 95.8\% | 82.4 | 10.6 | F |
| 15 | Creekside Ridge Dr/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,575 | 4,398 | 96.1\% | 46.5 | 13.4 | D |
| 16 | Taylor Rd/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 6,690 | 6,501 | 97.2\% | 51.8 | 11.8 | D |
| 17 | North Sunrise Ave/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 6,330 | 6,369 | 100.6\% | 56.5 | 33.3 | E |
| 18 | Wills Rd/Atlantic St | Signal | 3,215 | 3,293 | 102.4\% | 24.8 | 3.1 | C |
| 19 | I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St | Signal | 4,830 | 4,974 | 103.0\% | 23.7 | 9.8 | C |
| 20 | Taylor Rd-I-80 EB Ramps/Eureka Rd | Signal | 6,580 | 6,704 | 101.9\% | 80.9 | 17.7 | F |
| 21 | North Sunrise Ave/Eureka Rd | Signal | 6,855 | 7,077 | 103.2\% | 103.3 | 26.0 | F |
| 22 | Harding Blvd/Wills Rd | Signal | 2,915 | 3,006 | 103.1\% | 16.0 | 1.6 | B |
| 23 | Harding Blvd/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 3,920 | 3,878 | 98.9\% | 96.2 | 7.4 | F |
| 24 | I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 4,715 | 4,553 | 96.6\% | 32.9 | 14.1 | C |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 121,450 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 121,624 |
| Percent Served | $100.1 \%$ |

Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 25 | I-80 EB Ramps/Douglas Blvd |  | Signal | 5,445 | 5,078 | 93.3\% | 37.2 | 25.8 | D |
| 26 | North Sunrise Ave/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 6,285 | 5,738 | 91.3\% | 241.3 | 10.3 | F |
| 27 | Pacific St/Woodside Dr | Signal | 3,360 | 3,365 | 100.2\% | 10.8 | 1.2 | B |
| 28 | Pacific St/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 5,090 | 5,118 | 100.5\% | 36.7 | 3.7 | D |
| 29 | Granite Dr/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,970 | 4,134 | 104.1\% | 83.5 | 20.0 | F |
| 30 | I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,865 | 3,986 | 103.1\% | 62.5 | 15.3 | E |
| 31 | I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,830 | 3,893 | 101.6\% | 19.9 | 2.1 | B |
| 32 | Aguilar Rd/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,995 | 3,057 | 102.1\% | 31.3 | 7.6 | C |
| 33 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 NB Off-Ramp | Signal | 3,000 | 3,032 | 101.1\% | 10.4 | 0.4 | B |
| 34 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 SB On-Ramp | Signal | 1,580 | 1,588 | 100.5\% | 17.1 | 1.7 | B |
| 35 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy | Signal | 4,870 | 4,935 | 101.3\% | 22.2 | 1.1 | C |
| 36 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Signal | 4,625 | 4,703 | 101.7\% | 21.4 | 2.8 | C |
| 40 | Galleria Blvd/Berry St | Signal | 2,940 | 3,001 | 102.1\% | 12.6 | 1.0 | B |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 51,855 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 51,627 |
| Percent Served | $99.6 \%$ |

[^10]Intersection 2
SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 440 | 45 | 18 | 258 | 34 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,500 | 39 | 20 | 253 | 34 | NO |

Intersection 3
SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eto | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 700 | 20 | 18 | 157 | 32 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,500 | 20 | 18 | 157 | 32 | NO |

Intersection 4
SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |
|  | Left Turn | 360 | 68 | 8 | 261 | 24 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,330 | 70 | 8 | 263 | 24 | NO |

Intersection 5
SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd
Signalized

| Direction |  | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exceeds |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,400 | 55 | 5 | 228 | 32 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,400 | 24 | 5 | 150 | 18 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Etd | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 200 | 41 | 9 | 208 | 174 | MAX |
|  | Through | 2,260 | 175 | 73 | 952 | 350 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 200 | 43 | 53 | 699 | 416 | MAX |

## Intersection 7

SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 400 | 52 | 19 | 284 | 48 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,100 | 51 | 19 | 283 | 48 | NO |

## Intersection 8

SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 430 | 31 | 5 | 158 | 23 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,130 | 33 | 5 | 160 | 23 | NO |

Intersection 9
SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage(ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,420 | 48 | 10 | 194 | 23 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,420 | 47 | 10 | 193 | 23 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

| Direction | Movement | Storage(ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| EB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,800 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 11 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,170 | 30 | 4 | 179 | 54 | NO |

Intersection 12
SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| EB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,130 | 67 | 8 | 380 | 64 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,780 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 13 | NO |

Intersection 19
I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,150 | 1 | 1 | 72 | 228 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,430 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 180 | 86 | 15 | 473 | 444 | MAX |
|  | Through | 1,700 | 76 | 26 | 488 | 289 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 1,700 | 10 | 11 | 396 | 503 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn | 550 | 27 | 3 | 98 | 24 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 550 | 36 | 2 | 183 | 40 | NO |
| EB | Left Turn | 1,120 | 36 | 3 | 127 | 23 | NO |
|  | Through | 1,120 | 121 | 26 | 739 | 100 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 810 | 14 | 9 | 325 | 101 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through | 1,370 | 98 | 20 | 632 | 126 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 280 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 12 | NO |

Intersection 24
I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas BIvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (ft) | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 1,530 | 90 | 92 | 429 | 131 | NO |
|  | Through | 1,530 | 90 | 92 | 429 | 131 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 730 | 90 | 92 | 429 | 131 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

| Direction | Movement | Storage(ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,400 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 34 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,250 | 13 | 3 | 103 | 24 | NO |

Intersection 30
I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 700 | 25 | 5 | 165 | 70 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,230 | 34 | 7 | 185 | 70 | NO |

Intersection 31
I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,080 | 60 | 5 | 269 | 45 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,080 | 49 | 7 | 280 | 31 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| WB | Left Turn | 1,940 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,940 | 24 | 7 | 157 | 30 | NO |

Intersection 35
SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy
Signalized

| Direction |  | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exceeds |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 1,650 | 149 | 108 | 824 | 441 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,650 | 150 | 108 | 825 | 441 | NO |

Intersection 36
SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |
|  | Left Turn | 1,620 | 63 | 11 | 319 | 51 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,620 | 63 | 11 | 319 | NO |  |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

Intersection 2
SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 440 | 52 | 6 | 217 | 38 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,500 | 47 | 7 | 212 | 38 | NO |

Intersection 3
SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 700 | 25 | 2 | 97 | 21 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,500 | 25 | 2 | 97 | 21 | NO |

Intersection 4
SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |
|  | Left Turn | 360 | 61 | 1 | 199 | 24 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,330 | 63 | 1 | 201 | NO |  |

Intersection 5
SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd
Signalized

| Direction |  | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exceeds |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,400 | 63 | 2 | 237 | 37 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,400 | 18 | 3 | 140 | 24 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (ft) | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 200 | 83 | 29 | 528 | 382 | MAX |
|  | Through | 2,260 | 140 | 76 | 846 | 302 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 200 | 22 | 33 | 565 | 302 | MAX |

## Intersection 7

SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 400 | 61 | 6 | 272 | 54 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,100 | 61 | 6 | 272 | 54 | NO |

Intersection 8
SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 430 | 30 | 4 | 134 | 16 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,130 | 32 | 4 | 137 | 16 | NO |

Intersection 9
SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd
Signalized

| Direction |  | Movement | Storage |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |  |  |
|  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,420 | 51 | 0 | 194 | 21 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,420 | 50 | 0 | 193 | NO |  |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| EB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,800 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 27 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,170 | 56 | 4 | 303 | 33 | NO |

Intersection 12
SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| EB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,130 | 81 | 3 | 388 | 65 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,780 | 6 | 3 | 166 | 55 | NO |

Intersection 19
I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St
Signalized

| Direction |  | Movement | Storage | (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |  |  |
|  | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,150 | 21 | 37 | 398 | 687 | NO |  |  |
| SB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,430 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NO |  |  |  |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 180 | 82 | 10 | 387 | 210 | MAX |
|  | Through | 1,700 | 26 | 11 | 163 | 30 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 1,700 | 1 | 1 | 113 | 191 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn | 550 | 32 | 12 | 124 | 21 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 550 | 140 | 83 | 671 | 89 | MAX |
| EB | Left Turn | 1,120 | 56 | 4 | 197 | 40 | NO |
|  | Through | 1,120 | 232 | 27 | 803 | 101 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 810 | 52 | 14 | 386 | 101 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through | 1,370 | 657 | 246 | 1,502 | 39 | MAX |
|  | Right Turn | 280 | 13 | 15 | 281 | 282 | MAX |

Intersection 24
I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 1,530 | 145 | 156 | 548 | 402 | NO |
|  | Through | 1,530 | 145 | 156 | 548 | 402 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 730 | 146 | 157 | 548 | 402 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

Average Results from 10 Runs Design Year - General Purpose Lane Alternative Queue Length PM Peak Hour

Intersection 25 I-80 EB Ramps/Douglas Blvd

Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage(ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,400 | 167 | 274 | 1,156 | 799 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,250 | 31 | 10 | 208 | 172 | NO |

Intersection 30
I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (ft) | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 700 | 75 | 66 | 335 | 211 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,230 | 88 | 68 | 355 | 211 | NO |

Intersection 31
I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,080 | 74 | 9 | 288 | 44 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,080 | 56 | 4 | 288 | 33 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

Average Results from 10 Runs Design Year - General Purpose Lane Alternative Queue Length PM Peak Hour

Intersection 33
Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 NB Off-Ramp
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| WB | Left Turn | 1,940 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,940 | 74 | 4 | 356 | 91 | NO |

## Intersection 35

SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 1,650 | 67 | 6 | 344 | 33 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,650 | 68 | 6 | 345 | 33 | NO |

Intersection 36
SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |
|  | Left Turn | 1,620 | 127 | 26 | 494 | 89 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,620 | 127 | 26 | 494 | NO |  |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

# SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements 

Vissim Model Results - Design Year Alternative 3 (No Build)

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Network Statistics

SR 65 Widening Design Year - No Build AM Peak Period

| Network Performance | Vehicle Types | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Vehicles Served | All Vehicles | 208,799 | 146 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | All Vehicles | 917,290 | 1,551 |
| Travel Time [h] | All Vehicles | 22,142 | 179.1 |
| Average Speed [mph] | All Vehicles | 41.4 | 0.4 |
| Total Delay [h] | All Vehicles | 6,325 | 185.5 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | All Vehicles | 106 | 3.1 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | All Vehicles | 0.41 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | HOV | 34,742 | 49 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | HOV | 159,556 | 600 |
| Travel Time [h] | HOV | 3,611 | 32 |
| Average Speed [mph] | HOV | 44.2 | 0.4 |
| Total Delay [h] | HOV | 885 | 29 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | HOV | 90 | 3 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | HOV | 0.33 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | Truck | 7,619 | 19 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | Truck | 42,426 | 480 |
| Travel Time [h] | Truck | 987 | 16 |
| Average Speed [mph] | Truck | 43.0 | 1 |
| Total Delay [h] | Truck | 264 | 13 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | Truck | 121 | 6 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | Truck | 0.37 | 0.02 |


| Performance Measure | Vehicle Types |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HOV | Truck | All |
|  | 34,740 | 7,620 | 208,800 |
| Demand Volume | 35,960 | 8,270 | 211,350 |
| Percent Demand Served | $96.6 \%$ | $92.1 \%$ | $98.8 \%$ |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel | 159,560 | 42,430 | 917,290 |
| Person Miles of Travel | 335,070 | 44,550 | $1,094,920$ |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel | 3,610 | 990 | 22,140 |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay | 890 | 260 | 6,330 |
| VHD \% of VHT | $24.7 \%$ | $26.3 \%$ | $28.6 \%$ |
| Average Delay per Vehicle $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.54 | 2.05 | 1.82 |
| Person Hours of Delay | 1,870 | 270 | 7,320 |
| Average Travel Speed | 44.2 | 43.0 | 41.4 |

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Peak Hour Travel Time

SR 65 Widening Design Year - No Build AM Peak Period


VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Network Statistics

SR 65 Widening Design Year - No Build PM Peak Period

| Network Performance | Vehicle Types | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Vehicles Served | All Vehicles | 302,584 | 315 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | All Vehicles | $1,106,394$ | 1,394 |
| Travel Time [h] | All Vehicles | 32,921 | 479.3 |
| Average Speed [mph] | All Vehicles | 33.6 | 0.5 |
| Total Delay [h] | All Vehicles | 13,378 | 475.7 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | All Vehicles | 156 | 5.6 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | All Vehicles | 0.73 | 0.03 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | HOV | 52,957 | 168 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | HOV | 200,204 | 642 |
| Travel Time [h] | HOV | 5,368 | 56 |
| Average Speed [mph] | HOV | 37.3 | 0.4 |
| Total Delay [h] | HOV | 1,860 | 51 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | HOV | 124 | 3 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | HOV | 0.56 | 0.02 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | Truck | 8,062 | 29 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | Truck | 38,340 | 320 |
| Travel Time [h] | Truck | 1,085 | 30 |
| Average Speed [mph] | Truck | 35.4 | 1 |
| Total Delay [h] | Truck | 422 | 26 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | Truck | 184 | 11 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | Truck | 0.66 | 0.04 |


| Performance Measure | Vehicle Types |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HOV | Truck | All |
|  | 52,960 | 8,060 | 302,580 |
| Percent Demand Served | 54,620 | 8,720 | 305,210 |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel | $97.0 \%$ | $92.4 \%$ | $99.1 \%$ |
| Person Miles of Travel | 200,200 | 38,340 | $1,106,390$ |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel | 520,430 | 40,260 | $1,328,540$ |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay | 1,860 | 1,080 | 32,920 |
| VHD \% of VHT | $34.6 \%$ | 420 | 13,380 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle $(\mathrm{min})$ | 2.11 | $38.9 \%$ | $40.6 \%$ |
| Person Hours of Delay | 3,910 | 3.13 | 2.65 |
| Average Travel Speed | 37.3 | 440 | 15,450 |

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Peak Hour Travel Time

SR 65 Widening Design Year - No Build PM Peak Period


| VISSIM Post-Processor Average Results from 10 Runs Freeway Operations Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SR 65 Widening Design Year - No Build AM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| Location |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 1 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 7,466 | 44 | 110.3\% | 1,238 | 24 | 110.5\% |  |  |  | 60.8 | 1.5 | 33.5 | 1.1 | D |
| 2 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | Basic | 8,698 | 74 | 110.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52.9 | 4.2 | 42.0 | 4.1 | E |
| 3 | 1-80 EB - Douglas Blvd EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,690 | 91 | 110.1\% |  |  |  | 1,382 | 48 | 108.0\% | 59.1 | 3.7 | 31.3 | 3.3 | D |
| 4 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,307 | 101 | 110.5\% |  |  |  | 385 | 36 | 113.3\% | 62.0 | 1.0 | 25.6 | 1.1 | C |
| 5 | 1-80 EB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,919 | 111 | 110.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.4 | 27.8 | 0.4 | D |
| 6 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd | Weave | 6,918 | 118 | 110.3\% | 1,134 | 26 | 94.5\% | 1,841 | 81 | 105.2\% | 62.4 | 0.2 | 26.6 | 0.3 | C |
| 7 | I-80 EB CD - Eureka Rd to Taylor Rd/SR-65 | Weave | 644 | 48 | 109.1\% | 1,220 | 69 | 105.2\% | 925 | 52 | 105.1\% | 61.9 | 1.1 | 15.2 | 1.0 | B |
| 8 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd to SR-65 | Basic | 6,215 | 106 | 108.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.9 | 0.3 | 29.2 | 0.5 | D |
| 9 | I-80 EB - HOV Connector Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,215 | 101 | 108.6\% |  |  |  | 534 | 41 | 106.8\% | 59.0 | 1.5 | 29.7 | 1.2 | D |
| 10 | I-80 EB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,678 | 113 | 108.8\% |  |  |  | 3,231 | 94 | 108.1\% | 62.9 | 0.6 | 23.9 | 0.5 | C |
| 11 | 1-80 EB - SR-65 Off-ramp to Eureka Rd On-ramp | Basic | 2,446 | 68 | 109.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.2 | 14.7 | 0.5 | B |
| 17 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd On-ramp | Merge | 2,450 | 68 | 109.9\% | 619 | 43 | 104.9\% |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.6 | 15.5 | 0.6 | B |
| 18 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd On-ramp to SR-65 On-ramp | Basic | 3,070 | 88 | 108.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.2 | 16.9 | 0.6 | B |
| 19 | I-80 EB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 3,069 | 90 | 108.8\% | 1,841 | 76 | 104.0\% |  |  |  | 61.2 | 0.3 | 26.3 | 0.5 | C |
| 20 | 1-80 EB - SR-65 to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 4,910 | 116 | 107.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.2 | 24.0 | 0.5 | C |
| 22 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,918 | 101 | 107.1\% |  |  |  | 1,749 | 73 | 108.0\% | 63.4 | 0.1 | 22.9 | 0.3 | C |
| 23 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,182 | 105 | 107.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.2 | 20.2 | 0.5 | C |
| 24 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,185 | 101 | 107.2\% | 249 | 5 | 99.6\% |  |  |  | 60.1 | 0.7 | 20.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 25 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd to Sierra College Blvd | Basic | 3,440 | 106 | 106.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.3 | 21.3 | 0.6 | C |
| 26 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,442 | 107 | 106.9\% |  |  |  | 624 | 46 | 107.5\% | 62.2 | 0.7 | 22.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 27 | 1-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,823 | 91 | 106.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.3 | 18.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 28 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 2,825 | 88 | 107.0\% | 139 | 6 | 92.7\% |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.2 | 17.3 | 0.6 | B |
| 29 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 2,966 | 91 | 106.3\% | 489 | 22 | 101.8\% |  |  |  | 61.9 | 0.4 | 19.3 | 0.6 | B |
| 38 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,377 | 22 | 105.8\% |  |  |  | 1,116 | 57 | 107.3\% | 52.8 | 2.1 | 32.5 | 1.2 | D |
| 39 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,258 | 68 | 105.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.1 | 0.7 | 26.0 | 0.2 | C |
| 40 | 1-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 4,258 | 70 | 105.4\% | 50 | 3 | 82.8\% |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.2 | 22.9 | 0.5 | C |
| 41 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 4,307 | 83 | 105.0\% | 320 | 14 | 103.1\% |  |  |  | 60.8 | 1.3 | 24.8 | 1.0 | C |
| 42 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 4,619 | 86 | 104.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.4 | 27.4 | 0.5 | D |
| 43 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,618 | 82 | 104.7\% |  |  |  | 297 | 33 | 102.4\% | 60.8 | 0.5 | 28.1 | 0.6 | D |
| 44 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,316 | 90 | 104.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.2 | 25.6 | 0.4 | C |
| 45 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 4,316 | 91 | 104.7\% | 967 | 50 | 99.7\% |  |  |  | 60.5 | 1.0 | 27.0 | 0.8 | C |
| 46 | 1-80 WB - Rocklin Rd to HOV Lane Start | Basic | 5,273 | 118 | 103.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.9 | 0.8 | 30.0 | 0.8 | D |
| 47 | I-80 WB - HOV Lane Start to SR-65 | Basic | 5,270 | 124 | 103.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.5 | 24.4 | 0.7 | C |
| 48 | I-80 WB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,269 | 126 | 103.5\% |  |  |  | 1,608 | 97 | 103.1\% | 63.4 | 0.3 | 22.5 | 0.8 | C |
| 49 | I-80 WB - SR-65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,654 | 121 | 103.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.1 | 20.3 | 0.8 | C |
| 60 | I-80 WB - SR-65 to Atlantic St | Weave | 3,650 | 126 | 103.4\% | 5,275 | 135 | 100.5\% | 477 | 45 | 101.5\% | 58.8 | 0.8 | 24.8 | 0.6 | C |
| 62 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,403 | 162 | 101.1\% |  |  |  | 1,237 | 65 | 100.6\% | 57.2 | 4.6 | 31.2 | 3.0 | D |
| 63 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,164 | 166 | 101.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.5 | 27.3 | 0.4 | D |
| 64 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St On-ramp | Merge | 7,161 | 159 | 101.1\% | 903 | 31 | 105.0\% |  |  |  | 57.6 | 2.1 | 38.1 | 1.3 | E |
| 65 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,058 | 142 | 101.5\% |  |  |  | 1,075 | 62 | 96.0\% | 59.0 | 2.8 | 33.6 | 1.8 | D |
| 66 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,982 | 147 | 102.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.7 | 28.0 | 0.5 | D |
| 67 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 6,985 | 143 | 102.4\% | 937 | 49 | 105.3\% |  |  |  | 59.5 | 2.5 | 30.2 | 1.8 | D |
| 68 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 7,921 | 141 | 102.7\% | 459 | 40 | 109.3\% |  |  |  | 59.3 | 1.5 | 35.2 | 1.3 | E |
| 69 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd to Riverside Ave | Basic | 8,381 | 130 | 103.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.6 | 0.5 | 33.8 | 0.6 | D |
| 70 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,383 | 140 | 103.1\% |  |  |  | 1,040 | 73 | 98.1\% | 62.1 | 0.6 | 34.4 | 0.7 | D |
| 71 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,341 | 150 | 103.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.3 | 29.4 | 0.5 | D |
| 72 | 1-80 WB - Riverside Ave NB On-ramp | Merge | 7,342 | 153 | 103.8\% | 213 | 6 | 85.2\% |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.2 | 27.2 | 0.9 | C |
| 73 | 1-80 WB - Riverside Ave SB On-ramp | Merge | 7,553 | 155 | 103.2\% | 778 | 14 | 94.8\% |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.2 | 32.7 | 1.1 | D |
| 74 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave to Antelope Rd | Basic | 8,344 | 150 | 102.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.4 | 0.3 | 33.7 | 0.8 | D |
| 75 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,354 | 146 | 102.6\% |  |  |  | 464 | 29 | 89.1\% | 57.0 | 5.3 | 37.0 | 3.4 | E |
| 76 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,932 | 128 | 104.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 47.1 | 13.0 | 45.9 | 14.7 | F |
| 77 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 7,955 | 143 | 104.4\% | 521 | 14 | 98.2\% |  |  |  | 34.5 | 11.2 | 70.2 | 21.2 | F |
| 78 | 1-80 WB - Antelope Rd to Truck Scales | Weave | 8,530 | 189 | 104.7\% | 444 | 13 | 88.9\% | 91 | 17 | 82.4\% | 32.7 | 7.3 | 70.3 | 11.7 | F |
| 79 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales Off to On-ramp | Basic | 9,026 | 193 | 105.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31.7 | 2.8 | 77.8 | 7.4 | F |
| 80 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales On-ramp | Merge | 9,075 | 231 | 106.3\% | 92 | 15 | 83.5\% |  |  |  | 31.2 | 1.1 | 86.6 | 3.4 | F |
| 81 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales to Elkhorn Blvd | Basic | 9,248 | 227 | 106.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 39.2 | 1.5 | 59.5 | 2.2 | F |
| 82 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 9,256 | 224 | 107.0\% |  |  |  | 1,087 | 63 | 105.5\% | 52.5 | 6.3 | 36.6 | 4.6 | E |
| 83 | 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 8,207 | 213 | 107.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 46.6 | 16.7 | 54.0 | 26.6 | F |
| 84 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 8,232 | 220 | 108.0\% | 742 | 11 | 93.9\% |  |  |  | 42.9 | 16.8 | 60.9 | 29.8 | F |
| 85 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 9,008 | 254 | 107.1\% | 810 | 18 | 98.8\% |  |  |  | 45.1 | 14.2 | 57.5 | 19.7 | F |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| VISSIM Post-Processor <br> Average Results from 10 Runs <br> Freeway Operations Summary $\qquad$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | De | SR 65 n Year AM Pe | dening <br> o Build <br> k Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
|  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 100 SR-65 NB - EB l-80 Connector | Basic | 3,231 | 95 | 108.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.3 | 28.0 | 1.0 | D |
| 101 SR-65 NB - Eureka Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,230 | 95 | 108.0\% | 941 | 58 | 105.7\% |  |  |  | 48.8 | 0.2 | 31.2 | 0.9 | D |
| 102 SR-65 NB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 1,609 | 91 | 103.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 53.1 | 0.3 | 17.6 | 0.9 | B |
| 103 SR-65 NB - I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Weave | 4,164 | 94 | 107.3\% | 2,142 | 93 | 104.0\% | 1,074 | 64 | 104.3\% | 59.9 | 0.4 | 25.8 | 0.8 | C |
| 106 SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,235 | 109 | 106.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58.8 | 8.0 | 29.1 | 6.1 | D |
| 107 SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | 5,240 | 110 | 106.7\% | 519 | 26 | 98.0\% |  |  |  | 51.2 | 7.4 | 40.1 | 6.2 | E |
| 109 SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,762 | 128 | 105.9\% |  |  |  | 1,141 | 59 | 100.1\% | 55.5 | 2.9 | 39.5 | 3.3 | E |
| 110 SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,623 | 112 | 107.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.8 | 1.9 | 30.0 | 1.2 | D |
| 111 SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Weave | 4,625 | 117 | 107.6\% | 278 | 29 | 95.7\% | 1,821 | 85 | 110.4\% | 63.1 | 0.3 | 23.1 | 0.5 | C |
| 114 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,078 | 111 | 104.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.2 | 17.2 | 0.7 | B |
| 115 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 3,078 | 111 | 104.7\% | 483 | 31 | 100.7\% |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.3 | 19.4 | 0.7 | B |
| 116 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | 3,562 | 133 | 104.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.3 | 20.9 | 0.8 | C |
| 118 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,563 | 135 | 104.2\% |  |  |  | 1,168 | 58 | 104.3\% | 63.8 | 0.2 | 18.7 | 0.6 | B |
| 119 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,397 | 96 | 104.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.0 | 0.2 | 13.8 | 0.7 | B |
| 120 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 2,398 | 91 | 104.3\% | 161 | 20 | 94.4\% |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.3 | 13.9 | 0.6 | B |
| 121 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd to Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Weave | 2,559 | 83 | 103.6\% | 456 | 19 | 108.6\% | 680 | 43 | 93.1\% | 63.7 | 0.2 | 13.7 | 0.4 | B |
| 124 SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,335 | 76 | 108.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.0 | 0.1 | 13.6 | 0.4 | B |
| 125 SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy EB On-ramp | Merge | 2,337 | 79 | 108.2\% | 497 | 26 | 105.8\% |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.3 | 16.3 | 0.4 | B |
| 126 SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy WB On-ramp | Merge | 2,834 | 84 | 107.8\% | 465 | 26 | 110.8\% |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.1 | 18.6 | 0.4 | B |
| 127 SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr | Basic | 3,298 | 91 | 108.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.1 | 19.1 | 0.5 | C |
| 128 SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,300 | 89 | 108.2\% |  |  |  | 701 | 50 | 96.1\% | 62.7 | 0.4 | 23.1 | 0.8 | C |
| 129 SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,602 | 84 | 112.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.3 | 15.8 | 0.3 | B |
| 130 SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Lincoln Blvd | Weave | 2,602 | 87 | 112.2\% | 942 | 53 | 107.0\% | 824 | 58 | 114.5\% | 63.3 | 0.2 | 17.2 | 0.4 | B |
| 133 SR-65 NB - Lincoln Blvd to Ferrari Ranch Rd | Basic | 2,720 | 83 | 109.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.4 | 21.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 134 SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,721 | 83 | 109.7\% |  |  |  | 1,186 | 51 | 104.9\% | 63.6 | 0.2 | 18.5 | 0.5 | B |
| 135 SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,540 | 78 | 114.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.1 | 0.2 | 14.6 | 0.5 | B |
| 136 SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | 1,542 | 76 | 114.2\% | 181 | 5 | 106.2\% |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.6 | 15.3 | 0.5 | B |
| 150 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,183 | 40 | 112.5\% |  |  |  | 146 | 23 | 104.3\% | 62.9 | 0.3 | 27.3 | 0.5 | C |
| 151 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,035 | 48 | 113.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.2 | 25.7 | 0.7 | C |
| 152 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 2,036 | 48 | 113.1\% | 1,023 | 22 | 106.6\% |  |  |  | 61.1 | 0.2 | 24.9 | 0.5 | C |
| 153 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | 3,057 | 55 | 110.8\% | 1,020 | 25 | 93.5\% |  |  |  | 58.3 | 2.3 | 28.5 | 1.3 | D |
| 154 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd to Lincoln Blvd | Basic | 4,081 | 64 | 106.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.1 | 30.0 | 0.5 | D |
| 156 SR-65 SB - Lincoln Blvd to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | 4,081 | 63 | 106.0\% | 887 | 67 | 108.2\% | 1,012 | 60 | 108.8\% | 59.5 | 1.3 | 28.1 | 0.8 | D |
| 159 SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,953 | 97 | 105.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.5 | 26.1 | 0.4 | D |
| 160 SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr On-ramp | Merge | 3,953 | 96 | 105.7\% | 639 | 32 | 116.2\% |  |  |  | 60.7 | 1.6 | 29.2 | 1.0 | D |
| 161 SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Placer Pkwy | Basic | 4,594 | 121 | 107.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.2 | 29.6 | 0.5 | D |
| 162 SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,592 | 116 | 107.0\% |  |  |  | 841 | 57 | 109.2\% | 61.2 | 1.7 | 29.1 | 0.6 | D |
| 163 SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,750 | 104 | 106.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.5 | 23.3 | 0.7 | C |
| 164 SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,750 | 102 | 106.5\% | 332 | 28 | 103.8\% |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.6 | 25.4 | 0.6 | C |
| 165 SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy to Sunset Blvd | Weave | 4,079 | 101 | 106.2\% | 641 | 30 | 112.5\% | 853 | 52 | 106.6\% | 61.7 | 0.2 | 23.9 | 0.4 | C |
| 168 SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,862 | 90 | 107.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 47.4 | 22.5 | 38.6 | 34.5 | E |
| 169 SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,852 | 102 | 106.7\% | 114 | 16 | 103.7\% |  |  |  | 33.6 | 23.6 | 74.0 | 53.9 | F |
| 170 SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 3,923 | 143 | 105.5\% | 349 | 15 | 97.0\% |  |  |  | 19.6 | 15.3 | 97.0 | 29.9 | F |
| 171 SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Basic | 4,188 | 179 | 102.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16.5 | 8.6 | 101.7 | 22.2 | F |
| 172 SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,168 | 174 | 102.1\% |  |  |  | 601 | 63 | 103.6\% | 15.3 | 2.5 | 97.3 | 8.6 | F |
| 173 SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp to Lane Drop | Basic | 3,494 | 137 | 99.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.1 | 1.4 | 113.7 | 4.7 | F |
| 174 SR-65 SB - Lane Drop to Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Basic | 3,469 | 149 | 99.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.4 | 1.5 | 113.9 | 5.4 | F |
| 175 SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,461 | 150 | 98.9\% | 390 | 15 | 100.1\% |  |  |  | 15.7 | 1.9 | 106.9 | 5.7 | F |
| 176 SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | 3,803 | 172 | 97.8\% | 1,272 | 75 | 102.6\% | 599 | 51 | 98.3\% | 24.3 | 3.0 | 79.1 | 6.1 | F |
| 178 ${ }^{\text {SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp }}$ | Basic | 4,426 | 126 | 97.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30.2 | 3.4 | 73.7 | 5.6 | F |
| 179 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 4,420 | 127 | 97.8\% | 1,081 | 36 | 102.0\% |  |  |  | 24.8 | 2.3 | 78.8 | 4.7 | F |
| 180 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 5,464 | 106 | 97.9\% | 857 | 51 | 103.2\% |  |  |  | 28.1 | 0.6 | 81.6 | 2.3 | F |
| 181 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | 6,288 | 110 | 98.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55.7 | 1.3 | 36.9 | 1.3 | E |
| 182 SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,288 | 109 | 98.1\% |  |  |  | 1,074 | 58 | 92.6\% | 60.0 | 0.6 | 34.2 | 0.9 | D |
| 183 SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,218 | 121 | 99.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.3 | 0.3 | 28.3 | 0.7 | D |
| 184 SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd to I-80 | Weave | 5,220 | 105 | 99.4\% | 1,120 | 53 | 101.8\% | 4,511 | 130 | 98.5\% | 61.6 | 0.9 | 24.4 | 0.4 | C |
| 187 SR-65 SB - EB I-80 Connector | Basic | 1,833 | 77 | 103.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52.5 | 0.8 | 25.4 | 1.1 | C |
| 188 SR-65 SB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 3,674 | 106 | 94.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 54.7 | 0.5 | 23.6 | 0.6 | C |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| VISSIM Post-Processor Average Results from 10 Runs Freeway Operations Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SR 65 Widening Design Year - No Build PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
|  | Location | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 1 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 8,054 | 46 | 102.0\% | 995 | 18 | 101.6\% |  |  |  | 61.5 | 1.2 | 29.9 | 0.8 | D |
| 2 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | Basic | 9,038 | 74 | 101.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58.8 | 5.4 | 35.1 | 4.6 | E |
| 3 | 1-80 EB - Douglas Blvd EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 9,021 | 108 | 101.6\% |  |  |  | 1,141 | 76 | 99.2\% | 53.7 | 8.0 | 41.8 | 16.6 | E |
| 4 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,858 | 118 | 101.7\% |  |  |  | 388 | 46 | 97.0\% | 62.3 | 0.6 | 26.1 | 0.7 | C |
| 5 | 1-80 EB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,470 | 120 | 101.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.3 | 4.7 | 27.2 | 3.1 | D |
| 6 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd | Weave | 7,463 | 138 | 101.8\% | 1,722 | 47 | 91.6\% | 1,770 | 88 | 101.2\% | 52.5 | 14.1 | 41.5 | 23.0 | E |
| 7 | I-80 EB CD - Eureka Rd to Taylor Rd/SR-65 | Weave | 1,148 | 61 | 103.4\% | 1,417 | 74 | 93.2\% | 1,424 | 78 | 98.9\% | 19.7 | 15.9 | 87.9 | 29.6 | F |
| 8 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd to SR-65 | Basic | 7,306 | 186 | 97.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40.4 | 18.3 | 65.0 | 33.5 | F |
| 9 | I-80 EB - HOV Connector Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,272 | 197 | 97.5\% |  |  |  | 978 | 52 | 96.8\% | 36.2 | 12.3 | 61.8 | 20.5 | F |
| 10 | I-80 EB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,261 | 220 | 97.1\% |  |  |  | 3,506 | 140 | 97.7\% | 41.3 | 10.5 | 57.8 | 17.6 | F |
| 11 | 1-80 EB - SR-65 Off-ramp to Eureka Rd On-ramp | Basic | 2,724 | 141 | 95.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.2 | 17.0 | 0.7 | B |
| 17 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd On-ramp | Merge | 2,720 | 142 | 95.1\% | 740 | 52 | 98.7\% |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.7 | 15.3 | 0.6 | B |
| 18 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd On-ramp to SR-65 On-ramp | Basic | 3,456 | 145 | 95.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.8 | 0.2 | 17.1 | 0.4 | B |
| 19 | I-80 EB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 3,456 | 148 | 95.7\% | 2,485 | 135 | 95.9\% |  |  |  | 60.1 | 0.8 | 28.2 | 0.8 | D |
| 20 | 1-80 EB - SR-65 to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 5,940 | 198 | 95.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.4 | 26.2 | 0.8 | D |
| 22 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,934 | 199 | 95.7\% |  |  |  | 1,634 | 88 | 96.7\% | 63.2 | 0.1 | 25.2 | 0.7 | C |
| 23 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,290 | 166 | 95.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.2 | 25.0 | 1.0 | C |
| 24 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 4,285 | 175 | 95.0\% | 267 | 26 | 102.5\% |  |  |  | 59.0 | 1.5 | 25.3 | 1.6 | C |
| 25 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd to Sierra College Blvd | Basic | 4,548 | 166 | 95.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.3 | 25.8 | 1.1 | C |
| 26 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,549 | 169 | 95.4\% |  |  |  | 553 | 57 | 86.3\% | 60.2 | 2.1 | 27.6 | 1.9 | C |
| 27 | 1-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,995 | 140 | 96.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.2 | 22.6 | 0.5 | C |
| 28 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 3,993 | 139 | 96.7\% | 325 | 8 | 95.4\% |  |  |  | 59.8 | 1.0 | 21.7 | 1.0 | C |
| 29 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 4,315 | 144 | 96.5\% | 889 | 20 | 102.1\% |  |  |  | 59.2 | 0.7 | 26.8 | 1.0 | C |
| 38 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,075 | 25 | 105.9\% |  |  |  | 764 | 45 | 104.7\% | 59.9 | 0.6 | 22.0 | 0.4 | C |
| 39 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,308 | 55 | 106.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.5 | 20.4 | 0.6 | C |
| 40 | 1-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 3,309 | 58 | 106.1\% | 386 | 10 | 101.6\% |  |  |  | 61.9 | 0.5 | 19.4 | 0.4 | B |
| 41 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 3,697 | 59 | 105.6\% | 385 | 10 | 101.3\% |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.2 | 21.4 | 0.4 | C |
| 42 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 4,079 | 62 | 105.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.2 | 23.7 | 0.6 | C |
| 43 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,079 | 62 | 105.1\% |  |  |  | 312 | 41 | 107.7\% | 62.0 | 0.5 | 24.6 | 0.7 | C |
| 44 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,765 | 81 | 104.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.1 | 22.0 | 0.6 | C |
| 45 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,764 | 85 | 104.8\% | 1,559 | 73 | 103.9\% |  |  |  | 58.4 | 1.4 | 27.6 | 0.8 | C |
| 46 | 1-80 WB - Rocklin Rd to HOV Lane Start | Basic | 5,317 | 123 | 104.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.2 | 0.9 | 30.3 | 0.6 | D |
| 47 | 1-80 WB - HOV Lane Start to SR-65 | Basic | 5,307 | 125 | 104.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.9 | 0.6 | 23.2 | 0.6 | C |
| 48 | I-80 WB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,306 | 123 | 104.2\% |  |  |  | 2,066 | 88 | 102.8\% | 63.7 | 0.2 | 21.3 | 0.5 | C |
| 49 | I-80 WB - SR-65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,240 | 97 | 105.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.8 | 0.1 | 18.4 | 0.6 | C |
| 60 | 1-80 WB - SR-65 to Atlantic St | Weave | 3,242 | 95 | 105.3\% | 4,970 | 100 | 99.2\% | 579 | 45 | 101.5\% | 59.3 | 1.6 | 23.7 | 1.2 | C |
| 62 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,703 | 157 | 102.4\% |  |  |  | 1,094 | 55 | 98.6\% | 59.5 | 4.8 | 29.8 | 6.9 | D |
| 63 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,609 | 140 | 103.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.4 | 25.3 | 0.7 | C |
| 64 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St On-ramp | Merge | 6,610 | 146 | 103.1\% | 1,253 | 54 | 98.6\% |  |  |  | 56.1 | 3.2 | 38.9 | 2.5 | E |
| 65 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,861 | 157 | 102.4\% |  |  |  | 1,177 | 71 | 102.3\% | 60.9 | 0.7 | 31.6 | 0.9 | D |
| 66 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,684 | 140 | 102.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.3 | 26.5 | 0.4 | D |
| 67 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 6,684 | 143 | 102.4\% | 1,197 | 48 | 88.7\% |  |  |  | 57.8 | 2.4 | 28.8 | 1.5 | D |
| 68 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 7,883 | 162 | 100.0\% | 726 | 43 | 99.5\% |  |  |  | 57.9 | 3.9 | 35.7 | 3.0 | E |
| 69 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd to Riverside Ave | Basic | 8,609 | 135 | 100.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.2 | 0.5 | 33.3 | 0.7 | D |
| 70 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,613 | 156 | 100.0\% |  |  |  | 1,260 | 61 | 100.8\% | 61.5 | 1.5 | 34.8 | 1.4 | D |
| 71 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,358 | 138 | 100.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.4 | 27.8 | 0.4 | D |
| 72 | 1-80 WB - Riverside Ave NB On-ramp | Merge | 7,356 | 136 | 99.9\% | 200 | 0 | 100.0\% |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.2 | 31.6 | 0.7 | D |
| 73 | 1-80 WB - Riverside Ave SB On-ramp | Merge | 7,551 | 133 | 99.9\% | 553 | 5 | 98.7\% |  |  |  | 59.2 | 2.2 | 34.4 | 0.8 | D |
| 74 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave to Antelope Rd | Basic | 8,095 | 144 | 99.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.7 | 1.1 | 32.0 | 1.1 | D |
| 75 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,095 | 141 | 99.7\% |  |  |  | 1,168 | 75 | 99.8\% | 62.1 | 0.6 | 32.9 | 0.5 | D |
| 76 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,936 | 141 | 99.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.4 | 26.9 | 0.5 | D |
| 77 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 6,935 | 140 | 99.8\% | 341 | 3 | 97.5\% |  |  |  | 61.1 | 0.7 | 24.8 | 0.5 | C |
| 78 | 1-80 WB - Antelope Rd to Truck Scales | Weave | 7,278 | 139 | 99.7\% | 528 | 16 | 99.5\% | 76 | 14 | 69.1\% | 61.9 | 0.5 | 27.5 | 0.6 | C |
| 79 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,729 | 148 | 100.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.1 | 28.8 | 0.3 | D |
| 80 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales On-ramp | Merge | 7,722 | 148 | 100.0\% | 77 | 18 | 70.0\% |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.3 | 29.0 | 0.5 | D |
| 81 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales to Elkhorn Blvd | Basic | 7,797 | 157 | 99.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.8 | 1.4 | 31.0 | 0.8 | D |
| 82 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,794 | 157 | 99.5\% |  |  |  | 1,220 | 68 | 97.6\% | 61.3 | 0.9 | 28.2 | 0.5 | D |
| 83 | 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,579 | 130 | 100.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.8 | 25.9 | 0.4 | C |
| 84 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 6,580 | 133 | 100.0\% | 898 | 4 | 99.7\% |  |  |  | 56.2 | 1.6 | 28.0 | 1.2 | C |
| 85 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 7,481 | 138 | 100.0\% | 582 | 8 | 100.3\% |  |  |  | 61.6 | 0.5 | 30.0 | 0.5 | D |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| VISSIM Post-Processor Average Results from 10 Runs Freeway Operations Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SR 65 Widening Design Year - No Build PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 100 | SR-65 NB - EB I-80 Connector | Basic | 3,494 | 143 | 97.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.5 | 15.4 | 98.8 | 31.6 | F |
| 101 | SR-65 NB - Eureka Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,481 | 148 | 97.0\% | 1,072 | 87 | 89.4\% |  |  |  | 16.7 | 11.1 | 108.0 | 27.6 | F |
| 102 | SR-65 NB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 2,066 | 90 | 102.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 41.9 | 7.9 | 27.7 | 6.9 | D |
| 103 | SR-65 NB - I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Weave | 4,468 | 236 | 93.3\% | 3,045 | 98 | 100.8\% | 1,572 | 104 | 92.5\% | 24.7 | 8.3 | 78.7 | 13.9 | F |
| 106 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,829 | 146 | 95.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24.1 | 1.9 | 109.9 | 14.1 | F |
| 107 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | 5,826 | 126 | 95.4\% | 960 | 53 | 97.0\% |  |  |  | 30.4 | 1.2 | 66.9 | 1.7 | F |
| 109 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,795 | 91 | 95.7\% |  |  |  | 1,964 | 69 | 96.3\% | 52.6 | 1.2 | 40.5 | 1.1 | E |
| 110 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,830 | 89 | 95.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.4 | 27.3 | 0.6 | D |
| 111 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Weave | 4,830 | 90 | 95.4\% | 588 | 35 | 98.0\% | 1,953 | 69 | 96.7\% | 63.1 | 0.3 | 22.5 | 0.3 | C |
| 114 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,471 | 81 | 95.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.2 | 19.1 | 0.4 | C |
| 115 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 3,472 | 79 | 95.4\% | 428 | 44 | 89.1\% |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.3 | 20.5 | 0.6 | C |
| 116 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | 3,894 | 113 | 94.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.2 | 21.4 | 0.7 | C |
| 118 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,896 | 109 | 94.6\% |  |  |  | 695 | 49 | 97.8\% | 63.6 | 0.1 | 19.5 | 0.6 | B |
| 119 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,202 | 106 | 93.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.2 | 17.3 | 0.5 | B |
| 120 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 3,202 | 109 | 93.9\% | 455 | 37 | 101.2\% |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.4 | 19.0 | 0.6 | B |
| 121 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd to Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Weave | 3,660 | 117 | 94.8\% | 903 | 39 | 107.4\% | 1,058 | 60 | 97.9\% | 63.2 | 0.4 | 19.2 | 0.4 | B |
| 124 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,507 | 97 | 96.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.1 | 18.8 | 0.3 | C |
| 125 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy EB On-ramp | Merge | 3,508 | 101 | 96.9\% | 296 | 22 | 98.5\% |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.3 | 20.4 | 0.5 | C |
| 126 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,803 | 95 | 97.0\% | 516 | 27 | 105.4\% |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.2 | 22.5 | 0.4 | C |
| 127 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr | Basic | 4,317 | 102 | 97.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.2 | 23.5 | 0.4 | C |
| 128 | SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,318 | 106 | 97.9\% |  |  |  | 795 | 55 | 101.9\% | 61.0 | 3.2 | 27.7 | 1.8 | C |
| 129 | SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,519 | 89 | 96.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.2 | 19.5 | 0.5 | C |
| 130 | SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Lincoln Blvd | Weave | 3,515 | 90 | 96.8\% | 1,056 | 50 | 96.0\% | 952 | 75 | 96.2\% | 62.8 | 0.2 | 20.4 | 0.6 | C |
| 133 | SR-65 NB - Lincoln Blvd to Ferrari Ranch Rd | Basic | 3,611 | 127 | 96.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.4 | 26.1 | 0.9 | D |
| 134 | SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,612 | 127 | 96.6\% |  |  |  | 1,812 | 65 | 96.4\% | 63.2 | 0.2 | 21.9 | 0.9 | C |
| 135 | SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,796 | 97 | 96.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.1 | 0.2 | 14.5 | 0.8 | B |
| 136 | SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | 1,799 | 95 | 96.7\% | 212 | 11 | 100.9\% |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.5 | 15.2 | 0.7 | B |
| 150 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,063 | 48 | 99.7\% |  |  |  | 270 | 31 | 100.0\% | 63.6 | 0.5 | 18.5 | 0.3 | B |
| 151 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,793 | 56 | 99.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.3 | 15.8 | 0.4 | B |
| 152 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 1,793 | 52 | 99.6\% | 662 | 17 | 97.4\% |  |  |  | 61.9 | 0.3 | 15.5 | 0.3 | B |
| 153 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | 2,456 | 57 | 99.0\% | 661 | 16 | 98.6\% |  |  |  | 61.5 | 0.2 | 16.1 | 0.3 | B |
| 154 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd to Lincoln Blvd | Basic | 3,117 | 62 | 99.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.1 | 17.9 | 0.4 | B |
| 156 | SR-65 SB - Lincoln Blvd to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | 3,121 | 63 | 99.1\% | 749 | 50 | 101.2\% | 895 | 52 | 100.6\% | 62.5 | 0.4 | 17.0 | 0.5 | B |
| 159 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,973 | 79 | 99.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.8 | 0.1 | 16.4 | 0.4 | B |
| 160 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr On-ramp | Merge | 2,973 | 77 | 99.1\% | 567 | 40 | 96.2\% |  |  |  | 62.3 | 0.3 | 19.0 | 0.5 | B |
| 161 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Placer Pkwy | Basic | 3,544 | 77 | 98.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.1 | 19.3 | 0.4 | C |
| 162 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,546 | 80 | 98.8\% |  |  |  | 1,032 | 54 | 98.3\% | 63.4 | 0.2 | 19.6 | 0.6 | B |
| 163 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,512 | 81 | 98.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.8 | 0.2 | 14.1 | 0.4 | B |
| 164 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy WB On-ramp | Merge | 2,514 | 82 | 99.0\% | 392 | 35 | 103.0\% |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.3 | 17.6 | 0.6 | B |
| 165 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy to Sunset Blvd | Weave | 2,907 | 91 | 99.5\% | 730 | 55 | 100.1\% | 738 | 55 | 97.1\% | 63.2 | 0.2 | 16.6 | 0.4 | B |
| 168 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,903 | 86 | 100.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.2 | 16.1 | 0.4 | B |
| 169 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 2,904 | 88 | 100.5\% | 381 | 25 | 102.9\% |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.2 | 17.7 | 0.5 | B |
| 170 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 3,285 | 85 | 100.8\% | 752 | 29 | 103.1\% |  |  |  | 62.1 | 1.0 | 25.4 | 0.7 | C |
| 171 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Basic | 4,038 | 95 | 101.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 59.2 | 8.5 | 28.5 | 6.6 | D |
| 172 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,038 | 95 | 101.2\% |  |  |  | 706 | 44 | 99.5\% | 58.3 | 13.2 | 30.9 | 17.3 | D |
| 173 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp to Lane Drop | Basic | 3,340 | 101 | 101.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 56.8 | 15.1 | 36.8 | 25.4 | E |
| 174 | SR-65 SB - Lane Drop to Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Basic | 3,344 | 96 | 101.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50.7 | 19.7 | 42.9 | 30.0 | E |
| 175 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,344 | 95 | 102.0\% | 374 | 41 | 95.8\% |  |  |  | 46.4 | 19.2 | 48.2 | 31.2 | F |
| 176 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | 3,726 | 112 | 101.5\% | 1,238 | 83 | 88.4\% | 560 | 53 | 96.6\% | 45.0 | 16.8 | 48.4 | 22.4 | F |
| 178 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,407 | 123 | 98.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45.5 | 16.8 | 55.2 | 20.8 | F |
| 179 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 4,404 | 120 | 98.1\% | 822 | 46 | 100.3\% |  |  |  | 34.9 | 14.2 | 63.4 | 22.6 | F |
| 180 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 5,219 | 116 | 98.3\% | 1,123 | 88 | 94.4\% |  |  |  | 28.0 | 0.8 | 89.4 | 4.8 | F |
| 181 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | 6,334 | 90 | 97.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 57.5 | 0.9 | 36.5 | 0.7 | E |
| 182 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,334 | 90 | 97.4\% |  |  |  | 1,190 | 73 | 97.5\% | 60.9 | 0.6 | 34.2 | 0.5 | D |
| 183 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,142 | 109 | 97.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.2 | 29.1 | 0.7 | D |
| 184 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd to l-80 | Weave | 5,144 | 106 | 97.4\% | 1,655 | 41 | 103.5\% | 4,339 | 116 | 101.1\% | 59.9 | 2.8 | 26.0 | 2.2 | C |
| 187 | SR-65 SB - EB I-80 Connector | Basic | 2,479 | 117 | 95.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 47.4 | 10.7 | 37.1 | 22.0 | E |
| 188 | SR-65 SB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 3,695 | 103 | 98.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 54.6 | 0.3 | 23.5 | 0.6 | C |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 1 | Lincoln Blvd/Sterling Pkwy |  | Signal | 3,025 | 3,330 | 110.1\% | 15.3 | 1.0 | B |
| 2 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 2,280 | 2,494 | 109.4\% | 16.2 | 1.0 | B |
| 3 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 2,425 | 2,592 | 106.9\% | 28.7 | 6.2 | C |
| 4 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 3,035 | 3,245 | 106.9\% | 16.5 | 5.4 | B |
| 5 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 3,530 | 3,792 | 107.4\% | 13.6 | 5.3 | B |
| 6 | SR-65 SB Ramps-Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 5,325 | 5,504 | 103.4\% | 89.5 | 14.6 | F |
| 7 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 3,300 | 3,471 | 105.2\% | 16.5 | 25.9 | B |
| 8 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 4,760 | 4,835 | 101.6\% | 16.9 | 8.7 | B |
| 9 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 3,955 | 4,041 | 102.2\% | 14.4 | 0.6 | B |
| 10 | Stanford Ranch Rd/Five Star Blvd | Signal | 3,735 | 3,903 | 104.5\% | 26.3 | 2.2 | C |
| 11 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Stanford Ranch Rd | Signal | 3,950 | 4,102 | 103.9\% | 18.6 | 8.8 | B |
| 12 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd | Signal | 3,800 | 3,806 | 100.2\% | 54.6 | 14.5 | D |
| 13 | Galleria Blvd/Antelope Creek Dr | Signal | 2,405 | 2,416 | 100.4\% | 8.4 | 1.1 | A |
| 14 | Galleria Blvd/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 5,321 | 5,631 | 105.8\% | 40.7 | 1.5 | D |
| 15 | Creekside Ridge Dr/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 3,465 | 3,637 | 105.0\% | 7.6 | 2.1 | A |
| 16 | Taylor Rd/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,945 | 5,266 | 106.5\% | 60.4 | 15.3 | E |
| 17 | North Sunrise Ave/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,865 | 5,182 | 106.5\% | 33.1 | 3.6 | C |
| 18 | Wills Rd/Atlantic St | Signal | 2,265 | 2,454 | 108.3\% | 18.8 | 4.6 | B |
| 19 | I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St | Signal | 3,805 | 4,009 | 105.4\% | 30.2 | 12.7 | C |
| 20 | Taylor Rd-I-80 EB Ramps/Eureka Rd | Signal | 5,440 | 5,669 | 104.2\% | 30.0 | 3.2 | C |
| 21 | North Sunrise Ave/Eureka Rd | Signal | 5,145 | 5,382 | 104.6\% | 40.7 | 4.6 | D |
| 22 | Harding Blvd/Wills Rd | Signal | 2,120 | 2,240 | 105.7\% | 14.5 | 2.2 | B |
| 23 | Harding Blvd/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 2,720 | 2,970 | 109.2\% | 25.6 | 4.1 | C |
| 24 | I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 3,880 | 4,128 | 106.4\% | 22.4 | 7.1 | C |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 89,496 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 94,098 |
| Percent Served | $105.1 \%$ |

Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 25 | I-80 EB Ramps/Douglas Blvd |  | Signal | 4,235 | 4,527 | 106.9\% | 28.5 | 10.0 | C |
| 26 | North Sunrise Ave/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 4,585 | 4,839 | 105.5\% | 43.0 | 9.8 | D |
| 27 | Pacific St/Woodside Dr | Signal | 2,300 | 2,548 | 110.8\% | 7.6 | 0.4 | A |
| 28 | Pacific St/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 3,580 | 3,968 | 110.8\% | 28.8 | 1.3 | C |
| 29 | Granite Dr/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,006 | 3,139 | 104.4\% | 26.1 | 1.7 | C |
| 30 | I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,105 | 3,247 | 104.6\% | 22.2 | 2.2 | C |
| 31 | I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,255 | 3,511 | 107.9\% | 40.7 | 11.4 | D |
| 32 | Aguilar Rd/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,310 | 2,516 | 108.9\% | 9.2 | 0.9 | A |
| 33 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 NB Off-Ramp | Signal | 2,720 | 3,006 | 110.5\% | 9.5 | 0.8 | A |
| 34 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 SB On-Ramp | Signal | 2,000 | 2,180 | 109.0\% | 17.4 | 3.3 | B |
| 35 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy | Signal | 3,800 | 4,114 | 108.3\% | 18.8 | 3.8 | B |
| 36 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Signal | 3,545 | 3,714 | 104.8\% | 13.5 | 4.4 | B |
| 40 | Galleria Blvd/Berry St | Signal | 2,005 | 2,124 | 105.9\% | 9.9 | 1.3 | A |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 40,446 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 43,432 |
| Percent Served | $107.4 \%$ |

Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.

[^11]| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 1 | Lincoln Blvd/Sterling Pkwy |  | Signal | 3,460 | 3,417 | 98.8\% | 20.4 | 0.8 | C |
| 2 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 2,305 | 2,302 | 99.9\% | 15.6 | 1.2 | B |
| 3 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 2,540 | 2,512 | 98.9\% | 21.6 | 1.7 | C |
| 4 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 4,105 | 4,193 | 102.1\% | 16.6 | 7.6 | B |
| 5 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 4,210 | 4,340 | 103.1\% | 13.9 | 1.3 | B |
| 6 | SR-65 SB Ramps-Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 7,075 | 6,500 | 91.9\% | 213.8 | 16.4 | F |
| 7 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 4,100 | 3,853 | 94.0\% | 94.3 | 48.8 | F |
| 8 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 6,340 | 6,222 | 98.1\% | 29.5 | 28.0 | C |
| 9 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 5,905 | 5,798 | 98.2\% | 12.9 | 0.8 | B |
| 10 | Stanford Ranch Rd/Five Star Blvd | Signal | 5,405 | 5,351 | 99.0\% | 85.0 | 18.7 | F |
| 11 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Stanford Ranch Rd | Signal | 6,115 | 6,022 | 98.5\% | 20.6 | 2.6 | C |
| 12 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd | Signal | 5,930 | 5,924 | 99.9\% | 27.4 | 10.8 | C |
| 13 | Galleria Blvd/Antelope Creek Dr | Signal | 4,150 | 4,104 | 98.9\% | 27.9 | 2.4 | C |
| 14 | Galleria Blvd/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 8,080 | 7,658 | 94.8\% | 92.5 | 21.0 | F |
| 15 | Creekside Ridge Dr/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,685 | 4,388 | 93.7\% | 50.2 | 16.7 | D |
| 16 | Taylor Rd/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 6,855 | 6,554 | 95.6\% | 55.4 | 7.1 | E |
| 17 | North Sunrise Ave/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 6,345 | 6,369 | 100.4\% | 88.5 | 57.8 | F |
| 18 | Wills Rd/Atlantic St | Signal | 3,385 | 3,450 | 101.9\% | 30.4 | 8.5 | C |
| 19 | I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St | Signal | 4,900 | 4,909 | 100.2\% | 21.5 | 14.2 | C |
| 20 | Taylor Rd-I-80 EB Ramps/Eureka Rd | Signal | 6,575 | 6,473 | 98.5\% | 99.3 | 15.0 | F |
| 21 | North Sunrise Ave/Eureka Rd | Signal | 6,645 | 6,762 | 101.8\% | 104.2 | 22.9 | F |
| 22 | Harding Blvd/Wills Rd | Signal | 3,025 | 3,095 | 102.3\% | 18.5 | 2.2 | B |
| 23 | Harding Blvd/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 3,870 | 3,825 | 98.8\% | 68.9 | 7.9 | E |
| 24 | I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 4,675 | 4,525 | 96.8\% | 20.1 | 4.0 | C |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 120,680 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 118,547 |
| Percent Served | $98.2 \%$ |

Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 25 | I-80 EB Ramps/Douglas Blvd |  | Signal | 5,500 | 5,166 | 93.9\% | 39.0 | 26.0 | D |
| 26 | North Sunrise Ave/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 6,325 | 5,816 | 92.0\% | 238.5 | 8.7 | F |
| 27 | Pacific St/Woodside Dr | Signal | 3,510 | 3,526 | 100.5\% | 10.0 | 0.8 | A |
| 28 | Pacific St/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 5,485 | 5,516 | 100.6\% | 37.4 | 3.7 | D |
| 29 | Granite Dr/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 4,190 | 4,321 | 103.1\% | 101.4 | 9.3 | F |
| 30 | I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,955 | 4,061 | 102.7\% | 53.9 | 19.7 | D |
| 31 | I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,885 | 3,923 | 101.0\% | 21.4 | 3.9 | C |
| 32 | Aguilar Rd/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,025 | 3,075 | 101.6\% | 27.6 | 6.4 | C |
| 33 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 NB Off-Ramp | Signal | 2,930 | 2,894 | 98.8\% | 7.8 | 1.0 | A |
| 34 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 SB On-Ramp | Signal | 1,940 | 1,949 | 100.5\% | 14.8 | 1.6 | B |
| 35 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy | Signal | 4,765 | 4,830 | 101.4\% | 24.4 | 2.6 | C |
| 36 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Signal | 4,270 | 4,277 | 100.2\% | 23.7 | 5.2 | C |
| 40 | Galleria Blvd/Berry St | Signal | 2,960 | 3,009 | 101.6\% | 10.8 | 1.2 | B |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 52,740 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 52,364 |
| Percent Served | $99.3 \%$ |

[^12]
# SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements 

## Vissim Model Results - Construction Year Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane)

VISSIM Post-Processor
SR 65 Widening
Average Values from 10 Runs Construction Year - HOV Lane Alternative Network Statistics AM Peak Period

| Network Performance | Vehicle Types | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Vehicles Served | All Vehicles | 167,492 | 95 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | All Vehicles | 799,522 | 1,334 |
| Travel Time [h] | All Vehicles | 18,061 | 156.4 |
| Average Speed [mph] | All Vehicles | 44.3 | 0.4 |
| Total Delay [h] | All Vehicles | 4,351 | 150.8 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | All Vehicles | 91 | 3.1 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | All Vehicles | 0.33 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | HOV | 32,238 | 42 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | HOV | 164,736 | 723 |
| Travel Time [h] | HOV | 3,525 | 28 |
| Average Speed [mph] | HOV | 46.7 | 0.4 |
| Total Delay [h] | HOV | 727 | 26 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | HOV | 79 | 3 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | HOV | 0.26 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | Truck | 7,508 | 15 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | Truck | 38,847 | 354 |
| Travel Time [h] | Truck | 902 | 9 |
| Average Speed [mph] | Truck | 43.1 | 1 |
| Total Delay [h] | Truck | 231 | 10 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | Truck | 108 | 5 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | Truck | 0.36 | 0.02 |


| Performance Measure | Vehicle Types |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HOV | Truck | All |
|  | 32,240 | 7,510 | 167,490 |
| Percent Demand Served | 33,420 | 8,100 | 169,440 |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel | $96.5 \%$ | $92.7 \%$ | $98.8 \%$ |
| Person Miles of Travel | 164,740 | 38,850 | 799,520 |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel | 345,950 | 40,790 | 982,670 |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay | 730 | 900 | 18,060 |
| VHD \% of VHT | $20.7 \%$ | 230 | 4,350 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.36 | $25.6 \%$ | $24.1 \%$ |
| Person Hours of Delay | 1,530 | 1.84 | 1.56 |
| Average Travel Speed | 46.7 | 240 | 5,160 |

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Peak Hour Travel Time


VISSIM Post-Processor
SR 65 Widening
Average Values from 10 Runs
Network Statistics

| Network Performance | Vehicle Types | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Vehicles Served | All Vehicles | 231,395 | 372 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | All Vehicles | 924,671 | 1,366 |
| Travel Time [h] | All Vehicles | 27,208 | 152.8 |
| Average Speed [mph] | All Vehicles | 34.0 | 0.2 |
| Total Delay [h] | All Vehicles | 10,937 | 160.1 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | All Vehicles | 166 | 2.6 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | All Vehicles | 0.71 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | HOV | 45,782 | 104 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | HOV | 199,634 | 531 |
| Travel Time [h] | HOV | 5,111 | 24 |
| Average Speed [mph] | HOV | 39.1 | 0.2 |
| Total Delay [h] | HOV | 1,642 | 25 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | HOV | 127 | 2 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | HOV | 0.49 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | Truck | 8,906 | 20 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | Truck | 36,993 | 431 |
| Travel Time [h] | Truck | 1,196 | 23 |
| Average Speed [mph] | Truck | 30.9 | 0 |
| Total Delay [h] | Truck | 539 | 17 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | Truck | 212 | 6 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | Truck | 0.87 | 0.02 |


| Performance Measure | Vehicle Types |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HOV | Truck | All |
|  | 45,780 | 8,910 | 231,400 |
| Demand Volume | 46,980 | 9,680 | 233,230 |
| Percent Demand Served | $97.4 \%$ | $92.0 \%$ | $99.2 \%$ |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel | 199,630 | 36,990 | 924,670 |
| Person Miles of Travel | 419,230 | 38,840 | $1,146,120$ |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel | 5,110 | 1,200 | 27,210 |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay | 1,640 | 540 | 10,940 |
| VHD \% of VHT | $32.1 \%$ | $45.0 \%$ | $40.2 \%$ |
| Average Delay per Vehicle $(\mathrm{min})$ | 2.15 | 3.64 | 2.84 |
| Person Hours of Delay | 3,440 | 570 | 12,770 |
| Average Travel Speed | 39.1 | 30.9 | 34.0 |

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Peak Hour Travel Time


| Location |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 1 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 7,230 | 34 | 110.2\% | 1,023 | 17 | 110.0\% |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.4 | 28.6 | 0.2 | D |
| 2 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | Basic | 8,244 | 48 | 110.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 59.5 | 1.8 | 34.3 | 1.2 | D |
| 3 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd Slip Off | Diverge | 8,238 | 66 | 110.0\% |  |  |  | 1,401 | 74 | 107.8\% | 59.8 | 2.6 | 29.9 | 1.7 | D |
| 4 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,828 | 162 | 110.3\% |  |  |  | 502 | 45 | 106.8\% | 62.2 | 1.0 | 23.3 | 1.2 | C |
| 5 | 1-80 EB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,324 | 158 | 110.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.2 | 24.8 | 0.8 | C |
| 6 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 6,323 | 149 | 110.5\% | 849 | 21 | 93.3\% |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.8 | 28.2 | 1.2 | D |
| 7 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,173 | 135 | 108.2\% |  |  |  | 1,359 | 63 | 107.0\% | 60.8 | 2.3 | 30.2 | 2.7 | D |
| 8 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,809 | 130 | 108.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.5 | 24.7 | 0.5 | C |
| 9 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | 5,809 | 135 | 108.4\% | 186 | 9 | 97.7\% |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.1 | 22.9 | 0.7 | C |
| 10 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd to Taylor Rd | Weave | 5,998 | 141 | 108.1\% | 444 | 38 | 103.3\% | 377 | 34 | 107.6\% | 62.5 | 0.3 | 25.1 | 0.5 | C |
| 11 | I-80 EB -Taylor Rd to SR 65 | Basic | 6,066 | 143 | 107.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 59.5 | 2.3 | 31.3 | 1.6 | D |
| 17 | I-80 EB - SR 65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,068 | 139 | 107.8\% |  |  |  | 3,214 | 117 | 108.2\% | 59.0 | 5.1 | 33.2 | 5.5 | D |
| 18 | 1-80 EB - SR 65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,854 | 79 | 107.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.1 | 15.7 | 0.4 | B |
| 19 | I-80 EB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 2,854 | 84 | 107.3\% | 1,561 | 82 | 108.4\% |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.2 | 22.9 | 1.0 | C |
| 21 | 1-80 EB - SR-65 to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 4,417 | 117 | 107.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.1 | 21.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 22 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,422 | 119 | 107.8\% |  |  |  | 1,490 | 82 | 104.9\% | 63.5 | 0.2 | 21.0 | 0.4 | C |
| 23 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,934 | 96 | 109.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.1 | 18.2 | 0.7 | C |
| 24 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 2,935 | 102 | 109.5\% | 180 | 7 | 94.8\% |  |  |  | 61.7 | 0.7 | 18.4 | 0.7 | B |
| 25 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd to Sierra College Blvd | Basic | 3,119 | 105 | 108.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.2 | 19.0 | 0.7 | C |
| 26 | 1-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,118 | 111 | 108.7\% |  |  |  | 413 | 39 | 105.8\% | 63.1 | 0.2 | 20.1 | 0.8 | C |
| 27 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,709 | 102 | 109.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.1 | 17.3 | 0.7 | B |
| 28 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 2,712 | 104 | 109.3\% | 131 | 4 | 101.1\% |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.2 | 16.3 | 0.6 | B |
| 29 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 2,848 | 105 | 109.1\% | 417 | 11 | 109.7\% |  |  |  | 62.3 | 0.6 | 18.0 | 0.6 | B |
| 38 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,879 | 23 | 105.8\% |  |  |  | 850 | 49 | 106.2\% | 57.2 | 1.1 | 27.8 | 0.4 | C |
| 39 | 1-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,030 | 66 | 105.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.4 | 24.8 | 0.3 | C |
| 40 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 4,032 | 68 | 105.8\% | 51 | 4 | 84.7\% |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.3 | 22.1 | 0.5 | C |
| 41 | 1-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 4,079 | 72 | 105.4\% | 310 | 11 | 103.4\% |  |  |  | 61.5 | 0.6 | 23.6 | 0.4 | C |
| 42 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 4,389 | 77 | 105.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.3 | 0.3 | 26.6 | 0.4 | D |
| 43 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,387 | 80 | 105.2\% |  |  |  | 227 | 26 | 103.4\% | 61.0 | 0.7 | 27.5 | 0.5 | C |
| 44 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,159 | 89 | 105.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.2 | 24.9 | 0.5 | C |
| 45 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 4,158 | 89 | 105.3\% | 903 | 54 | 101.4\% |  |  |  | 60.7 | 0.6 | 26.6 | 0.7 | C |
| 46 | 1-80 WB - Rocklin Rd to HOV Lane Start | Basic | 5,054 | 120 | 104.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.3 | 0.3 | 28.7 | 0.6 | D |
| 47 | 1-80 WB - HOV Lane Start to SR-65 | Basic | 5,054 | 129 | 104.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.2 | 24.1 | 0.5 | C |
| 48 | 1-80 WB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,052 | 131 | 104.4\% |  |  |  | 1,466 | 55 | 106.2\% | 63.5 | 0.2 | 22.0 | 0.5 | C |
| 49 | I-80 WB - SR-65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,582 | 123 | 103.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.1 | 19.6 | 0.4 | C |
| 50 | 1-80 WB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 3,582 | 121 | 103.5\% | 3,902 | 100 | 104.6\% |  |  |  | 60.5 | 0.7 | 30.0 | 1.0 | D |
| 60 | I-80 WB - Taylor Rd On-ramp | Merge | 7,481 | 157 | 104.1\% | 626 | 35 | 111.8\% |  |  |  | 54.3 | 4.6 | 38.3 | 3.6 | E |
| 61 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,106 | 157 | 104.6\% |  |  |  | 343 | 33 | 104.0\% | 59.2 | 1.6 | 35.7 | 1.7 | E |
| 62 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,761 | 144 | 104.6\% |  |  |  | 997 | 54 | 102.8\% | 61.6 | 0.7 | 34.9 | 0.6 | D |
| 63 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,763 | 131 | 104.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.2 | 26.9 | 0.6 | D |
| 64 | 1-80 WB - Atlantic St On-ramp | Merge | 6,759 | 137 | 104.8\% | 1,182 | 66 | 107.5\% |  |  |  | 57.3 | 4.1 | 37.0 | 2.9 | E |
| 65 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,936 | 143 | 105.1\% |  |  |  | 956 | 46 | 101.7\% | 60.0 | 0.6 | 32.9 | 0.8 | D |
| 66 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,976 | 140 | 105.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.2 | 28.3 | 0.4 | D |
| 67 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 6,975 | 142 | 105.5\% | 1,020 | 44 | 107.4\% |  |  |  | 58.7 | 1.2 | 30.8 | 1.1 | D |
| 68 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Slip On | Merge | 7,995 | 155 | 105.8\% | 453 | 32 | 105.4\% |  |  |  | 58.3 | 5.0 | 35.4 | 4.4 | E |
| 69 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd to Riverside Ave | Basic | 8,452 | 150 | 105.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.3 | 33.9 | 0.5 | D |
| 70 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,457 | 144 | 105.8\% |  |  |  | 902 | 55 | 99.2\% | 62.4 | 0.1 | 33.6 | 0.6 | D |
| 71 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,559 | 151 | 106.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.1 | 30.1 | 0.6 | D |
| 72 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave NB On-ramp | Merge | 7,559 | 151 | 106.8\% | 285 | 6 | 83.8\% |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.1 | 28.2 | 0.8 | D |
| 73 | 1-80 WB - Riverside Ave SB On-ramp | Merge | 7,840 | 155 | 105.7\% | 823 | 14 | 100.3\% |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.2 | 34.5 | 0.9 | D |
| 74 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave to Antelope Rd | Basic | 8,660 | 152 | 105.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52.6 | 11.0 | 40.8 | 10.8 | E |
| 75 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,663 | 185 | 105.1\% |  |  |  | 345 | 27 | 90.7\% | 43.8 | 12.9 | 53.3 | 16.1 | F |
| 76 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 8,335 | 216 | 106.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40.8 | 15.2 | 62.1 | 24.8 | F |
| 77 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 8,338 | 228 | 106.1\% | 566 | 12 | 97.6\% |  |  |  | 31.9 | 10.8 | 80.1 | 21.8 | F |
| 78 | 1-80 WB - Antelope Rd to Truck Scales | Weave | 8,919 | 241 | 105.7\% | 444 | 14 | 96.6\% | 91 | 18 | 82.8\% | 33.0 | 7.3 | 70.4 | 11.5 | F |
| 79 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales Off to On-ramp | Basic | 9,367 | 228 | 106.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30.6 | 2.2 | 81.8 | 6.3 | F |
| 80 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales On-ramp | Merge | 9,404 | 231 | 107.0\% | 91 | 17 | 82.5\% |  |  |  | 29.2 | 1.8 | 91.6 | 5.9 | F |
| 81 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales to Elkhorn Blvd | Basic | 9,569 | 220 | 107.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 34.4 | 4.3 | 68.4 | 7.7 | F |
| 82 | 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 9,578 | 213 | 107.6\% |  |  |  | 809 | 61 | 109.4\% | 36.8 | 9.0 | 55.2 | 10.8 | F |
| 83 | 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 8,806 | 131 | 107.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 28.1 | 5.2 | 87.8 | 13.9 | F |
| 84 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 8,822 | 119 | 108.1\% | 803 | 10 | 95.6\% |  |  |  | 26.7 | 1.0 | 95.5 | 5.0 | F |
| 85 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 9,637 | 109 | 107.1\% | 882 | 25 | 95.8\% |  |  |  | 32.7 | 0.4 | 76.9 | 1.0 | F |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Results from 10 Runs
Freeway Operations Summary

| Location |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 100 | SR-65 NB - EB l-80 Connector | Basic | 3,216 | 117 | 108.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 41.5 | 1.7 | 45.4 | 4.0 | F |
| 101 | SR-65 NB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 1,465 | 55 | 106.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51.4 | 0.3 | 23.4 | 0.7 | C |
| 103 | SR-65 NB - I-80 WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,215 | 106 | 108.2\% | 1,466 | 55 | 106.2\% |  |  |  | 61.1 | 0.6 | 28.3 | 1.1 | D |
| 104 | SR-65 NB - I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Basic | 4,682 | 133 | 107.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.2 | 27.1 | 0.9 | D |
| 105 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,682 | 133 | 107.6\% |  |  |  | 694 | 53 | 103.6\% | 62.9 | 0.2 | 25.2 | 0.8 | C |
| 106 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,987 | 113 | 108.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.2 | 23.3 | 0.7 | C |
| 107 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | 3,986 | 119 | 108.3\% | 903 | 52 | 108.8\% | 651 | 46 | 101.6\% | 62.4 | 0.3 | 23.9 | 0.6 | C |
| 110 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,240 | 131 | 109.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.2 | 25.0 | 0.7 | C |
| 111 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 4,239 | 126 | 109.5\% | 230 | 24 | 100.0\% |  |  |  | 60.5 | 0.6 | 33.1 | 1.1 | D |
| 112 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,470 | 115 | 109.0\% |  |  |  | 1,969 | 93 | 109.4\% | 62.2 | 0.4 | 27.0 | 0.6 | C |
| 114 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,502 | 72 | 108.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.2 | 22.0 | 0.6 | C |
| 115 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 2,504 | 71 | 108.9\% | 522 | 35 | 100.4\% |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.2 | 19.0 | 0.4 | B |
| 116 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | 3,029 | 82 | 107.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.2 | 18.9 | 0.3 | C |
| 118 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,029 | 78 | 107.4\% |  |  |  | 1,316 | 55 | 107.9\% | 63.6 | 0.1 | 18.3 | 0.5 | B |
| 119 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,712 | 66 | 107.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.2 | 14.9 | 0.6 | B |
| 120 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 1,711 | 66 | 106.9\% | 54 | 12 | 107.4\% |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.4 | 15.0 | 0.6 | B |
| 121 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd to Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Weave | 1,765 | 67 | 107.0\% | 161 | 16 | 107.1\% | 354 | 37 | 98.4\% | 63.5 | 0.2 | 14.3 | 0.4 | B |
| 124 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,576 | 55 | 109.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.2 | 13.9 | 0.3 | B |
| 125 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy EB On-ramp | Merge | 1,576 | 56 | 109.5\% | 185 | 15 | 97.2\% |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.2 | 14.3 | 0.4 | B |
| 126 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | 1,763 | 63 | 108.1\% | 212 | 12 | 106.1\% | 412 | 37 | 95.8\% | 63.7 | 0.3 | 13.0 | 0.3 | B |
| 129 | SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,563 | 73 | 111.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.8 | 0.2 | 14.4 | 0.6 | B |
| 130 | SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Lincoln Blvd | Weave | 1,564 | 70 | 111.7\% | 266 | 29 | 106.3\% | 646 | 60 | 113.4\% | 63.8 | 0.2 | 13.0 | 0.5 | B |
| 133 | SR-65 NB - Lincoln Blvd to Ferrari Ranch Rd | Basic | 1,184 | 56 | 109.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.1 | 0.2 | 12.8 | 0.4 | B |
| 134 | SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 1,183 | 56 | 109.6\% |  |  |  | 702 | 52 | 107.9\% | 64.4 | 0.2 | 10.4 | 0.3 | B |
| 135 | SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 482 | 42 | 112.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.6 | 0.3 | 4.7 | 0.5 | A |
| 136 | SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | 483 | 44 | 112.2\% | 114 | 8 | 103.6\% |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.3 | 5.3 | 0.5 | A |
| 150 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 1,050 | 31 | 114.1\% |  |  |  | 74 | 16 | 105.7\% | 64.3 | 0.1 | 11.3 | 0.3 | B |
| 151 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 975 | 33 | 114.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.2 | 0.1 | 10.5 | 0.3 | A |
| 152 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 975 | 34 | 114.8\% | 899 | 18 | 108.3\% |  |  |  | 60.4 | 0.2 | 14.0 | 0.3 | B |
| 153 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | 1,874 | 40 | 111.6\% | 708 | 24 | 93.1\% |  |  |  | 60.2 | 0.4 | 18.9 | 0.6 | B |
| 154 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd to Lane Drop | Basic | 2,583 | 48 | 105.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.6 | 26.7 | 0.5 | D |
| 155 | SR-65 SB - Lane Drop to Lincoln Blvd | Basic | 2,582 | 48 | 105.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.3 | 26.7 | 0.5 | D |
| 156 | SR-65 SB - Lincoln Blvd to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | 2,582 | 51 | 105.8\% | 900 | 48 | 105.9\% | 326 | 36 | 108.6\% | 59.9 | 0.5 | 26.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 159 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,159 | 71 | 105.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.7 | 0.5 | 30.2 | 0.8 | D |
| 160 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Placer Pkwy | Weave | 3,158 | 68 | 105.6\% | 859 | 30 | 113.1\% | 445 | 46 | 111.2\% | 61.1 | 0.2 | 27.8 | 0.6 | C |
| 163 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,562 | 72 | 106.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.3 | 31.7 | 0.7 | D |
| 164 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,560 | 70 | 106.3\% | 287 | 26 | 106.3\% |  |  |  | 58.2 | 5.3 | 33.5 | 3.6 | D |
| 165 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy to Sunset Blvd | Weave | 3,849 | 71 | 106.3\% | 236 | 23 | 112.2\% | 479 | 38 | 104.1\% | 51.5 | 8.3 | 40.1 | 9.4 | E |
| 168 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,610 | 64 | 107.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31.6 | 16.3 | 71.1 | 23.6 | F |
| 169 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,609 | 71 | 107.1\% | 612 | 29 | 111.2\% |  |  |  | 32.4 | 11.2 | 67.8 | 16.3 | F |
| 170 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Weave | 4,220 | 64 | 107.6\% | 453 | 15 | 100.6\% | 904 | 49 | 106.3\% | 59.8 | 0.4 | 31.3 | 0.8 | D |
| 172 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to HOV Lane Start | Basic | 3,764 | 87 | 106.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.1 | 32.3 | 0.7 | D |
| 173 | SR-65 SB - HOV Lane Start to Blue Oaks Blvd On | Basic | 3,763 | 86 | 106.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.9 | 0.4 | 31.7 | 0.7 | D |
| 174 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,762 | 87 | 106.9\% | 555 | 31 | 106.7\% |  |  |  | 56.1 | 2.2 | 34.8 | 1.7 | D |
| 175 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB to EB On-ramp | Basic | 4,318 | 86 | 106.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.7 | 1.0 | 34.2 | 1.1 | D |
| 176 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 4,318 | 88 | 106.9\% | 1,157 | 50 | 101.5\% |  |  |  | 60.8 | 0.6 | 30.1 | 0.8 | D |
| 177 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,476 | 99 | 105.7\% |  |  |  | 705 | 58 | 106.8\% | 61.9 | 1.6 | 27.9 | 1.1 | C |
| 178 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,770 | 87 | 105.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.5 | 25.4 | 0.4 | C |
| 179 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 4,768 | 92 | 105.5\% | 441 | 35 | 102.5\% |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.3 | 24.6 | 0.5 | C |
| 180 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 5,209 | 102 | 105.2\% | 615 | 44 | 102.4\% |  |  |  | 60.5 | 1.0 | 17.2 | 0.6 | B |
| 181 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | 5,821 | 119 | 104.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58.6 | 1.7 | 29.5 | 1.0 | D |
| 182 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,822 | 119 | 104.9\% |  |  |  | 1,151 | 61 | 101.0\% | 62.0 | 0.9 | 24.9 | 0.6 | C |
| 183 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off-ramp to Lane Drop | Basic | 4,674 | 133 | 106.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58.0 | 9.4 | 31.9 | 7.5 | D |
| 184 | SR-65 SB - Lane Drop to Galleria Blvd On-ramp | Basic | 4,680 | 132 | 106.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52.9 | 13.4 | 37.7 | 15.5 | E |
| 185 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 4,683 | 129 | 106.2\% | 773 | 33 | 101.7\% |  |  |  | 44.5 | 10.9 | 54.1 | 16.9 | F |
| 186 | SR-65 SB - I-80 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,457 | 142 | 105.6\% |  |  |  | 3,902 | 106 | 104.6\% | 59.0 | 1.6 | 33.3 | 1.4 | D |
| 187 | SR-65 SB - EB l-80 Connector (2 lanes) | Basic | 1,558 | 84 | 108.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 59.5 | 1.8 | 30.1 | 2.2 | D |
| 188 | SR-65 SB - EB I-80 Connector (1 lane) | Basic | 1,559 | 83 | 108.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.4 | 0.5 | 29.3 | 1.7 | D |
| 189 | SR-65 SB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 3,905 | 102 | 104.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51.5 | 0.4 | 40.6 | 1.3 | E |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane,
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| Location |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 1 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 7,162 | 306 | 96.7\% | 896 | 55 | 92.3\% |  |  |  | 23.4 | 0.6 | 126.1 | 6.3 | F |
| 2 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | Basic | 7,790 | 398 | 93.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23.2 | 1.5 | 108.0 | 5.1 | F |
| 3 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd Slip Off | Diverge | 7,695 | 511 | 91.8\% |  |  |  | 1,030 | 136 | 88.8\% | 25.9 | 2.2 | 91.8 | 10.1 | F |
| 4 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,578 | 406 | 91.1\% |  |  |  | 602 | 86 | 86.0\% | 22.9 | 0.6 | 145.5 | 10.9 | F |
| 5 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,898 | 326 | 90.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22.1 | 1.5 | 133.3 | 6.4 | F |
| 6 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 5,867 | 328 | 90.0\% | 1,121 | 106 | 84.3\% |  |  |  | 14.8 | 1.2 | 138.2 | 5.3 | F |
| 7 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,970 | 405 | 88.8\% |  |  |  | 860 | 96 | 81.9\% | 19.2 | 1.4 | 117.6 | 8.3 | F |
| 8 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,102 | 318 | 89.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21.0 | 0.8 | 129.3 | 4.6 | F |
| 9 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | 6,102 | 345 | 89.7\% | 329 | 21 | 102.8\% |  |  |  | 17.0 | 1.1 | 136.3 | 3.9 | F |
| 10 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd to Taylor Rd | Weave | 6,435 | 392 | 90.4\% | 1,126 | 58 | 99.7\% | 489 | 61 | 85.8\% | 18.5 | 0.6 | 124.1 | 3.2 | F |
| 11 | I-80 EB -Taylor Rd to SR 65 | Basic | 7,061 | 326 | 91.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19.7 | 1.2 | 112.4 | 4.8 | F |
| 17 | I-80 EB - SR 65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,051 | 323 | 91.8\% |  |  |  | 3,856 | 119 | 93.6\% | 24.2 | 2.0 | 91.4 | 6.7 | F |
| 18 | 1-80 EB - SR 65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,190 | 203 | 89.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.4 | 17.7 | 1.6 | B |
| 19 | I-80 EB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 3,193 | 204 | 89.7\% | 1,894 | 86 | 97.6\% |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.2 | 22.5 | 0.9 | C |
| 21 | I-80 EB - SR-65 to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 5,086 | 222 | 92.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.3 | 22.4 | 1.0 | C |
| 22 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,080 | 229 | 92.4\% |  |  |  | 1,614 | 96 | 94.4\% | 62.0 | 4.2 | 23.3 | 4.1 | C |
| 23 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,463 | 179 | 91.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.9 | 19.4 | 1.3 | C |
| 24 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,464 | 182 | 91.4\% | 273 | 28 | 104.8\% |  |  |  | 60.8 | 0.5 | 19.5 | 0.9 | B |
| 25 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd to Sierra College Blvd | Basic | 3,735 | 173 | 92.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.2 | 20.4 | 1.0 | C |
| 26 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,732 | 173 | 92.1\% |  |  |  | 271 | 27 | 84.8\% | 62.6 | 0.8 | 21.7 | 1.2 | C |
| 27 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,457 | 145 | 92.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.2 | 19.6 | 1.0 | C |
| 28 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 3,455 | 138 | 92.6\% | 236 | 3 | 94.4\% |  |  |  | 61.6 | 0.4 | 18.7 | 0.8 | B |
| 29 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 3,689 | 146 | 92.7\% | 608 | 13 | 101.4\% |  |  |  | 60.8 | 0.7 | 22.1 | 1.0 | C |
| 38 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,662 | 20 | 105.8\% |  |  |  | 583 | 40 | 104.1\% | 60.9 | 0.4 | 19.3 | 0.2 | B |
| 39 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,078 | 50 | 106.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.2 | 18.1 | 0.3 | C |
| 40 | 1-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 3,078 | 53 | 106.1\% | 170 | 3 | 100.1\% |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.2 | 16.7 | 0.2 | B |
| 41 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 3,245 | 57 | 105.7\% | 229 | 5 | 91.7\% |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.3 | 17.7 | 0.2 | B |
| 42 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 3,472 | 59 | 104.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.2 | 20.0 | 0.3 | C |
| 43 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,471 | 62 | 104.5\% |  |  |  | 284 | 39 | 105.0\% | 62.6 | 0.5 | 20.7 | 0.7 | C |
| 44 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,185 | 57 | 104.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.1 | 18.5 | 0.4 | C |
| 45 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,186 | 68 | 104.5\% | 1,269 | 67 | 90.6\% |  |  |  | 60.4 | 0.7 | 22.5 | 0.4 | C |
| 46 | 1-80 WB - Rocklin Rd to HOV Lane Start | Basic | 4,448 | 99 | 99.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.2 | 24.1 | 0.5 | C |
| 47 | I-80 WB - HOV Lane Start to SR-65 | Basic | 4,451 | 102 | 100.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.3 | 20.2 | 0.4 | C |
| 48 | I-80 WB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,450 | 106 | 100.0\% |  |  |  | 1,763 | 70 | 98.5\% | 63.7 | 0.2 | 18.3 | 0.4 | B |
| 49 | 1-80 WB - SR-65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,683 | 73 | 100.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.1 | 15.5 | 0.4 | B |
| 50 | I-80 WB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 2,684 | 76 | 100.9\% | 3,304 | 103 | 100.7\% |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.1 | 23.4 | 0.6 | C |
| 60 | I-80 WB - Taylor Rd On-ramp | Merge | 5,989 | 112 | 100.8\% | 541 | 36 | 100.1\% |  |  |  | 60.9 | 0.5 | 28.3 | 0.9 | D |
| 61 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,528 | 119 | 100.7\% |  |  |  | 444 | 36 | 105.6\% | 62.4 | 1.0 | 27.8 | 1.1 | C |
| 62 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,084 | 109 | 100.4\% |  |  |  | 978 | 57 | 99.8\% | 62.4 | 0.4 | 28.6 | 0.6 | D |
| 63 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,105 | 102 | 100.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.2 | 20.6 | 0.4 | C |
| 64 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St On-ramp | Merge | 5,105 | 108 | 100.5\% | 1,410 | 67 | 102.9\% |  |  |  | 60.3 | 0.8 | 30.0 | 0.5 | D |
| 65 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,515 | 116 | 101.0\% |  |  |  | 952 | 50 | 100.2\% | 62.0 | 0.2 | 27.4 | 0.7 | C |
| 66 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,571 | 106 | 101.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.1 | 22.8 | 0.5 | C |
| 67 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 5,571 | 107 | 101.3\% | 1,412 | 79 | 100.8\% |  |  |  | 60.0 | 0.5 | 26.7 | 0.5 | C |
| 68 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Slip On | Merge | 6,980 | 108 | 101.2\% | 757 | 43 | 92.3\% |  |  |  | 58.3 | 3.3 | 32.6 | 2.1 | D |
| 69 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd to Riverside Ave | Basic | 7,745 | 140 | 100.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.7 | 0.4 | 30.3 | 0.5 | D |
| 70 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,747 | 133 | 100.4\% |  |  |  | 1,183 | 52 | 101.9\% | 62.7 | 0.3 | 31.4 | 0.7 | D |
| 71 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,566 | 141 | 100.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.2 | 25.0 | 0.5 | C |
| 72 | 1-80 WB - Riverside Ave NB On-ramp | Merge | 6,566 | 148 | 100.1\% | 206 | 1 | 98.0\% |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.1 | 22.9 | 0.7 | C |
| 73 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave SB On-ramp | Merge | 6,774 | 146 | 100.1\% | 521 | 5 | 96.5\% |  |  |  | 61.0 | 1.2 | 27.4 | 1.1 | C |
| 74 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave to Antelope Rd | Basic | 7,296 | 136 | 99.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.5 | 28.1 | 0.6 | D |
| 75 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,291 | 138 | 99.7\% |  |  |  | 956 | 67 | 99.6\% | 61.6 | 1.1 | 29.0 | 0.8 | D |
| 76 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,333 | 121 | 99.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.1 | 24.4 | 0.3 | C |
| 77 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 6,335 | 125 | 99.8\% | 371 | 8 | 97.5\% |  |  |  | 60.9 | 0.9 | 23.0 | 0.9 | C |
| 78 | 1-80 WB - Antelope Rd to Truck Scales | Weave | 6,707 | 117 | 99.7\% | 367 | 15 | 99.2\% | 64 | 15 | 57.8\% | 62.4 | 0.4 | 25.1 | 0.5 | C |
| 79 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,016 | 119 | 100.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.1 | 26.1 | 0.4 | D |
| 80 | I-80 WB - Truck Scales On-ramp | Merge | 7,017 | 129 | 100.4\% | 64 | 15 | 58.5\% |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.1 | 26.3 | 0.4 | C |
| 81 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales to Elkhorn Blvd | Basic | 7,080 | 129 | 99.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.3 | 27.6 | 0.5 | D |
| 82 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Offrramp | Diverge | 7,078 | 128 | 99.7\% |  |  |  | 1,075 | 58 | 97.7\% | 62.4 | 0.2 | 25.4 | 0.5 | C |
| 83 | 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,000 | 140 | 100.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.4 | 23.2 | 0.6 | C |
| 84 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 6,002 | 138 | 100.0\% | 899 | 3 | 99.9\% |  |  |  | 58.4 | 0.6 | 24.4 | 0.8 | C |
| 85 | 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 6,902 | 149 | 100.0\% | 656 | 16 | 102.5\% |  |  |  | 61.7 | 0.8 | 28.1 | 1.1 | D |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| Location | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 100 SR-65 NB - EB I-80 Connector | Basic | 3,856 | 107 | 93.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36.4 | 0.8 | 61.3 | 1.9 | F |
| 101 SR-65 NB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 1,761 | 66 | 98.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50.2 | 0.6 | 28.0 | 0.7 | D |
| 103 SR-65 NB - I-80 WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,857 | 103 | 93.6\% | 1,759 | 66 | 98.3\% |  |  |  | 60.4 | 0.6 | 32.4 | 0.5 | D |
| 104 SR-65 NB - 1-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Basic | 5,614 | 133 | 95.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.2 | 30.8 | 0.3 | D |
| 105 SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,614 | 134 | 95.0\% |  |  |  | 1,101 | 52 | 93.3\% | 62.3 | 0.8 | 29.7 | 0.6 | D |
| 106 SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,509 | 144 | 95.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.3 | 25.3 | 0.5 | C |
| 107 SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | 4,505 | 145 | 95.2\% | 1,397 | 54 | 101.3\% | 1,009 | 59 | 98.9\% | 61.7 | 0.5 | 26.1 | 0.6 | C |
| 110 SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,892 | 136 | 96.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58.4 | 13.6 | 33.2 | 20.3 | D |
| 111 SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 4,889 | 134 | 96.0\% | 548 | 28 | 99.7\% |  |  |  | 53.7 | 10.8 | 38.6 | 12.6 | E |
| 112 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,432 | 145 | 96.3\% |  |  |  | 1,857 | 95 | 94.3\% | 60.7 | 1.0 | 31.6 | 1.0 | D |
| 114 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,574 | 123 | 97.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.3 | 28.8 | 1.2 | D |
| 115 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 3,574 | 123 | 97.4\% | 836 | 53 | 104.5\% |  |  |  | 61.5 | 0.5 | 25.8 | 1.0 | C |
| 116 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | 4,410 | 142 | 98.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.4 | 26.5 | 0.9 | D |
| 118 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,409 | 136 | 98.6\% |  |  |  | 999 | 47 | 98.9\% | 62.5 | 0.3 | 27.7 | 1.1 | C |
| 119 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,412 | 124 | 98.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.2 | 28.2 | 1.2 | D |
| 120 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 3,410 | 122 | 98.6\% | 80 | 14 | 99.8\% |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.6 | 28.6 | 1.2 | D |
| 121 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd to Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Weave | 3,488 | 128 | 98.5\% | 234 | 17 | 101.6\% | 549 | 35 | 96.2\% | 62.1 | 0.3 | 26.8 | 1.1 | C |
| 124 SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,173 | 120 | 99.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.2 | 26.6 | 1.2 | D |
| 125 SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy EB On-ramp | Merge | 3,171 | 120 | 99.1\% | 266 | 10 | 95.1\% |  |  |  | 61.3 | 1.6 | 28.0 | 1.6 | C |
| 126 SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | 3,436 | 121 | 98.7\% | 271 | 14 | 100.3\% | 832 | 58 | 102.7\% | 62.6 | 0.3 | 23.3 | 0.9 | C |
| 129 SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,864 | 84 | 97.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.2 | 24.4 | 0.5 | C |
| 130 SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Lincoln Blvd | Weave | 2,862 | 88 | 97.3\% | 276 | 32 | 91.9\% | 1,096 | 57 | 98.7\% | 63.1 | 0.2 | 20.3 | 0.5 | C |
| 133 SR-65 NB - Lincoln Blvd to Ferrari Ranch Rd | Basic | 2,039 | 73 | 95.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.2 | 19.3 | 0.8 | C |
| 134 SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,038 | 73 | 95.7\% |  |  |  | 1,388 | 65 | 95.7\% | 64.0 | 0.2 | 15.0 | 0.5 | B |
| 135 SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 650 | 60 | 95.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.6 | 0.1 | 5.4 | 0.4 | A |
| 136 SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | 650 | 59 | 95.6\% | 83 | 5 | 92.0\% |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.2 | 5.7 | 0.4 | A |
| 150 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 981 | 33 | 101.1\% |  |  |  | 144 | 14 | 96.1\% | 64.5 | 0.3 | 8.4 | 0.3 | A |
| 151 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 837 | 35 | 102.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.5 | 0.2 | 7.0 | 0.2 | A |
| 152 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 837 | 37 | 102.0\% | 477 | 18 | 99.3\% |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.2 | 7.9 | 0.2 | A |
| 153 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | 1,313 | 48 | 101.0\% | 320 | 15 | 91.5\% |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.1 | 11.3 | 0.5 | B |
| 154 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd to Lane Drop | Basic | 1,632 | 49 | 98.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.1 | 0.2 | 14.1 | 0.5 | B |
| 155 SR-65 SB - Lane Drop to Lincoln Blvd | Basic | 1,632 | 49 | 98.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.2 | 0.1 | 14.0 | 0.5 | B |
| 156 SR-65 SB - Lincoln Blvd to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | 1,631 | 52 | 98.8\% | 733 | 44 | 99.0\% | 258 | 34 | 95.6\% | 62.5 | 0.5 | 14.7 | 0.4 | B |
| 159 SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,102 | 55 | 99.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.3 | 17.1 | 0.4 | B |
| 160 SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Placer Pkwy | Weave | 2,102 | 55 | 99.2\% | 470 | 20 | 95.8\% | 458 | 38 | 97.4\% | 63.1 | 0.2 | 15.9 | 0.3 | B |
| 163 SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,110 | 64 | 98.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.2 | 17.3 | 0.5 | B |
| 164 SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy WB On-ramp | Merge | 2,111 | 67 | 98.6\% | 260 | 22 | 100.0\% |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.4 | 18.6 | 0.6 | B |
| 165 SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy to Sunset Blvd | Weave | 2,371 | 67 | 98.8\% | 363 | 24 | 98.2\% | 264 | 32 | 97.8\% | 62.8 | 0.2 | 19.3 | 0.6 | B |
| 168 SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,469 | 71 | 98.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.2 | 20.2 | 0.5 | C |
| 169 SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 2,469 | 69 | 98.8\% | 788 | 33 | 107.9\% |  |  |  | 58.5 | 1.9 | 25.2 | 0.9 | C |
| 170 SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Weave | 3,258 | 80 | 100.9\% | 750 | 34 | 101.3\% | 745 | 52 | 96.8\% | 62.0 | 0.3 | 24.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 173 SR-65 SB - HOV Lane Start to Blue Oaks Blvd WB On | Basic | 3,260 | 82 | 101.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.2 | 26.5 | 0.8 | D |
| 174 SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,260 | 82 | 101.9\% | 500 | 27 | 104.2\% |  |  |  | 59.7 | 0.6 | 27.8 | 0.7 | C |
| 175 SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB to EB On-ramp | Basic | 3,761 | 82 | 102.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.2 | 28.6 | 0.6 | D |
| 176 SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 3,761 | 84 | 102.2\% | 1,210 | 47 | 101.6\% |  |  |  | 61.7 | 0.2 | 26.3 | 0.4 | C |
| 177 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,972 | 101 | 102.1\% |  |  |  | 565 | 44 | 95.8\% | 63.0 | 0.5 | 24.9 | 0.4 | C |
| 178 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,403 | 103 | 102.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.3 | 22.7 | 0.4 | C |
| 179 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 4,402 | 103 | 102.8\% | 282 | 7 | 94.1\% |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.1 | 21.0 | 0.5 | C |
| 180 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 4,683 | 104 | 102.3\% | 734 | 25 | 96.6\% |  |  |  | 61.9 | 0.5 | 15.3 | 0.4 | B |
| 181 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | 5,419 | 120 | 101.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.0 | 0.6 | 25.3 | 0.5 | C |
| 182 SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,420 | 119 | 101.5\% |  |  |  | 1,178 | 64 | 104.2\% | 62.9 | 0.7 | 22.2 | 0.7 | C |
| 183 SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off-ramp to Lane Drop | Basic | 4,236 | 109 | 100.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.1 | 1.2 | 26.9 | 0.6 | D |
| 184 SR-65 SB - Lane Drop to Galleria Blvd On-ramp | Basic | 4,235 | 109 | 100.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.3 | 25.2 | 0.6 | C |
| 185 SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 4,233 | 110 | 100.6\% | 967 | 39 | 95.7\% |  |  |  | 57.1 | 3.3 | 33.9 | 2.5 | D |
| 186 SR-65 SB - I-80 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,200 | 104 | 99.6\% |  |  |  | 3,311 | 93 | 100.9\% | 61.2 | 0.5 | 29.1 | 0.7 | D |
| 187 SR-65 SB - EB l-80 Connector (2 lanes) | Basic | 1,892 | 76 | 97.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 56.4 | 3.0 | 34.6 | 2.2 | D |
| 188 SR-65 SB - EB I-80 Connector (1 lane) | Basic | 1,894 | 80 | 97.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.1 | 0.9 | 33.0 | 1.3 | D |
| 189 SR-65 SB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 3,308 | 98 | 100.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52.5 | 0.2 | 32.4 | 1.0 | D |

Notes. Average density reported for the analysis area only. for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane,
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 1 | Lincoln Blvd/Sterling Parkway |  | Signal | 1,860 | 2,034 | 109.4\% | 11.1 | 0.7 | B |
| 2 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 1,285 | 1,436 | 111.8\% | 10.2 | 0.7 | B |
| 3 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 1,385 | 1,490 | 107.6\% | 8.9 | 1.4 | A |
| 4 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 2,660 | 2,878 | 108.2\% | 11.4 | 1.1 | B |
| 5 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 2,790 | 3,068 | 109.9\% | 12.9 | 0.8 | B |
| 6 | SR-65 SB Ramps-Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 4,535 | 4,723 | 104.1\% | 31.0 | 3.0 | C |
| 7 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 3,095 | 3,315 | 107.1\% | 12.2 | 1.3 | B |
| 8 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 3,600 | 3,737 | 103.8\% | 7.1 | 1.0 | A |
| 9 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 2,730 | 2,791 | 102.2\% | 14.2 | 0.6 | B |
| 10 | Stanford Ranch Rd/Five Star Blvd | Signal | 2,835 | 2,942 | 103.8\% | 26.7 | 1.2 | C |
| 11 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Stanford Ranch Rd | Signal | 3,485 | 3,656 | 104.9\% | 15.2 | 4.1 | B |
| 12 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd | Signal | 3,815 | 3,995 | 104.7\% | 16.7 | 1.0 | B |
| 13 | Galleria Blvd/Antelope Creek Dr | Signal | 2,926 | 3,087 | 105.5\% | 13.8 | 2.1 | B |
| 14 | Galleria Blvd/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 5,131 | 5,514 | 107.5\% | 41.2 | 4.2 | D |
| 15 | Creekside Ridge Dr/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 3,520 | 3,724 | 105.8\% | 7.8 | 1.6 | A |
| 16 | Taylor Rd/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,500 | 4,768 | 105.9\% | 48.9 | 4.9 | D |
| 17 | North Sunrise Ave/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,295 | 4,579 | 106.6\% | 28.1 | 3.6 | C |
| 18 | Wills Rd/Atlantic St | Signal | 1,990 | 2,201 | 110.6\% | 24.2 | 2.6 | C |
| 19 | I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St | Signal | 3,425 | 3,658 | 106.8\% | 14.7 | 2.4 | B |
| 20 | Taylor Rd-I-80 EB Ramps/Eureka Rd | Signal | 4,340 | 4,549 | 104.8\% | 25.0 | 4.5 | C |
| 21 | North Sunrise Ave/Eureka Rd | Signal | 3,955 | 4,138 | 104.6\% | 32.1 | 4.0 | C |
| 22 | Harding Blvd/Wills Rd | Signal | 355 | 364 | 102.4\% | 23.3 | 2.8 | C |
| 23 | Harding Blvd/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 2,680 | 2,858 | 106.7\% | 50.5 | 31.3 | D |
| 24 | I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 3,670 | 3,894 | 106.1\% | 22.9 | 5.7 | C |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 74,862 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 79,396 |
| Percent Served | $106.1 \%$ |

Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 25 | I-80 EB Ramps/Douglas Blvd |  | Signal | 4,050 | 4,323 | 106.7\% | 20.0 | 9.5 | B |
| 26 | North Sunrise Ave/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 4,410 | 4,652 | 105.5\% | 33.4 | 2.5 | C |
| 27 | Pacific St/Woodside Dr | Signal | 1,700 | 1,872 | 110.1\% | 7.1 | 0.8 | A |
| 28 | Pacific St/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 2,485 | 2,739 | 110.2\% | 24.1 | 1.3 | C |
| 29 | Granite Dr/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,301 | 2,396 | 104.1\% | 16.8 | 1.3 | B |
| 30 | I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,555 | 2,672 | 104.6\% | 23.3 | 3.8 | C |
| 31 | I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,685 | 2,856 | 106.4\% | 41.6 | 11.0 | D |
| 32 | Aguilar Rd/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 1,925 | 2,062 | 107.1\% | 13.9 | 13.9 | B |
| 33 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 NB Off-Ramp | Signal | 1,805 | 1,970 | 109.2\% | 5.9 | 0.6 | A |
| 34 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 SB On-Ramp | Signal | 1,245 | 1,344 | 107.9\% | 21.1 | 1.7 | C |
| 35 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy | Signal | 1,715 | 1,767 | 103.0\% | 8.6 | 0.7 | A |
| 36 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Signal | 1,625 | 1,738 | 107.0\% | 9.1 | 1.4 | A |
| 40 | Galleria Blvd/Berry St | Signal | 1,920 | 2,079 | 108.3\% | 10.7 | 1.7 | B |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 30,421 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 32,469 |
| Percent Served | $106.7 \%$ |

[^13]| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 1 | Lincoln Blvd/Sterling Parkway |  | Signal | 2,345 | 2,305 | 98.3\% | 9.4 | 0.7 | A |
| 2 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 1,100 | 1,063 | 96.7\% | 11.6 | 2.0 | B |
| 3 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 1,590 | 1,580 | 99.4\% | 10.8 | 0.9 | B |
| 4 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 2,885 | 3,013 | 104.5\% | 5.9 | 0.5 | A |
| 5 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 2,860 | 2,967 | 103.7\% | 12.8 | 2.8 | B |
| 6 | SR-65 SB Ramps-Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 5,505 | 5,718 | 103.9\% | 46.5 | 7.0 | D |
| 7 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 4,040 | 4,165 | 103.1\% | 14.9 | 1.3 | B |
| 8 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 5,095 | 5,055 | 99.2\% | 31.4 | 16.6 | C |
| 9 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 4,235 | 4,212 | 99.5\% | 23.8 | 19.2 | C |
| 10 | Stanford Ranch Rd/Five Star Blvd | Signal | 4,345 | 4,380 | 100.8\% | 92.2 | 10.9 | F |
| 11 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Stanford Ranch Rd | Signal | 5,620 | 5,687 | 101.2\% | 23.2 | 13.4 | C |
| 12 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd | Signal | 5,645 | 5,726 | 101.4\% | 16.3 | 2.8 | B |
| 13 | Galleria Blvd/Antelope Creek Dr | Signal | 4,690 | 4,590 | 97.9\% | 23.1 | 4.3 | C |
| 14 | Galleria Blvd/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 7,635 | 7,533 | 98.7\% | 60.6 | 6.0 | E |
| 15 | Creekside Ridge Dr/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,695 | 4,647 | 99.0\% | 34.2 | 9.4 | C |
| 16 | Taylor Rd/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 5,895 | 5,869 | 99.6\% | 50.6 | 10.3 | D |
| 17 | North Sunrise Ave/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 5,415 | 5,516 | 101.9\% | 41.7 | 4.7 | D |
| 18 | Wills Rd/Atlantic St | Signal | 2,970 | 3,019 | 101.6\% | 39.0 | 6.2 | D |
| 19 | I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St | Signal | 4,505 | 4,587 | 101.8\% | 12.5 | 1.0 | B |
| 20 | Taylor Rd-I-80 EB Ramps/Eureka Rd | Signal | 5,660 | 5,707 | 100.8\% | 52.1 | 7.5 | D |
| 21 | North Sunrise Ave/Eureka Rd | Signal | 5,540 | 5,735 | 103.5\% | 43.8 | 3.6 | D |
| 22 | Harding Blvd/Wills Rd | Signal | 375 | 402 | 107.1\% | 26.4 | 3.6 | C |
| 23 | Harding Blvd/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 3,745 | 3,589 | 95.8\% | 77.0 | 38.3 | E |
| 24 | I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 4,500 | 4,458 | 99.1\% | 35.0 | 5.0 | C |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 100,890 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 101,523 |
| Percent Served | $100.6 \%$ |

Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 25 | I-80 EB Ramps/Douglas Blvd |  | Signal | 5,225 | 5,021 | 96.1\% | 40.5 | 14.4 | D |
| 26 | North Sunrise Ave/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 5,855 | 5,758 | 98.3\% | 53.9 | 16.1 | D |
| 27 | Pacific St/Woodside Dr | Signal | 2,235 | 2,174 | 97.2\% | 6.6 | 1.0 | A |
| 28 | Pacific St/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 3,460 | 3,413 | 98.6\% | 29.7 | 1.9 | C |
| 29 | Granite Dr/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,700 | 3,480 | 94.0\% | 129.6 | 5.9 | F |
| 30 | I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,785 | 3,677 | 97.2\% | 27.3 | 6.6 | C |
| 31 | I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,535 | 3,535 | 100.0\% | 56.5 | 27.4 | E |
| 32 | Aguilar Rd/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,400 | 2,417 | 100.7\% | 22.5 | 3.8 | C |
| 33 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 NB Off-Ramp | Signal | 2,205 | 2,167 | 98.3\% | 9.0 | 0.9 | A |
| 34 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 SB On-Ramp | Signal | 1,140 | 1,139 | 99.9\% | 23.0 | 5.4 | C |
| 35 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy | Signal | 2,015 | 2,008 | 99.6\% | 8.9 | 0.5 | A |
| 36 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Signal | 2,025 | 2,024 | 99.9\% | 32.0 | 19.2 | C |
| 40 | Galleria Blvd/Berry St | Signal | 2,885 | 2,926 | 101.4\% | 9.9 | 1.5 | A |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 40,465 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 39,736 |
| Percent Served | $98.2 \%$ |

[^14]VISSIM Post-Processor
SR 65 Widening
Average Results from 10 Runs
Queue Length

Intersection 2
SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Etd | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 440 | 19 | 7 | 104 | 14 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,500 | 12 | 7 | 101 | 14 | NO |

Intersection 3
SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 700 | 6 | 1 | 52 | 11 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,500 | 6 | 1 | 52 | 11 | NO |

Intersection 4
SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (ft) | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 360 | 46 | 7 | 174 | 31 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,330 | 48 | 7 | 176 | 31 | NO |

Intersection 5
SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,400 | 61 | 5 | 263 | 37 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,400 | 9 | 2 | 90 | 25 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

VISSIM Post-Processor
SR 65 Widening
Average Results from 10 Runs Construction Year - HOV Lane Alternative
Queue Length
AM Peak Hour

Intersection 6
SR-65 SB Ramps-Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (ft) | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 200 | 23 | 4 | 109 | 27 | NO |
|  | Through | 2,260 | 71 | 8 | 329 | 65 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 200 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 56 | NO |

Intersection 7
SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Etorage | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 400 | 42 | 27 | 596 | 333 | MAX |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,100 | 43 | 27 | 597 | 333 | NO |

Intersection 8
SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (ft) | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 430 | 25 | 6 | 154 | 31 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,130 | 27 | 6 | 157 | 31 | NO |

Intersection 9
SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd
Signalized

| Direction |  | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exceeds |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,420 | 36 | 1 | 143 | 24 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,420 | 35 | 1 | 142 | 24 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

| Direction | Movement | Storage (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| EB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,800 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 21 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,170 | 9 | 2 | 107 | 43 | NO |

Intersection 12
SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| EB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,130 | 48 | 1 | 259 | 52 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,780 | 1 | 0 | 46 | 35 | NO |

Intersection 19
I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,430 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 180 | 88 | 39 | 499 | 501 | MAX |
|  | Through | 1,700 | 56 | 11 | 253 | 92 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 1,700 | 15 | 18 | 271 | 571 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn | 550 | 15 | 6 | 74 | 17 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 550 | 70 | 6 | 309 | 51 | NO |
| EB | Left Turn | 1,120 | 29 | 4 | 106 | 16 | NO |
|  | Through | 1,120 | 78 | 17 | 600 | 128 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 810 | 3 | 4 | 224 | 92 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through | 1,370 | 36 | 3 | 286 | 53 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 280 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NO |

Intersection 24
I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas BIvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (ft) | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 1,530 | 65 | 66 | 339 | 123 | NO |
|  | Through | 1,530 | 65 | 66 | 339 | 123 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 730 | 65 | 66 | 339 | 123 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

VISSIM Post-Processor
SR 65 Widening
Average Results from 10 Runs
Construction Year - HOV Lane Alternative
Queue Length
AM Peak Hour

Intersection 25
I-80 EB Ramps/Douglas Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage(ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,400 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 30 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,250 | 14 | 2 | 109 | 35 | NO |

Intersection 30
I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 700 | 9 | 2 | 96 | 30 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,230 | 13 | 3 | 110 | 30 | NO |

Intersection 31
I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,080 | 73 | 9 | 299 | 33 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,080 | 71 | 9 | 296 | 33 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

VISSIM Post-Processor
SR 65 Widening
Average Results from 10 Runs Construction Year - HOV Lane Alternative
Queue Length
AM Peak Hour

Intersection 33
Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 NB Off-Ramp
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| WB | Left Turn | 1,940 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,940 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NO |

Intersection 35
SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage(ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 1,650 | 30 | 6 | 189 | 46 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,650 | 30 | 6 | 189 | 46 | NO |

Intersection 36
SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |
|  | Left Turn | 1,620 | 23 | 3 | 144 | 26 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,620 | 23 | 3 | 144 | 26 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

VISSIM Post-Processor
SR 65 Widening
Average Results from 10 Runs Construction Year - HOV Lane Alternative
Queue Length
PM Peak Hour

Intersection 2
SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 440 | 19 | 3 | 80 | 18 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,500 | 12 | 3 | 77 | 18 | NO |

Intersection 3
SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 700 | 18 | 1 | 98 | 30 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,500 | 18 | 1 | 98 | 30 | NO |

Intersection 4
SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (ft) | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 360 | 30 | 2 | 123 | 32 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,330 | 31 | 2 | 125 | 32 | NO |

Intersection 5
SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,400 | 51 | 4 | 204 | 28 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,400 | 9 | 1 | 74 | 18 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

VISSIM Post-Processor
SR 65 Widening
Average Results from 10 Runs Construction Year - HOV Lane Alternative
Queue Length
PM Peak Hour

Intersection 6
SR-65 SB Ramps-Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 200 | 50 | 6 | 186 | 56 | NO |
|  | Through | 2,260 | 56 | 9 | 234 | 38 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 200 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | NO |

Intersection 7
SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 400 | 47 | 15 | 515 | 196 | MAX |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,100 | 48 | 15 | 516 | 196 | NO |

Intersection 8
SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |
|  | Left Turn | 430 | 25 | 3 | 125 | 29 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,130 | 27 | 3 | 127 | NO |  |

Intersection 9
SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd
Signalized

| Direction |  | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exceeds |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,420 | 47 | 3 | 182 | 45 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,420 | 46 | 3 | 181 | 45 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

| Direction | Movement | Storage (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| EB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,800 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 23 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,170 | 95 | 45 | 350 | 328 | NO |

Intersection 12
SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| EB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,130 | 50 | 3 | 240 | 18 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,780 | 7 | 2 | 142 | 35 | NO |

Intersection 19
I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,430 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 42 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 180 | 236 | 101 | 1,111 | 517 | AVG |
|  | Through | 1,700 | 85 | 9 | 467 | 507 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 1,700 | 96 | 91 | 904 | 630 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn | 550 | 21 | 5 | 99 | 30 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 550 | 210 | 105 | 748 | 78 | MAX |
| EB | Left Turn | 1,120 | 33 | 15 | 172 | 53 | NO |
|  | Through | 1,120 | 121 | 8 | 586 | 123 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 810 | 7 | 2 | 209 | 88 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through | 1,370 | 177 | 24 | 720 | 176 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 280 | 35 | 13 | 356 | 176 | MAX |

Intersection 24
I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (ft) | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 1,530 | 67 | 67 | 325 | 73 | NO |
|  | Through | 1,530 | 67 | 67 | 325 | 73 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 730 | 67 | 67 | 325 | 73 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

VISSIM Post-Processor
SR 65 Widening
Average Results from 10 Runs Construction Year - HOV Lane Alternative
Queue Length
PM Peak Hour

Intersection 25
I-80 EB Ramps/Douglas Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,400 | 0 | 1 | 41 | 129 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,250 | 199 | 157 | 1,087 | 580 | NO |

Intersection 30
I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 700 | 25 | 3 | 179 | 44 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,230 | 34 | 4 | 194 | 44 | NO |

Intersection 31
I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd
Signalized

| Direction |  | Movement | Storage |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |  |  |
|  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,080 | 312 | 123 | 913 | 523 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,080 | 309 | 122 | 910 | 523 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

Average Results from 10 Runs Construction Year - HOV Lane Alternative
Queue Length
PM Peak Hour

Intersection 33
Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 NB Off-Ramp
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| WB | Left Turn | 1,940 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,940 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 13 | NO |

Intersection 35
SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 1,650 | 27 | 3 | 140 | 24 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,650 | 27 | 3 | 140 | 24 | NO |

Intersection 36
SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |
|  | Left Turn | 1,620 | 35 | 3 | 182 | 22 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,620 | 35 | 3 | 182 | 22 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

# SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements 

Vissim Model Results - Construction Year Alternative 2 (General Purpose Lane)

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs Network Statistics

SR 65 Widening Construction Year - GP Alternative AM Peak Period

| Network Performance | Vehicle Types | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Vehicles Served | All Vehicles | 167,506 | 48 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | All Vehicles | 797,356 | 1,082 |
| Travel Time [h] | All Vehicles | 18,004 | 145.9 |
| Average Speed [mph] | All Vehicles | 44.3 | 0.3 |
| Total Delay [h] | All Vehicles | 4,329 | 141.3 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | All Vehicles | 91 | 3.0 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | All Vehicles | 0.33 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | HOV | 32,234 | 24 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | HOV | 163,532 | 503 |
| Travel Time [h] | HOV | 3,508 | 19 |
| Average Speed [mph] | HOV | 46.6 | 0.3 |
| Total Delay [h] | HOV | 730 | 21 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | HOV | 79 | 2 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | HOV | 0.27 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | Truck | 7,509 | 9 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | Truck | 38,735 | 382 |
| Travel Time [h] | Truck | 900 | 12 |
| Average Speed [mph] | Truck | 43.0 | 0 |
| Total Delay [h] | Truck | 230 | 9 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | Truck | 108 | 4 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | Truck | 0.36 | 0.01 |


| Performance Measure | Vehicle Types |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HOV | Truck | All |
| Vehicles Served | 32,230 | 7,510 | 167,510 |
| Demand Volume | 33,370 | 8,090 | 169,340 |
| Percent Demand Served | $96.6 \%$ | $92.8 \%$ | $98.9 \%$ |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel | 163,530 | 38,740 | 797,360 |
| Person Miles of Travel | 343,420 | 40,670 | 979,180 |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel | 3,510 | 900 | 18,000 |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay | 730 | 230 | 4,330 |
| VHD \% of VHT | $20.8 \%$ | $25.6 \%$ | $24.1 \%$ |
| Average Delay per Vehicle $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.36 | 1.84 | 1.55 |
| Person Hours of Delay | 1,530 | 240 | 5,140 |
| Average Travel Speed | 46.6 | 43.0 | 44.3 |

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Peak Hour Travel Time


VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Network Statistics

SR 65 Widening Construction Year - GP Alternative PM Peak Period

| Network Performance | Vehicle Types | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Vehicles Served | All Vehicles | 232,112 | 704 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | All Vehicles | 930,143 | 3,315 |
| Travel Time [h] | All Vehicles | 25,886 | 332.5 |
| Average Speed [mph] | All Vehicles | 35.9 | 0.4 |
| Total Delay [h] | All Vehicles | 9,523 | 313.0 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | All Vehicles | 145 | 4.6 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | All Vehicles | 0.61 | 0.02 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | HOV | 45,803 | 178 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | HOV | 198,328 | 1,126 |
| Travel Time [h] | HOV | 4,985 | 36 |
| Average Speed [mph] | HOV | 39.8 | 0.3 |
| Total Delay [h] | HOV | 1,532 | 35 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | HOV | 118 | 3 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | HOV | 0.46 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | Truck | 9,009 | 37 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | Truck | 37,964 | 214 |
| Travel Time [h] | Truck | 1,138 | 28 |
| Average Speed [mph] | Truck | 33.4 | 1 |
| Total Delay [h] | Truck | 465 | 29 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | Truck | 181 | 11 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | Truck | 0.74 | 0.05 |


| Performance Measure | Vehicle Types |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HOV | Truck | All |
|  | 45,800 | 9,010 | 232,110 |
| Demand Volume | 46,890 | 9,660 | 233,410 |
| Percent Demand Served | $97.7 \%$ | $93.3 \%$ | $99.4 \%$ |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel | 198,330 | 37,960 | 930,140 |
| Person Miles of Travel | 416,490 | 39,860 | $1,150,200$ |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel | 4,990 | 1,140 | 25,890 |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay | 1,530 | 470 | 9,520 |
| VHD \% of VHT | $30.7 \%$ | $41.2 \%$ | $36.8 \%$ |
| Average Delay per Vehicle $(\mathrm{min})$ | 2.00 | 3.13 | 2.46 |
| Person Hours of Delay | 3,210 | 490 | 11,220 |
| Average Travel Speed | 39.8 | 33.4 | 35.9 |

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Peak Hour Travel Time

SR 65 Widening Construction Year - GP Alternative PM Peak Period


| VISSIM Post-Processor Average Results from 10 Runs Freeway Operations Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SR 65 Widening Construction Year - GP Alternative AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
|  | Location | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 1 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 7,228 | 34 | 110.3\% | 1,023 | 18 | 110.0\% |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.4 | 28.4 | 0.6 | D |
| 2 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | Basic | 8,238 | 64 | 110.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58.3 | 1.4 | 35.2 | 1.0 | E |
| 3 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd Slip Off | Diverge | 8,227 | 80 | 110.0\% |  |  |  | 1,434 | 89 | 110.3\% | 60.5 | 1.1 | 29.5 | 0.7 | D |
| 4 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,790 | 106 | 109.9\% |  |  |  | 514 | 49 | 109.4\% | 62.7 | 0.8 | 23.1 | 0.3 | C |
| 5 | 1-80 EB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,277 | 100 | 109.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.1 | 25.2 | 0.3 | C |
| 6 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 6,273 | 102 | 109.9\% | 866 | 31 | 95.2\% |  |  |  | 62.3 | 0.3 | 28.3 | 0.8 | D |
| 7 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,141 | 105 | 107.9\% |  |  |  | 1,353 | 75 | 106.5\% | 61.7 | 0.5 | 29.6 | 0.9 | D |
| 8 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,783 | 107 | 108.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.3 | 24.9 | 0.4 | C |
| 9 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | 5,783 | 109 | 108.1\% | 184 | 4 | 96.6\% |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.1 | 23.1 | 0.3 | C |
| 10 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd to Taylor Rd | Weave | 5,969 | 107 | 107.7\% | 438 | 31 | 101.8\% | 368 | 40 | 105.1\% | 62.7 | 0.1 | 25.2 | 0.4 | C |
| 11 | I-80 EB -Taylor Rd to SR 65 | Basic | 6,035 | 114 | 107.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 59.7 | 1.2 | 31.6 | 0.8 | D |
| 17 | I-80 EB - SR 65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,035 | 110 | 107.4\% |  |  |  | 3,196 | 102 | 107.6\% | 60.6 | 1.0 | 32.1 | 0.9 | D |
| 18 | 1-80 EB - SR 65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,838 | 82 | 107.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.1 | 15.8 | 0.5 | B |
| 19 | 1-80 EB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 2,839 | 88 | 107.1\% | 1,557 | 74 | 108.1\% |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.8 | 23.3 | 0.7 | C |
| 21 | 1-80 EB - SR-65 to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 4,403 | 132 | 107.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.2 | 21.8 | 0.5 | C |
| 22 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,405 | 124 | 107.7\% |  |  |  | 1,511 | 73 | 105.7\% | 63.5 | 0.2 | 21.2 | 0.5 | C |
| 23 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,901 | 101 | 109.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.2 | 18.1 | 0.7 | C |
| 24 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 2,902 | 99 | 109.1\% | 176 | 5 | 92.8\% |  |  |  | 61.6 | 0.4 | 18.2 | 0.7 | B |
| 25 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd to Sierra College Blvd | Basic | 3,084 | 106 | 108.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.3 | 18.9 | 0.7 | C |
| 26 | 1-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,084 | 107 | 108.2\% |  |  |  | 418 | 43 | 107.1\% | 62.7 | 0.5 | 20.0 | 0.7 | C |
| 27 | 1-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,670 | 95 | 108.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.2 | 17.3 | 0.7 | B |
| 28 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 2,672 | 97 | 108.6\% | 132 | 6 | 101.4\% |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.3 | 16.2 | 0.5 | B |
| 29 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 2,805 | 90 | 108.3\% | 417 | 14 | 109.8\% |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.3 | 18.0 | 0.5 | B |
| 38 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,877 | 16 | 105.8\% |  |  |  | 856 | 55 | 107.0\% | 56.6 | 2.0 | 27.9 | 1.2 | C |
| 39 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,018 | 71 | 105.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.4 | 24.5 | 0.3 | C |
| 40 | 1-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 4,018 | 73 | 105.5\% | 58 | 4 | 96.7\% |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.2 | 21.9 | 0.6 | C |
| 41 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 4,076 | 78 | 105.3\% | 309 | 10 | 103.0\% |  |  |  | 61.1 | 0.9 | 23.8 | 0.7 | C |
| 42 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 4,385 | 91 | 105.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.3 | 0.5 | 26.4 | 0.6 | D |
| 43 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,386 | 91 | 105.2\% |  |  |  | 225 | 27 | 102.1\% | 61.2 | 1.3 | 27.2 | 0.9 | C |
| 44 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,161 | 92 | 105.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.5 | 24.6 | 0.4 | C |
| 45 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 4,162 | 99 | 105.4\% | 904 | 45 | 101.6\% |  |  |  | 60.6 | 0.8 | 26.4 | 0.9 | C |
| 46 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd to HOV Lane Start | Basic | 5,067 | 115 | 104.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.5 | 28.4 | 0.8 | D |
| 47 | 1-80 WB - HOV Lane Start to SR-65 | Basic | 5,059 | 116 | 104.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.3 | 23.8 | 0.5 | C |
| 48 | 1-80 WB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,059 | 114 | 104.5\% |  |  |  | 1,461 | 68 | 105.1\% | 63.6 | 0.2 | 21.9 | 0.5 | C |
| 49 | I-80 WB - SR-65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,588 | 91 | 104.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.1 | 19.5 | 0.5 | C |
| 50 | 1-80 WB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 3,586 | 91 | 103.9\% | 3,874 | 116 | 105.6\% |  |  |  | 60.6 | 0.4 | 29.8 | 0.7 | D |
| 60 | I-80 WB - Taylor Rd On-ramp | Merge | 7,454 | 126 | 104.7\% | 618 | 43 | 108.5\% |  |  |  | 55.7 | 3.0 | 37.7 | 2.6 | E |
| 61 | 1-80 WB - Atlantic St WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,071 | 115 | 105.0\% |  |  |  | 333 | 33 | 104.2\% | 58.5 | 2.3 | 37.0 | 1.9 | E |
| 62 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,733 | 109 | 104.9\% |  |  |  | 1,003 | 56 | 102.3\% | 59.6 | 2.1 | 36.0 | 1.4 | E |
| 63 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,729 | 98 | 105.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.3 | 27.2 | 0.3 | D |
| 64 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St On-ramp | Merge | 6,728 | 106 | 105.3\% | 1,151 | 68 | 105.6\% |  |  |  | 56.9 | 3.3 | 37.1 | 2.1 | E |
| 65 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,872 | 129 | 105.2\% |  |  |  | 966 | 71 | 102.7\% | 59.6 | 0.5 | 33.2 | 0.8 | D |
| 66 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,914 | 116 | 105.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.2 | 28.7 | 0.4 | D |
| 67 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 6,914 | 119 | 105.7\% | 1,020 | 40 | 107.4\% |  |  |  | 57.7 | 4.8 | 32.0 | 4.5 | D |
| 68 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Slip On | Merge | 7,939 | 104 | 106.0\% | 462 | 32 | 107.5\% |  |  |  | 56.4 | 6.3 | 36.9 | 5.9 | E |
| 69 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd to Riverside Ave | Basic | 8,404 | 130 | 106.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.3 | 33.7 | 0.6 | D |
| 70 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,406 | 125 | 106.1\% |  |  |  | 913 | 65 | 99.2\% | 62.4 | 0.2 | 33.3 | 0.7 | D |
| 71 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,499 | 131 | 107.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.2 | 29.9 | 0.6 | D |
| 72 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave NB On-ramp | Merge | 7,499 | 133 | 107.1\% | 286 | 7 | 84.1\% |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.2 | 28.0 | 0.8 | D |
| 73 | 1-80 WB - Riverside Ave SB On-ramp | Merge | 7,791 | 143 | 106.1\% | 814 | 13 | 99.3\% |  |  |  | 61.0 | 4.4 | 35.4 | 3.8 | E |
| 74 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave to Antelope Rd | Basic | 8,605 | 164 | 105.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51.9 | 13.7 | 44.4 | 18.0 | E |
| 75 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,608 | 188 | 105.5\% |  |  |  | 340 | 28 | 89.4\% | 45.3 | 13.7 | 52.6 | 18.4 | F |
| 76 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 8,274 | 240 | 106.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36.2 | 10.4 | 64.7 | 19.1 | F |
| 77 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 8,278 | 253 | 106.4\% | 565 | 12 | 97.4\% |  |  |  | 30.5 | 10.9 | 84.5 | 20.4 | F |
| 78 | 1-80 WB - Antelope Rd to Truck Scales | Weave | 8,869 | 225 | 106.1\% | 445 | 12 | 96.7\% | 91 | 14 | 82.3\% | 31.3 | 3.4 | 73.3 | 7.1 | F |
| 79 | I-80 WB - Truck Scales Off to On-ramp | Basic | 9,323 | 270 | 107.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 29.2 | 1.4 | 83.3 | 5.5 | F |
| 80 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales On-ramp | Merge | 9,368 | 244 | 107.6\% | 91 | 14 | 82.8\% |  |  |  | 28.8 | 0.5 | 94.0 | 2.6 | F |
| 81 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales to Elkhorn Blvd | Basic | 9,540 | 244 | 108.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 33.3 | 1.9 | 70.6 | 4.2 | F |
| 82 | 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 9,553 | 237 | 108.3\% |  |  |  | 817 | 58 | 110.4\% | 33.6 | 1.2 | 58.5 | 2.9 | F |
| 83 | 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 8,812 | 163 | 109.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26.3 | 0.3 | 92.7 | 1.7 | F |
| 84 | 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 8,836 | 157 | 109.4\% | 801 | 11 | 95.4\% |  |  |  | 26.6 | 0.4 | 95.5 | 2.1 | F |
| 85 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 9,660 | 148 | 108.3\% | 876 | 21 | 95.2\% |  |  |  | 32.6 | 0.5 | 76.6 | 1.5 | F |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| VISSIM Post-Processor Average Results from 10 Runs Freeway Operations Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SR 65 Widening Construction Year - GP Alternative AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 100 | SR-65 NB - EB l-80 Connector | Basic | 3,198 | 101 | 107.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40.9 | 1.3 | 46.8 | 2.7 | F |
| 101 | SR-65 NB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 1,460 | 68 | 105.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51.2 | 0.4 | 23.5 | 1.3 | C |
| 103 | SR-65 NB - I-80 WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,199 | 98 | 107.7\% | 1,459 | 67 | 105.0\% |  |  |  | 61.0 | 0.5 | 28.7 | 0.7 | D |
| 104 | SR-65 NB - I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Basic | 4,656 | 120 | 106.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.3 | 27.4 | 0.8 | D |
| 105 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Diverge | 4,656 | 117 | 106.8\% |  |  |  | 711 | 44 | 106.0\% | 62.8 | 0.6 | 23.8 | 1.1 | C |
| 106 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Basic | 3,946 | 124 | 106.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.4 | 23.5 | 0.7 | C |
| 107 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | 3,948 | 121 | 107.0\% | 904 | 40 | 108.9\% | 637 | 52 | 101.1\% | 62.6 | 0.2 | 23.9 | 0.6 | C |
| 110 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,213 | 91 | 108.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.1 | 25.1 | 0.5 | C |
| 111 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 4,213 | 92 | 108.3\% | 238 | 27 | 99.1\% |  |  |  | 60.4 | 0.9 | 33.2 | 0.8 | D |
| 112 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,451 | 93 | 107.8\% |  |  |  | 1,960 | 77 | 108.3\% | 62.2 | 0.4 | 26.8 | 0.7 | C |
| 114 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,490 | 89 | 107.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.2 | 21.7 | 0.7 | C |
| 115 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 2,493 | 90 | 107.4\% | 516 | 40 | 99.2\% |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.1 | 18.8 | 0.6 | B |
| 116 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | 3,008 | 89 | 105.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.2 | 18.6 | 0.4 | C |
| 118 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,010 | 90 | 106.0\% |  |  |  | 1,299 | 59 | 106.4\% | 63.6 | 0.2 | 18.3 | 0.5 | B |
| 119 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,709 | 89 | 105.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.2 | 14.5 | 0.6 | B |
| 120 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 1,710 | 86 | 105.6\% | 51 | 11 | 101.8\% |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.3 | 14.5 | 0.6 | B |
| 121 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd to Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Weave | 1,763 | 88 | 105.5\% | 157 | 14 | 104.8\% | 355 | 41 | 98.6\% | 63.6 | 0.2 | 13.8 | 0.7 | B |
| 124 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,570 | 96 | 107.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.2 | 13.4 | 0.8 | B |
| 125 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy EB On-ramp | Merge | 1,570 | 98 | 107.6\% | 188 | 12 | 98.9\% |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.4 | 14.1 | 0.6 | B |
| 126 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | 1,757 | 95 | 106.5\% | 206 | 17 | 108.4\% | 415 | 39 | 96.4\% | 63.8 | 0.2 | 12.7 | 0.5 | B |
| 129 | SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,554 | 81 | 110.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.8 | 0.2 | 14.0 | 0.6 | B |
| 130 | SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Lincoln Blvd | Weave | 1,557 | 82 | 110.4\% | 262 | 29 | 104.6\% | 650 | 52 | 114.0\% | 63.8 | 0.3 | 12.6 | 0.7 | B |
| 133 | SR-65 NB - Lincoln Blvd to Ferrari Ranch Rd | Basic | 1,169 | 75 | 107.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.1 | 0.1 | 12.6 | 0.8 | B |
| 134 | SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 1,169 | 76 | 107.3\% |  |  |  | 695 | 70 | 106.9\% | 64.4 | 0.1 | 10.5 | 0.5 | B |
| 135 | SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 475 | 33 | 107.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.6 | 0.3 | 4.6 | 0.2 | A |
| 136 | SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | 476 | 34 | 108.2\% | 114 | 7 | 104.0\% |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.4 | 5.1 | 0.2 | A |
| 150 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 1,039 | 40 | 112.9\% |  |  |  | 80 | 15 | 114.3\% | 64.3 | 0.2 | 11.5 | 0.4 | B |
| 151 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 959 | 40 | 112.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.3 | 0.2 | 10.5 | 0.4 | A |
| 152 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 959 | 40 | 112.8\% | 898 | 18 | 108.2\% |  |  |  | 60.3 | 0.2 | 14.2 | 0.3 | B |
| 153 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | 1,859 | 47 | 110.6\% | 708 | 23 | 93.1\% |  |  |  | 60.1 | 0.5 | 19.0 | 0.4 | B |
| 154 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd to Lane Drop | Basic | 2,568 | 54 | 105.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.5 | 27.1 | 0.6 | D |
| 155 | SR-65 SB - Lane Drop to Lincoln Blvd | Basic | 2,568 | 55 | 105.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.4 | 26.9 | 0.6 | D |
| 156 | SR-65 SB - Lincoln Blvd to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | 2,569 | 57 | 105.3\% | 898 | 46 | 106.9\% | 323 | 33 | 107.7\% | 59.4 | 1.8 | 27.2 | 1.1 | C |
| 159 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,146 | 79 | 105.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.5 | 1.0 | 30.7 | 1.0 | D |
| 160 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Placer Pkwy | Weave | 3,146 | 77 | 105.6\% | 866 | 38 | 113.9\% | 441 | 38 | 110.2\% | 61.2 | 0.2 | 28.2 | 0.6 | D |
| 163 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,568 | 81 | 106.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 59.1 | 0.6 | 33.8 | 1.2 | D |
| 164 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,567 | 80 | 106.8\% | 291 | 27 | 107.6\% |  |  |  | 58.7 | 5.5 | 35.0 | 4.2 | E |
| 165 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy to Sunset Blvd | Weave | 3,857 | 84 | 106.8\% | 230 | 20 | 109.5\% | 465 | 49 | 101.0\% | 48.0 | 10.5 | 44.7 | 14.1 | E |
| 168 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,626 | 97 | 107.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26.1 | 5.8 | 76.1 | 17.5 | F |
| 169 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,627 | 96 | 107.9\% | 615 | 33 | 111.8\% |  |  |  | 27.3 | 1.7 | 74.5 | 5.8 | F |
| 170 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Weave | 4,240 | 108 | 108.4\% | 457 | 13 | 101.6\% | 909 | 52 | 108.2\% | 59.7 | 0.6 | 31.2 | 0.4 | D |
| 172 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to Lane Add | Basic | 3,777 | 105 | 107.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.1 | 32.4 | 0.7 | D |
| 173 | SR-65 SB - Lane Add to Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Basic | 3,775 | 101 | 107.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.1 | 27.8 | 0.4 | D |
| 174 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,330 | 91 | 94.6\% | 529 | 20 | 105.7\% |  |  |  | 59.2 | 0.4 | 27.0 | 0.3 | C |
| 175 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB to EB On-ramp | Basic | 4,305 | 105 | 107.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.3 | 24.4 | 0.3 | C |
| 176 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 4,306 | 105 | 107.1\% | 1,195 | 44 | 103.0\% |  |  |  | 61.1 | 0.6 | 26.3 | 0.6 | C |
| 177 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,501 | 121 | 106.2\% |  |  |  | 680 | 39 | 104.6\% | 62.2 | 1.0 | 25.3 | 0.6 | C |
| 178 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,822 | 122 | 106.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.4 | 21.5 | 0.4 | C |
| 179 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 4,822 | 124 | 106.5\% | 436 | 35 | 101.4\% |  |  |  | 61.2 | 0.4 | 28.5 | 0.6 | D |
| 180 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 5,256 | 137 | 106.0\% | 626 | 38 | 102.7\% |  |  |  | 61.1 | 0.6 | 25.3 | 0.6 | C |
| 181 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | 5,882 | 139 | 105.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.3 | 27.8 | 0.6 | D |
| 182 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,882 | 137 | 105.6\% |  |  |  | 1,191 | 65 | 102.7\% | 62.9 | 0.2 | 27.3 | 0.6 | C |
| 183 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,693 | 114 | 106.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.2 | 0.8 | 31.2 | 0.7 | D |
| 185 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 4,697 | 121 | 106.5\% | 723 | 28 | 103.3\% |  |  |  | 53.7 | 10.7 | 41.8 | 13.4 | E |
| 186 | SR-65 SB - I-80 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,425 | 138 | 106.2\% |  |  |  | 3,876 | 121 | 105.6\% | 59.2 | 0.9 | 34.3 | 1.0 | D |
| 187 | SR-65 SB - EB I-80 Connector (2 lanes) | Basic | 1,555 | 71 | 108.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 59.2 | 1.2 | 30.4 | 1.9 | D |
| 188 | SR-65 SB - EB I-80 Connector (1 lane) | Basic | 1,556 | 78 | 108.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.2 | 0.6 | 29.7 | 1.6 | D |
| 189 | SR-65 SB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 3,877 | 119 | 105.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51.6 | 0.3 | 39.9 | 1.2 | E |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| VISSIM Post-Processor Average Results from 10 Runs Freeway Operations Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SR 65 Widening Construction Year - GP Alternative PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 100 | SR-65 NB - EB l-80 Connector | Basic | 3,895 | 50 | 93.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35.1 | 4.3 | 63.2 | 6.2 | F |
| 101 | SR-65 NB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 1,785 | 71 | 100.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 46.6 | 9.1 | 31.3 | 7.7 | D |
| 103 | SR-65 NB - I-80 WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,895 | 56 | 92.9\% | 1,780 | 77 | 100.6\% |  |  |  | 56.5 | 11.4 | 36.3 | 12.2 | E |
| 104 | SR-65 NB - I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Basic | 5,673 | 115 | 95.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58.5 | 13.2 | 35.7 | 15.8 | E |
| 105 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,673 | 116 | 95.2\% |  |  |  | 1,044 | 52 | 90.8\% | 57.3 | 14.1 | 35.7 | 19.9 | E |
| 106 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,622 | 124 | 96.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.4 | 25.2 | 0.6 | C |
| 107 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | 4,618 | 129 | 96.0\% | 1,365 | 52 | 100.4\% | 1,022 | 50 | 100.2\% | 62.0 | 0.3 | 26.0 | 0.4 | C |
| 110 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,958 | 140 | 96.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.4 | 5.9 | 28.3 | 5.5 | D |
| 111 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 4,959 | 144 | 96.3\% | 708 | 50 | 99.7\% |  |  |  | 50.7 | 10.3 | 39.7 | 10.9 | E |
| 112 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,655 | 164 | 96.5\% |  |  |  | 1,974 | 120 | 95.3\% | 60.2 | 0.8 | 32.5 | 0.5 | D |
| 114 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,687 | 121 | 97.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.3 | 30.2 | 0.5 | D |
| 115 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 3,686 | 124 | 97.3\% | 756 | 49 | 103.6\% |  |  |  | 61.7 | 0.2 | 26.5 | 0.5 | C |
| 116 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | 4,439 | 124 | 98.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.2 | 26.8 | 0.6 | D |
| 118 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,441 | 123 | 98.3\% |  |  |  | 972 | 58 | 99.2\% | 62.7 | 0.1 | 27.7 | 0.7 | C |
| 119 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,466 | 107 | 97.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.2 | 28.2 | 1.4 | D |
| 120 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 3,465 | 107 | 97.9\% | 76 | 17 | 108.7\% |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.8 | 28.6 | 1.4 | D |
| 121 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd to Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Weave | 3,536 | 113 | 97.9\% | 199 | 16 | 104.7\% | 550 | 50 | 94.8\% | 62.1 | 0.3 | 26.7 | 1.2 | C |
| 124 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,181 | 102 | 98.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.2 | 26.4 | 1.2 | D |
| 125 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy EB On-ramp | Merge | 3,183 | 104 | 98.8\% | 263 | 14 | 94.1\% |  |  |  | 61.7 | 0.7 | 27.5 | 1.3 | C |
| 126 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | 3,446 | 108 | 98.4\% | 271 | 12 | 100.3\% | 827 | 54 | 102.0\% | 62.6 | 0.1 | 23.1 | 0.9 | C |
| 129 | SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,885 | 78 | 97.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.1 | 24.4 | 0.8 | C |
| 130 | SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Lincoln Blvd | Weave | 2,886 | 73 | 97.5\% | 274 | 26 | 91.4\% | 1,079 | 56 | 96.3\% | 63.2 | 0.1 | 20.3 | 0.6 | C |
| 133 | SR-65 NB - Lincoln Blvd to Ferrari Ranch Rd | Basic | 2,078 | 66 | 97.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.1 | 19.1 | 0.7 | C |
| 134 | SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,079 | 65 | 97.1\% |  |  |  | 1,397 | 66 | 96.4\% | 64.1 | 0.1 | 14.7 | 0.5 | B |
| 135 | SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 680 | 59 | 98.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.6 | 0.3 | 5.5 | 0.6 | A |
| 136 | SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | 678 | 61 | 98.3\% | 83 | 6 | 91.7\% |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.2 | 5.7 | 0.4 | A |
| 150 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 992 | 33 | 103.3\% |  |  |  | 144 | 15 | 96.0\% | 64.4 | 0.3 | 8.4 | 0.2 | A |
| 151 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 848 | 39 | 104.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.5 | 0.2 | 7.1 | 0.2 | A |
| 152 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 848 | 40 | 104.7\% | 476 | 18 | 99.1\% |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.2 | 8.0 | 0.2 | A |
| 153 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | 1,324 | 51 | 102.7\% | 319 | 16 | 91.1\% |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.2 | 10.7 | 0.3 | B |
| 154 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd to Lane Drop | Basic | 1,642 | 53 | 100.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.1 | 0.3 | 13.9 | 0.4 | B |
| 155 | SR-65 SB - Lane Drop to Lincoln Blvd | Basic | 1,642 | 54 | 100.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.1 | 0.2 | 13.8 | 0.4 | B |
| 156 | SR-65 SB - Lincoln Blvd to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | 1,643 | 54 | 100.2\% | 722 | 40 | 98.9\% | 259 | 32 | 96.0\% | 62.5 | 0.4 | 14.6 | 0.3 | B |
| 159 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,104 | 64 | 100.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.3 | 17.3 | 0.4 | B |
| 160 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Placer Pkwy | Weave | 2,105 | 66 | 100.2\% | 470 | 20 | 96.0\% | 463 | 45 | 98.5\% | 63.1 | 0.2 | 16.0 | 0.5 | B |
| 163 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,112 | 65 | 99.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.4 | 17.5 | 0.7 | B |
| 164 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy WB On-ramp | Merge | 2,112 | 70 | 99.6\% | 258 | 24 | 99.2\% |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.4 | 18.5 | 0.7 | B |
| 165 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy to Sunset Blvd | Weave | 2,368 | 81 | 99.5\% | 369 | 23 | 97.1\% | 260 | 30 | 96.3\% | 62.8 | 0.2 | 19.3 | 0.9 | B |
| 168 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,477 | 80 | 99.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.1 | 20.1 | 0.6 | C |
| 169 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 2,478 | 82 | 99.5\% | 795 | 34 | 106.0\% |  |  |  | 59.6 | 1.2 | 24.6 | 0.9 | C |
| 170 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Weave | 3,276 | 85 | 101.1\% | 745 | 25 | 100.7\% | 735 | 48 | 95.5\% | 62.2 | 0.2 | 24.7 | 0.7 | C |
| 172 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to Lane Add | Basic | 3,284 | 82 | 102.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.1 | 27.3 | 0.6 | D |
| 173 | SR-65 SB - Lane Add to Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Basic | 3,284 | 84 | 102.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.2 | 23.8 | 0.6 | C |
| 174 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,285 | 84 | 102.3\% | 474 | 26 | 100.9\% |  |  |  | 61.4 | 0.3 | 23.4 | 0.5 | C |
| 175 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB On to EB On-ramp | Basic | 3,760 | 89 | 102.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.1 | 21.0 | 0.5 | C |
| 176 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 3,760 | 88 | 102.2\% | 1,239 | 58 | 102.4\% |  |  |  | 61.9 | 0.3 | 23.3 | 0.4 | C |
| 177 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,003 | 106 | 102.3\% |  |  |  | 559 | 48 | 96.3\% | 63.0 | 0.8 | 23.2 | 0.6 | C |
| 178 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,445 | 109 | 103.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.2 | 18.6 | 0.3 | C |
| 179 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 4,442 | 111 | 103.1\% | 287 | 10 | 95.7\% |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.2 | 24.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 180 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 4,723 | 110 | 102.5\% | 734 | 25 | 96.6\% |  |  |  | 61.6 | 0.6 | 22.8 | 0.5 | C |
| 181 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | 5,454 | 104 | 101.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.4 | 23.8 | 0.5 | C |
| 182 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,454 | 103 | 101.6\% |  |  |  | 1,177 | 59 | 103.2\% | 63.3 | 0.2 | 23.9 | 0.5 | C |
| 183 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,270 | 97 | 101.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.4 | 26.1 | 0.4 | D |
| 185 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 4,267 | 96 | 100.9\% | 941 | 50 | 95.0\% |  |  |  | 57.6 | 2.9 | 33.3 | 1.3 | D |
| 186 | SR-65 SB - I-80 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,209 | 115 | 99.8\% |  |  |  | 3,291 | 113 | 100.3\% | 60.9 | 0.7 | 29.0 | 0.6 | D |
| 187 | SR-65 SB - EB I-80 Connector (2 lanes) | Basic | 1,924 | 89 | 99.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 54.0 | 6.9 | 37.3 | 6.1 | E |
| 188 | SR-65 SB - EB I-80 Connector (1 lane) | Basic | 1,922 | 84 | 99.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 59.2 | 2.1 | 34.3 | 2.0 | D |
| 189 | SR-65 SB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 3,294 | 107 | 100.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52.6 | 0.2 | 32.1 | 0.9 | D |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 1 | Lincoln Blvd/Sterling Parkway |  | Signal | 1,850 | 2,052 | 110.9\% | 10.7 | 0.4 | B |
| 2 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 1,285 | 1,436 | 111.8\% | 10.1 | 0.5 | B |
| 3 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 1,385 | 1,485 | 107.2\% | 9.0 | 1.2 | A |
| 4 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 2,650 | 2,856 | 107.8\% | 12.0 | 2.5 | B |
| 5 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 2,790 | 3,021 | 108.3\% | 13.3 | 0.4 | B |
| 6 | SR-65 SB Ramps-Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 4,530 | 4,721 | 104.2\% | 35.0 | 3.9 | C |
| 7 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 3,080 | 3,294 | 106.9\% | 14.9 | 3.2 | B |
| 8 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 3,605 | 3,725 | 103.3\% | 6.8 | 0.5 | A |
| 9 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 2,725 | 2,792 | 102.5\% | 13.8 | 0.8 | B |
| 10 | Stanford Ranch Rd/Five Star Blvd | Signal | 2,780 | 2,891 | 104.0\% | 26.7 | 1.5 | C |
| 11 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Stanford Ranch Rd | Signal | 3,440 | 3,622 | 105.3\% | 19.8 | 9.5 | B |
| 12 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd | Signal | 3,785 | 3,986 | 105.3\% | 17.4 | 4.9 | B |
| 13 | Galleria Blvd/Antelope Creek Dr | Signal | 2,941 | 3,106 | 105.6\% | 13.2 | 1.4 | B |
| 14 | Galleria Blvd/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 5,136 | 5,525 | 107.6\% | 41.8 | 9.0 | D |
| 15 | Creekside Ridge Dr/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 3,515 | 3,709 | 105.5\% | 8.3 | 2.6 | A |
| 16 | Taylor Rd/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,500 | 4,729 | 105.1\% | 45.6 | 8.8 | D |
| 17 | North Sunrise Ave/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,285 | 4,570 | 106.6\% | 27.7 | 3.2 | C |
| 18 | Wills Rd/Atlantic St | Signal | 1,985 | 2,182 | 109.9\% | 24.1 | 3.8 | C |
| 19 | I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St | Signal | 3,400 | 3,638 | 107.0\% | 14.1 | 1.6 | B |
| 20 | Taylor Rd-I-80 EB Ramps/Eureka Rd | Signal | 4,345 | 4,546 | 104.6\% | 25.3 | 4.6 | C |
| 21 | North Sunrise Ave/Eureka Rd | Signal | 3,950 | 4,152 | 105.1\% | 32.9 | 3.0 | C |
| 22 | Harding Blvd/Wills Rd | Signal | 355 | 362 | 102.1\% | 24.5 | 3.3 | C |
| 23 | Harding Blvd/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 2,685 | 2,924 | 108.9\% | 29.8 | 22.9 | C |
| 24 | I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 3,675 | 3,957 | 107.7\% | 23.6 | 7.2 | C |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 74,677 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 79,280 |
| Percent Served | $106.2 \%$ |

Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 25 | I-80 EB Ramps/Douglas Blvd |  | Signal | 4,060 | 4,410 | 108.6\% | 9.7 | 3.5 | A |
| 26 | North Sunrise Ave/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 4,400 | 4,711 | 107.1\% | 33.3 | 2.1 | C |
| 27 | Pacific St/Woodside Dr | Signal | 1,705 | 1,868 | 109.6\% | 6.9 | 0.8 | A |
| 28 | Pacific St/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 2,465 | 2,718 | 110.3\% | 24.1 | 1.6 | C |
| 29 | Granite Dr/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,301 | 2,375 | 103.2\% | 17.7 | 1.4 | B |
| 30 | I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,550 | 2,651 | 103.9\% | 28.6 | 3.4 | C |
| 31 | I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,690 | 2,873 | 106.8\% | 49.1 | 12.6 | D |
| 32 | Aguilar Rd/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 1,940 | 2,099 | 108.2\% | 20.3 | 16.2 | C |
| 33 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 NB Off-Ramp | Signal | 1,795 | 1,982 | 110.4\% | 6.3 | 0.8 | A |
| 34 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 SB On-Ramp | Signal | 1,245 | 1,358 | 109.1\% | 21.9 | 0.9 | C |
| 35 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy | Signal | 1,715 | 1,764 | 102.9\% | 8.4 | 0.6 | A |
| 36 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Signal | 1,625 | 1,736 | 106.8\% | 8.5 | 0.4 | A |
| 40 | Galleria Blvd/Berry St | Signal | 1,930 | 2,092 | 108.4\% | 10.8 | 1.9 | B |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 30,421 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 32,636 |
| Percent Served | $107.3 \%$ |

[^15]| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 1 | Lincoln Blvd/Sterling Parkway |  | Signal | 2,330 | 2,279 | 97.8\% | 9.5 | 0.5 | A |
| 2 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 1,100 | 1,067 | 97.0\% | 11.9 | 3.9 | B |
| 3 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 1,590 | 1,574 | 99.0\% | 11.4 | 1.0 | B |
| 4 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 2,885 | 3,022 | 104.8\% | 6.2 | 0.3 | A |
| 5 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 2,810 | 2,918 | 103.9\% | 13.6 | 0.9 | B |
| 6 | SR-65 SB Ramps-Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 5,450 | 5,643 | 103.5\% | 44.4 | 7.0 | D |
| 7 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 4,030 | 4,144 | 102.8\% | 18.3 | 2.3 | B |
| 8 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 5,200 | 5,184 | 99.7\% | 29.3 | 15.6 | C |
| 9 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 4,390 | 4,388 | 99.9\% | 32.5 | 34.8 | C |
| 10 | Stanford Ranch Rd/Five Star Blvd | Signal | 4,355 | 4,050 | 93.0\% | 75.9 | 16.7 | E |
| 11 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Stanford Ranch Rd | Signal | 5,615 | 5,675 | 101.1\% | 24.6 | 29.7 | C |
| 12 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd | Signal | 5,665 | 5,794 | 102.3\% | 16.6 | 2.3 | B |
| 13 | Galleria Blvd/Antelope Creek Dr | Signal | 4,720 | 4,690 | 99.4\% | 24.5 | 3.1 | C |
| 14 | Galleria Blvd/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 7,610 | 7,624 | 100.2\% | 61.5 | 8.1 | E |
| 15 | Creekside Ridge Dr/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,700 | 4,771 | 101.5\% | 31.7 | 5.8 | C |
| 16 | Taylor Rd/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 5,890 | 5,941 | 100.9\% | 52.9 | 9.4 | D |
| 17 | North Sunrise Ave/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 5,420 | 5,536 | 102.1\% | 41.2 | 7.5 | D |
| 18 | Wills Rd/Atlantic St | Signal | 2,965 | 3,019 | 101.8\% | 35.8 | 4.7 | D |
| 19 | I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St | Signal | 4,500 | 4,573 | 101.6\% | 12.2 | 1.4 | B |
| 20 | Taylor Rd-I-80 EB Ramps/Eureka Rd | Signal | 5,730 | 5,908 | 103.1\% | 72.2 | 11.2 | E |
| 21 | North Sunrise Ave/Eureka Rd | Signal | 5,565 | 5,777 | 103.8\% | 44.1 | 3.7 | D |
| 22 | Harding Blvd/Wills Rd | Signal | 370 | 401 | 108.4\% | 26.1 | 3.5 | C |
| 23 | Harding Blvd/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 3,710 | 3,595 | 96.9\% | 128.2 | 20.6 | F |
| 24 | I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 4,505 | 4,512 | 100.2\% | 31.2 | 7.9 | C |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 101,105 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 102,083 |
| Percent Served | $101.0 \%$ |

Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 25 | I-80 EB Ramps/Douglas Blvd |  | Signal | 5,210 | 5,221 | 100.2\% | 35.1 | 19.3 | D |
| 26 | North Sunrise Ave/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 5,850 | 5,741 | 98.1\% | 85.6 | 59.1 | F |
| 27 | Pacific St/Woodside Dr | Signal | 2,235 | 2,214 | 99.1\% | 7.0 | 1.0 | A |
| 28 | Pacific St/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 3,455 | 3,432 | 99.3\% | 29.1 | 2.6 | C |
| 29 | Granite Dr/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,690 | 3,479 | 94.3\% | 129.7 | 4.3 | F |
| 30 | I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,785 | 3,685 | 97.4\% | 25.1 | 6.0 | C |
| 31 | I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,535 | 3,555 | 100.6\% | 45.7 | 33.2 | D |
| 32 | Aguilar Rd/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,395 | 2,435 | 101.7\% | 22.7 | 3.0 | C |
| 33 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 NB Off-Ramp | Signal | 2,185 | 2,139 | 97.9\% | 9.1 | 0.9 | A |
| 34 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 SB On-Ramp | Signal | 1,135 | 1,129 | 99.4\% | 21.6 | 2.7 | C |
| 35 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy | Signal | 2,010 | 2,004 | 99.7\% | 8.9 | 0.8 | A |
| 36 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Signal | 2,035 | 2,030 | 99.8\% | 26.6 | 19.2 | C |
| 40 | Galleria Blvd/Berry St | Signal | 2,875 | 2,943 | 102.4\% | 10.0 | 1.3 | A |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 40,395 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 40,007 |
| Percent Served | $99.0 \%$ |

[^16]VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Results from 10 Runs
Queue Length

SR 65 Widening
Construction Year - GP Alternative
AM Peak Hour

Intersection 2
SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 440 | 19 | 5 | 105 | 16 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,500 | 13 | 6 | 100 | 16 | NO |

Intersection 3
SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 700 | 6 | 1 | 51 | 11 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,500 | 6 | 1 | 51 | 11 | NO |

Intersection 4
SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 360 | 45 | 7 | 189 | 31 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,330 | 47 | 7 | 191 | 31 | NO |

Intersection 5
SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd
Signalized

| Direction |  | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exceeds |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,400 | 62 | 6 | 265 | 34 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,400 | 9 | 2 | 85 | 18 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Results from 10 Runs
Queue Length

SR 65 Widening
Construction Year - GP Alternative
AM Peak Hour

Intersection 6
SR-65 SB Ramps-Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (ft) | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 200 | 21 | 3 | 116 | 37 | NO |
|  | Through | 2,260 | 71 | 9 | 328 | 75 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 200 | 0 | 1 | 57 | 64 | NO |

Intersection 7
SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ext | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 400 | 59 | 42 | 645 | 420 | MAX |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,100 | 60 | 42 | 646 | 420 | NO |

Intersection 8
SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |
|  | Left Turn | 430 | 25 | 4 | 132 | 23 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,130 | 27 | 4 | 134 | 23 | NO |

Intersection 9
SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd
Signalized

| Direction |  | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exceeds |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,420 | 36 | 1 | 129 | 18 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,420 | 34 | 2 | 129 | NO |  |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Results from 10 Runs
Queue Length

SR 65 Widening
Construction Year - GP Alternative
AM Peak Hour

Intersection 11
SR-65 NB Ramps/Stanford Ranch Rd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| EB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,800 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 13 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,170 | 9 | 2 | 100 | 24 | NO |

Intersection 12
SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| EB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,130 | 50 | 2 | 270 | 41 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,780 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 25 | NO |

Intersection 19
I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,430 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Results from 10 Runs Queue Length

SR 65 Widening
Construction Year - GP Alternative
AM Peak Hour

Intersection 20
Taylor Rd-I-80 EB Ramps/Eureka Rd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 180 | 74 | 25 | 391 | 448 | MAX |
|  | Through | 1,700 | 55 | 7 | 226 | 34 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 1,700 | 4 | 6 | 140 | 429 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn | 550 | 16 | 6 | 79 | 14 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 550 | 61 | 8 | 284 | 51 | NO |
| EB | Left Turn | 1,120 | 31 | 4 | 117 | 13 | NO |
|  | Through | 1,120 | 79 | 19 | 590 | 124 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 810 | 8 | 8 | 177 | 119 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through | 1,370 | 34 | 8 | 293 | 42 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 280 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | NO |

Intersection 24
I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas BIvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (ft) | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 1,530 | 65 | 65 | 328 | 78 | NO |
|  | Through | 1,530 | 65 | 65 | 328 | 78 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 730 | 65 | 65 | 328 | 78 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Results from 10 Runs
Queue Length

SR 65 Widening
Construction Year - GP Alternative
AM Peak Hour

Intersection 25
I-80 EB Ramps/Douglas Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage(ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,400 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,250 | 16 | 3 | 120 | 37 | NO |

Intersection 30
I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 700 | 10 | 3 | 99 | 29 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,230 | 14 | 4 | 114 | 29 | NO |

Intersection 31
I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,080 | 76 | 16 | 340 | 82 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,080 | 74 | 16 | 337 | 82 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Results from 10 Runs
Queue Length

SR 65 Widening
Construction Year - GP Alternative
AM Peak Hour

Intersection 33
Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 NB Off-Ramp
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Etd | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 1,940 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,940 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 | NO |

## Intersection 35

SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 1,650 | 29 | 5 | 190 | 37 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,650 | 29 | 5 | 190 | 37 | NO |

Intersection 36
SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |
|  | Left Turn | 1,620 | 23 | 4 | 149 | 28 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,620 | 23 | 4 | 149 | 28 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Results from 10 Runs
Queue Length

SR 65 Widening
Construction Year - GP Alternative
PM Peak Hour

Intersection 2
SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 440 | 19 | 4 | 82 | 13 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,500 | 12 | 4 | 78 | 13 | NO |

Intersection 3
SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 700 | 18 | 1 | 93 | 20 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,500 | 18 | 1 | 93 | 20 | NO |

Intersection 4
SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 360 | 30 | 3 | 127 | 19 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,330 | 32 | 3 | 129 | 19 | NO |

Intersection 5
SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,400 | 49 | 8 | 202 | 31 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,400 | 8 | 1 | 85 | 22 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Results from 10 Runs
Queue Length

SR 65 Widening
Construction Year - GP Alternative
PM Peak Hour

Intersection 6
SR-65 SB Ramps-Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 200 | 49 | 12 | 220 | 152 | MAX |
|  | Through | 2,260 | 55 | 9 | 245 | 36 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 200 | 1 | 1 | 37 | 116 | NO |

Intersection 7
SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ext | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 400 | 79 | 50 | 907 | 509 | MAX |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,100 | 80 | 50 | 908 | 509 | NO |

Intersection 8
SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |
|  | Left Turn | 430 | 24 | 3 | 115 | 19 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,130 | 27 | 2 | 117 | 19 | NO |

Intersection 9
SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd
Signalized

| Direction |  | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exceeds |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,420 | 57 | 13 | 229 | 130 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,420 | 56 | 13 | 229 | 130 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Results from 10 Runs
Queue Length

SR 65 Widening
Construction Year - GP Alternative
PM Peak Hour

Intersection 11
SR-65 NB Ramps/Stanford Ranch Rd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |  |
|  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |
| EB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,800 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 35 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,170 | 108 | 73 | 373 | 453 | NO |

Intersection 12
SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| EB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,130 | 50 | 3 | 267 | 38 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,780 | 8 | 3 | 165 | 49 | NO |

Intersection 19
I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,430 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 28 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Results from 10 Runs
Queue Length

SR 65 Widening
Construction Year - GP Alternative
PM Peak Hour

Intersection 20
Taylor Rd-I-80 EB Ramps/Eureka Rd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 180 | 981 | 119 | 1,664 | 13 | AVG |
|  | Through | 1,700 | 388 | 95 | 1,577 | 240 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 1,700 | 948 | 131 | 1,674 | 13 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn | 550 | 22 | 4 | 101 | 26 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 550 | 206 | 98 | 718 | 154 | MAX |
| EB | Left Turn | 1,120 | 32 | 19 | 159 | 31 | NO |
|  | Through | 1,120 | 136 | 7 | 626 | 65 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 810 | 11 | 2 | 234 | 73 | NO |
| WB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through | 1,370 | 193 | 25 | 849 | 136 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 280 | 45 | 14 | 486 | 136 | MAX |

Intersection 24
I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (ft) | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 1,530 | 67 | 66 | 296 | 41 | NO |
|  | Through | 1,530 | 67 | 66 | 296 | 41 | NO |
|  | Right Turn | 730 | 67 | 67 | 296 | 41 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Results from 10 Runs
Queue Length

SR 65 Widening
Construction Year - GP Alternative
PM Peak Hour

Intersection 25
I-80 EB Ramps/Douglas Blvd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |
|  | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,400 | 2 | 2 | 96 | 207 | NO |
| SB | Left Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,250 | 320 | 202 | 1,009 | 640 | NO |

Intersection 30
I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 700 | 24 | 6 | 187 | 90 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,230 | 33 | 6 | 202 | 90 | NO |

Intersection 31
I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds <br> Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| NB | Left Turn | 1,080 | 240 | 90 | 685 | 573 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,080 | 237 | 90 | 683 | 574 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Results from 10 Runs
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Intersection 33
Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 NB Off-Ramp
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Etd | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |
|  | Left Turn | 1,940 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,940 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 25 | NO |

## Intersection 35

SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds Storage? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SB | Left Turn | 1,650 | 28 | 2 | 150 | 20 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,650 | 28 | 2 | 150 | 20 | NO |

Intersection 36
SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy
Signalized

| Direction | Movement | Storage <br> (ft) | Average Queue (ft) |  | Maximum Queue (ft) |  | Exceeds |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Storage? |  |  |
|  | Left Turn | 1,620 | 35 | 4 | 216 | 47 | NO |
|  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1,620 | 35 | 4 | 216 | 47 | NO |

Note: The "Average Queue" is calaculated on a time-step basis so that queues when the approach is green (zero length) are included in the average.

# SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements 

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Vissim Model Results - Construction Year } \\
\text { Alternative } 3 \text { (No Build) }
\end{gathered}
$$

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Network Statistics

SR 65 Widening Construction Year - No Build AM Peak Period

| Network Performance | Vehicle Types | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Vehicles Served | All Vehicles | 168,625 | 81 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | All Vehicles | 788,490 | 1,746 |
| Travel Time [h] | All Vehicles | 18,266 | 205.6 |
| Average Speed [mph] | All Vehicles | 43.2 | 0.5 |
| Total Delay [h] | All Vehicles | 4,733 | 205.6 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | All Vehicles | 99 | 4.3 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | All Vehicles | 0.36 | 0.02 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | HOV | 32,341 | 38 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | HOV | 159,472 | 498 |
| Travel Time [h] | HOV | 3,489 | 30 |
| Average Speed [mph] | HOV | 45.7 | 0.4 |
| Total Delay [h] | HOV | 776 | 30 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | HOV | 84 | 3 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | HOV | 0.29 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | Truck | 7,552 | 15 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | Truck | 37,920 | 331 |
| Travel Time [h] | Truck | 905 | 15 |
| Average Speed [mph] | Truck | 41.9 | 1 |
| Total Delay [h] | Truck | 249 | 12 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | Truck | 116 | 6 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | Truck | 0.39 | 0.02 |


| Performance Measure | Vehicle Types |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HOV | Truck | All |
|  | 32,340 | 7,550 | 168,620 |
| Demand Volume | 33,520 | 8,150 | 170,610 |
| Percent Demand Served | $96.5 \%$ | $92.6 \%$ | $98.8 \%$ |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel | 159,470 | 37,920 | 788,490 |
| Person Miles of Travel | 334,890 | 39,820 | 965,810 |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel | 3,490 | 910 | 18,270 |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay | 780 | 250 | 4,730 |
| VHD \% of VHT | $22.3 \%$ | $27.5 \%$ | $25.9 \%$ |
| Average Delay per Vehicle $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.45 | 1.99 | 1.68 |
| Person Hours of Delay | 1,640 | 260 | 5,600 |
| Average Travel Speed | 45.7 | 41.9 | 43.2 |

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Peak Hour Travel Time


VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Network Statistics

SR 65 Widening
Construction Year - No Build Alternative PM Peak Period

| Network Performance | Vehicle Types | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Vehicles Served | All Vehicles | 233,868 | 256 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | All Vehicles | 909,556 | 2,008 |
| Travel Time [h] | All Vehicles | 25,868 | 397.3 |
| Average Speed [mph] | All Vehicles | 35.2 | 0.6 |
| Total Delay [h] | All Vehicles | 9,844 | 425.5 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | All Vehicles | 149 | 6.4 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | All Vehicles | 0.65 | 0.03 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | HOV | 46,090 | 82 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | HOV | 192,613 | 728 |
| Travel Time [h] | HOV | 4,875 | 37 |
| Average Speed [mph] | HOV | 39.5 | 0.3 |
| Total Delay [h] | HOV | 1,512 | 34 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | HOV | 116 | 3 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | HOV | 0.47 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | Truck | 9,024 | 30 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | Truck | 36,753 | 284 |
| Travel Time [h] | Truck | 1,121 | 30 |
| Average Speed [mph] | Truck | 32.8 | 1 |
| Total Delay [h] | Truck | 468 | 32 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | Truck | 183 | 13 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | Truck | 0.76 | 0.05 |


| Performance Measure | Vehicle Types |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HOV | Truck | All |
|  | 46,090 | 9,020 | 233,870 |
| Percent Demand Served | 47,310 | 9,670 | 235,630 |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel | $97.4 \%$ | $93.3 \%$ | $99.3 \%$ |
| Person Miles of Travel | 192,610 | 36,750 | 909,560 |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel | 4,490 | 38,590 | $1,123,280$ |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay | 1,510 | 1,120 | 25,870 |
| VHD \% of VHT | $31.0 \%$ | 470 | 9,840 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.97 | $42.0 \%$ | $38.0 \%$ |
| Person Hours of Delay | 3,170 | 3.13 | 2.52 |
| Average Travel Speed | 39.5 | 490 | 11,520 |

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Peak Hour Travel Time

SR 65 Widening
Construction Year - No Build Alternative
PM Peak Period

| Mode | Description | Distance <br> (ft) | Volume (vehicles) |  | Travel Time (min.:sec.) |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Speed (mph) } \\ \hline \text { Average } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SOV | SR-65 at Blue Oaks to I-80 at Antelope | 43,046 | 657 | 10 | 08:17 | 00:01 | 23.6 |
|  | I-80 at Auburn to SR-65 at Blue Oaks | 32,882 | 1,494 | 14 | 17:23 | 01:31 | 8.6 |
|  | I-80: Sierra College to Antelope | 45,827 | 498 | 10 | 08:16 | 00:01 | 25.2 |
|  | 1-80: Auburn to Sierra College | 36,777 | 706 | 13 | 16:25 | 01:30 | 10.2 |
|  | SR-65: I-80 to Sunset | 43,055 | 1,180 | 18 | 04:22 | 00:01 | 44.9 |
|  | SR-65: Sunset to Ferrari Ranch | 45,816 | 249 | 7 | 03:34 | 00:00 | 58.4 |
|  | SR-65: Ferrari Ranch to Sunset | 36,773 | 590 | 10 | 03:31 | 00:00 | 47.5 |
|  | SR-65: Sunset to I-80 | 32,883 | 782 | 13 | 04:11 | 00:01 | 35.8 |
| HOV | SR-65 at Blue Oaks to I-80 at Antelope | 43,046 | 119 | 6 | 08:15 | 00:03 | 44.9 |
|  | $1-80$ at Auburn to SR-65 at Blue Oaks | 32,882 | 573 | 12 | 09:38 | 00:21 | 58.4 |
|  | I-80: Sierra College to Antelope | 45,827 | 199 | 6 | 08:08 | 00:02 | 47.5 |
|  | 1-80: Auburn to Sierra College | 36,777 | 282 | 8 | 08:12 | 00:22 | 35.8 |
|  | SR-65: l-80 to Sunset | 43,055 | 419 | 9 | 04:21 | 00:01 | 23.7 |
|  | SR-65: Sunset to Ferrari Ranch | 45,816 | 52 | 3 | 03:34 | 00:01 | 15.5 |
|  | SR-65: Ferrari Ranch to Sunset | 36,773 | 94 | 4 | 03:31 | 00:01 | 25.6 |
|  | SR-65: Sunset to I-80 | 32,883 | 200 | 7 | 04:11 | 00:01 | 20.4 |


| VISSIM Post-Processor Average Results from 10 Runs Freeway Operations Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | nstructi | SR 65 n Year AM P | dening Build <br> Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| Location |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 1 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 7,239 | 35 | 110.0\% | 1,014 | 12 | 109.1\% |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.3 | 28.7 | 0.3 | D |
| 2 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | Basic | 8,245 | 67 | 109.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 53.7 | 3.7 | 38.8 | 3.1 | E |
| 3 | 1-80 EB - Douglas Blvd Slip Off | Diverge | 8,241 | 90 | 109.7\% |  |  |  | 1,434 | 83 | 109.4\% | 60.3 | 1.3 | 29.4 | 1.1 | D |
| 4 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,800 | 99 | 109.7\% |  |  |  | 575 | 47 | 108.5\% | 62.8 | 0.4 | 22.3 | 0.7 | C |
| 5 | 1-80 EB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,221 | 97 | 109.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.1 | 24.6 | 0.3 | C |
| 6 | 1-80 EB - Douglas Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 6,220 | 100 | 109.7\% | 822 | 23 | 91.3\% |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.5 | 27.7 | 0.9 | C |
| 7 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,044 | 100 | 107.2\% |  |  |  | 1,375 | 79 | 107.4\% | 61.7 | 0.5 | 28.9 | 0.9 | D |
| 8 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,667 | 83 | 107.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.2 | 23.9 | 0.4 | C |
| 9 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | 5,669 | 93 | 107.2\% | 174 | 6 | 96.8\% |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.1 | 21.9 | 0.7 | C |
| 10 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd to Taylor Rd | Weave | 5,847 | 93 | 106.9\% | 458 | 34 | 101.7\% | 359 | 33 | 105.5\% | 62.7 | 0.3 | 24.4 | 0.5 | C |
| 11 | 1-80 EB -Taylor Rd to SR 65 | Basic | 5,946 | 107 | 106.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.8 | 0.5 | 30.4 | 0.5 | D |
| 17 | I-80 EB - SR 65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,945 | 104 | 106.5\% |  |  |  | 3,119 | 105 | 106.8\% | 61.1 | 0.4 | 31.0 | 0.7 | D |
| 18 | I-80 EB - SR 65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,827 | 85 | 106.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.0 | 0.1 | 15.4 | 0.5 | B |
| 19 | I-80 EB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 2,826 | 83 | 106.2\% | 1,408 | 66 | 104.3\% |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.2 | 21.6 | 0.5 | C |
| 21 | I-80 EB - SR-65 to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 4,241 | 103 | 105.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.1 | 20.5 | 0.4 | C |
| 22 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,250 | 111 | 106.0\% |  |  |  | 1,473 | 66 | 103.7\% | 63.6 | 0.3 | 20.2 | 0.4 | C |
| 23 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,779 | 95 | 107.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.8 | 0.3 | 17.1 | 0.7 | B |
| 24 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 2,781 | 97 | 107.4\% | 239 | 8 | 95.7\% |  |  |  | 61.2 | 0.5 | 17.5 | 0.6 | B |
| 25 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd to Sierra College Blvd | Basic | 3,021 | 104 | 106.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.2 | 18.2 | 0.7 | C |
| 26 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,022 | 101 | 106.4\% |  |  |  | 399 | 49 | 105.0\% | 63.1 | 0.5 | 19.2 | 0.7 | B |
| 27 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,628 | 96 | 106.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.3 | 16.8 | 0.6 | B |
| 28 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 2,631 | 97 | 107.0\% | 131 | 4 | 100.8\% |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.2 | 15.8 | 0.7 | B |
| 29 | 1-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 2,761 | 101 | 106.6\% | 356 | 15 | 93.7\% |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.3 | 17.4 | 0.6 | B |
| 38 | 1-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,934 | 23 | 105.9\% |  |  |  | 846 | 49 | 105.7\% | 56.9 | 1.7 | 28.1 | 0.9 | D |
| 39 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,087 | 69 | 105.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.6 | 25.0 | 0.5 | C |
| 40 | 1-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 4,090 | 71 | 106.0\% | 51 | 4 | 84.8\% |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.4 | 22.2 | 0.4 | C |
| 41 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 4,140 | 75 | 105.6\% | 308 | 7 | 102.5\% |  |  |  | 61.3 | 1.1 | 23.8 | 0.5 | C |
| 42 | 1-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 4,446 | 85 | 105.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.3 | 0.2 | 26.9 | 0.4 | D |
| 43 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,444 | 81 | 105.3\% |  |  |  | 248 | 33 | 107.7\% | 61.4 | 0.4 | 27.6 | 0.5 | C |
| 44 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,198 | 93 | 105.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.1 | 25.2 | 0.4 | C |
| 45 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 4,197 | 93 | 105.2\% | 905 | 50 | 99.4\% |  |  |  | 60.4 | 1.4 | 26.8 | 0.7 | C |
| 46 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd to HOV Lane Start | Basic | 5,087 | 127 | 103.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.8 | 29.0 | 0.6 | D |
| 47 | I-80 WB - HOV Lane Start to SR-65 | Basic | 5,082 | 136 | 103.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.4 | 24.0 | 0.5 | C |
| 48 | I-80 WB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,085 | 134 | 103.8\% |  |  |  | 1,452 | 73 | 105.2\% | 63.4 | 0.4 | 22.1 | 0.5 | C |
| 49 | 1-80 WB - SR-65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,630 | 102 | 103.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.1 | 19.7 | 0.6 | C |
| 50 | 1-80 WB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 3,628 | 103 | 103.1\% | 3,836 | 112 | 104.5\% |  |  |  | 60.5 | 0.6 | 29.3 | 0.9 | D |
| 60 | I-80 WB - Taylor Rd On-ramp | Merge | 7,462 | 136 | 103.8\% | 618 | 39 | 108.5\% |  |  |  | 56.3 | 3.2 | 36.4 | 2.8 | E |
| 61 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,076 | 131 | 104.1\% |  |  |  | 334 | 37 | 104.4\% | 59.5 | 2.1 | 35.8 | 1.4 | E |
| 62 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,739 | 127 | 104.0\% |  |  |  | 993 | 51 | 102.3\% | 59.7 | 2.4 | 35.6 | 1.4 | E |
| 63 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,741 | 117 | 104.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.1 | 27.1 | 0.5 | D |
| 64 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St On-ramp | Merge | 6,740 | 107 | 104.2\% | 1,169 | 66 | 107.2\% |  |  |  | 56.8 | 3.7 | 37.7 | 2.8 | E |
| 65 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,904 | 113 | 104.5\% |  |  |  | 929 | 54 | 102.1\% | 59.8 | 0.7 | 33.2 | 0.7 | D |
| 66 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,974 | 122 | 104.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.3 | 28.5 | 0.4 | D |
| 67 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 6,974 | 124 | 104.9\% | 1,019 | 41 | 107.3\% |  |  |  | 57.0 | 2.2 | 32.1 | 1.8 | D |
| 68 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Slip On | Merge | 7,993 | 134 | 105.2\% | 454 | 31 | 105.5\% |  |  |  | 53.5 | 7.2 | 39.3 | 6.6 | E |
| 69 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd to Riverside Ave | Basic | 8,440 | 138 | 105.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.5 | 0.4 | 33.6 | 0.4 | D |
| 70 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,441 | 138 | 105.1\% |  |  |  | 925 | 52 | 100.6\% | 62.2 | 0.3 | 33.0 | 0.8 | D |
| 71 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,517 | 129 | 105.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.1 | 29.7 | 0.3 | D |
| 72 | 1-80 WB - Riverside Ave NB On-ramp | Merge | 7,518 | 125 | 105.7\% | 283 | 6 | 83.3\% |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.1 | 27.4 | 0.7 | C |
| 73 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave SB On-ramp | Merge | 7,800 | 111 | 104.7\% | 857 | 16 | 102.0\% |  |  |  | 55.7 | 11.2 | 38.2 | 12.9 | E |
| 74 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave to Antelope Rd | Basic | 8,659 | 131 | 104.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 44.8 | 13.6 | 52.2 | 17.8 | F |
| 75 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 8,659 | 192 | 104.5\% |  |  |  | 349 | 29 | 91.9\% | 40.5 | 13.7 | 61.1 | 18.8 | F |
| 76 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 8,306 | 232 | 105.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35.3 | 14.0 | 71.8 | 23.5 | F |
| 77 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 8,308 | 257 | 105.0\% | 566 | 13 | 97.6\% |  |  |  | 30.0 | 10.0 | 87.5 | 24.0 | F |
| 78 | 1-80 WB - Antelope Rd to Truck Scales | Weave | 8,908 | 235 | 104.9\% | 445 | 11 | 96.6\% | 91 | 19 | 83.1\% | 30.7 | 4.2 | 75.4 | 8.3 | F |
| 79 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales Off to On-ramp | Basic | 9,396 | 213 | 106.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30.1 | 0.7 | 83.2 | 2.2 | F |
| 80 | I-80 WB - Truck Scales On-ramp | Merge | 9,439 | 215 | 106.8\% | 92 | 20 | 83.5\% |  |  |  | 28.7 | 0.9 | 94.9 | 2.5 | F |
| 81 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales to Elkhorn Blvd | Basic | 9,580 | 169 | 107.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31.9 | 1.1 | 73.5 | 2.2 | F |
| 82 | 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 9,591 | 156 | 107.2\% |  |  |  | 809 | 52 | 109.4\% | 32.3 | 1.4 | 61.8 | 3.8 | F |
| 83 | 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 8,831 | 115 | 107.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26.5 | 0.4 | 92.7 | 2.0 | F |
| 84 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 8,829 | 110 | 107.5\% | 802 | 10 | 95.5\% |  |  |  | 26.6 | 0.3 | 96.2 | 1.3 | F |
| 85 | 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 9,647 | 105 | 106.6\% | 881 | 26 | 95.8\% |  |  |  | 32.7 | 0.3 | 77.0 | 0.8 | F |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| VISSIM Post-Processor Average Results from 10 Runs Freeway Operations Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | nstructi | SR 65 n Year AM Pe | dening <br> o Build <br> k Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 100 | SR-65 NB - EB I-80 Connector | Basic | 3,117 | 107 | 106.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 41.6 | 1.3 | 44.2 | 2.4 | E |
| 101 | SR-65 NB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 1,451 | 72 | 105.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51.1 | 0.4 | 24.5 | 0.9 | C |
| 103 | SR-65 NB - I-80 WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,113 | 109 | 106.6\% | 1,451 | 72 | 105.2\% |  |  |  | 60.8 | 0.7 | 28.2 | 0.8 | D |
| 104 | SR-65 NB - I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Basic | 4,568 | 131 | 106.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.2 | 26.9 | 0.8 | D |
| 105 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,568 | 132 | 106.2\% |  |  |  | 734 | 54 | 101.9\% | 62.8 | 0.3 | 23.9 | 1.0 | C |
| 106 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,838 | 119 | 107.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.2 | 23.2 | 0.7 | C |
| 107 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,839 | 117 | 107.2\% | 752 | 40 | 104.4\% |  |  |  | 57.7 | 2.0 | 31.3 | 1.6 | D |
| 109 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,591 | 141 | 106.8\% |  |  |  | 709 | 54 | 98.4\% | 58.3 | 1.2 | 35.6 | 1.9 | E |
| 110 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,882 | 144 | 108.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.6 | 0.5 | 35.8 | 1.5 | E |
| 111 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Weave | 3,880 | 141 | 108.4\% | 234 | 25 | 101.7\% | 1,805 | 75 | 108.7\% | 62.8 | 0.1 | 26.9 | 0.9 | C |
| 114 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,310 | 88 | 107.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.1 | 20.1 | 0.7 | C |
| 115 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 2,310 | 87 | 107.4\% | 467 | 35 | 99.3\% |  |  |  | 60.7 | 0.5 | 22.2 | 1.1 | C |
| 116 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | 2,778 | 97 | 106.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.3 | 25.2 | 1.3 | C |
| 118 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,776 | 100 | 105.9\% |  |  |  | 1,194 | 67 | 105.7\% | 63.6 | 0.2 | 19.4 | 1.1 | B |
| 119 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,583 | 82 | 106.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.2 | 13.9 | 0.9 | B |
| 120 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 1,582 | 78 | 106.1\% | 46 | 12 | 92.6\% |  |  |  | 63.8 | 0.2 | 13.8 | 0.8 | B |
| 121 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd to Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Weave | 1,629 | 77 | 105.8\% | 242 | 11 | 105.3\% | 321 | 37 | 97.4\% | 63.5 | 0.1 | 13.4 | 0.5 | B |
| 124 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,552 | 69 | 107.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.1 | 13.6 | 0.4 | B |
| 125 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy EB On-ramp | Merge | 1,553 | 69 | 107.8\% | 184 | 14 | 97.0\% |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.2 | 14.0 | 0.4 | B |
| 126 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy WB On-ramp | Merge | 1,737 | 74 | 106.6\% | 211 | 14 | 105.5\% |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.2 | 16.4 | 0.4 | B |
| 127 | SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr | Basic | 1,948 | 80 | 106.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.2 | 16.8 | 0.5 | B |
| 128 | SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off-ramp | Diverge | 1,948 | 78 | 106.5\% |  |  |  | 409 | 38 | 95.0\% | 63.1 | 0.2 | 17.1 | 0.6 | B |
| 129 | SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,542 | 76 | 110.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.2 | 14.0 | 0.6 | B |
| 130 | SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Lincoln Blvd | Weave | 1,546 | 68 | 110.4\% | 270 | 28 | 108.2\% | 641 | 46 | 112.5\% | 63.6 | 0.3 | 12.5 | 0.4 | B |
| 133 | SR-65 NB - Lincoln Blvd to Ferrari Ranch Rd | Basic | 945 | 56 | 87.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.0 | 0.2 | 12.3 | 0.5 | B |
| 134 | SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 1,177 | 63 | 108.9\% |  |  |  | 667 | 53 | 104.3\% | 64.4 | 0.2 | 10.1 | 0.4 | B |
| 135 | SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 512 | 42 | 116.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.5 | 0.3 | 4.9 | 0.5 | A |
| 136 | SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | 513 | 44 | 116.7\% | 114 | 6 | 103.5\% |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.3 | 5.4 | 0.5 | A |
| 150 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 990 | 26 | 112.5\% |  |  |  | 71 | 16 | 101.7\% | 64.3 | 0.2 | 11.2 | 0.2 | B |
| 151 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 919 | 27 | 113.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.3 | 0.1 | 10.3 | 0.3 | A |
| 152 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 919 | 29 | 113.5\% | 886 | 18 | 108.1\% |  |  |  | 60.3 | 0.2 | 13.8 | 0.3 | B |
| 153 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | 1,807 | 37 | 110.8\% | 697 | 22 | 92.9\% |  |  |  | 60.3 | 0.3 | 18.6 | 0.5 | B |
| 154 | SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd to Lane Drop | Basic | 2,505 | 46 | 105.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.6 | 26.4 | 0.6 | D |
| 155 | SR-65 SB - Lane Drop to Lincoln Blvd | Basic | 2,505 | 49 | 105.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.4 | 26.2 | 0.6 | D |
| 156 | SR-65 SB - Lincoln Blvd to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | 2,507 | 48 | 105.3\% | 873 | 50 | 106.5\% | 349 | 34 | 108.9\% | 60.8 | 0.7 | 25.4 | 0.6 | C |
| 159 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,032 | 67 | 105.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.3 | 28.5 | 0.5 | D |
| 160 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr On-ramp | Merge | 3,031 | 69 | 105.2\% | 598 | 25 | 112.8\% |  |  |  | 58.2 | 2.3 | 32.6 | 1.7 | D |
| 161 | SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Placer Pkwy | Basic | 3,628 | 80 | 106.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.5 | 0.3 | 33.6 | 0.6 | D |
| 162 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,625 | 87 | 106.3\% |  |  |  | 393 | 37 | 109.0\% | 62.2 | 0.1 | 31.0 | 0.6 | D |
| 163 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,228 | 90 | 105.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.1 | 28.3 | 0.7 | D |
| 164 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,224 | 91 | 105.7\% | 255 | 30 | 106.0\% |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.3 | 28.9 | 0.6 | D |
| 165 | SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy to Sunset Blvd | Weave | 3,479 | 93 | 105.8\% | 216 | 14 | 113.5\% | 549 | 44 | 103.6\% | 61.6 | 0.3 | 27.5 | 0.5 | C |
| 168 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,146 | 102 | 106.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.2 | 27.6 | 0.8 | D |
| 169 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,146 | 102 | 106.6\% | 292 | 24 | 112.2\% |  |  |  | 60.0 | 5.0 | 28.7 | 3.1 | D |
| 170 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 3,438 | 101 | 107.1\% | 346 | 18 | 101.8\% |  |  |  | 50.8 | 13.2 | 41.6 | 14.0 | E |
| 171 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Basic | 3,786 | 104 | 106.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 47.0 | 15.0 | 48.4 | 20.1 | F |
| 172 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,786 | 106 | 106.7\% |  |  |  | 637 | 46 | 106.1\% | 37.0 | 14.3 | 60.4 | 20.2 | F |
| 173 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,142 | 92 | 106.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17.6 | 3.0 | 96.2 | 11.5 | F |
| 174 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,134 | 93 | 106.2\% | 456 | 4 | 99.0\% |  |  |  | 20.8 | 1.4 | 80.9 | 3.6 | F |
| 175 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | 3,573 | 98 | 104.8\% | 1,212 | 59 | 101.9\% | 640 | 51 | 104.8\% | 35.8 | 0.8 | 56.5 | 1.4 | F |
| 178 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,139 | 84 | 103.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 59.6 | 1.0 | 35.5 | 1.0 | E |
| 179 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 4,136 | 83 | 103.7\% | 745 | 42 | 102.1\% |  |  |  | 61.7 | 0.4 | 29.5 | 0.4 | D |
| 180 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 4,879 | 94 | 103.4\% | 655 | 38 | 102.3\% |  |  |  | 59.3 | 2.9 | 29.9 | 1.9 | D |
| 181 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | 5,531 | 99 | 103.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.3 | 0.6 | 31.3 | 0.6 | D |
| 182 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,531 | 101 | 103.2\% |  |  |  | 1,013 | 59 | 97.4\% | 62.1 | 0.5 | 31.7 | 0.6 | D |
| 183 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,516 | 96 | 104.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.5 | 1.2 | 29.1 | 0.8 | D |
| 185 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 4,517 | 99 | 104.6\% | 721 | 40 | 103.0\% |  |  |  | 53.6 | 5.9 | 39.4 | 4.8 | E |
| 186 | SR-65 SB - I-80 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,238 | 126 | 104.4\% |  |  |  | 3,834 | 107 | 104.5\% | 60.0 | 0.7 | 32.0 | 0.8 | D |
| 187 | SR-65 SB - EB I-80 Connector (2 lanes) | Basic | 1,409 | 64 | 104.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.7 | 0.4 | 26.4 | 0.8 | D |
| 188 | SR-65 SB - EB I-80 Connector (1 lane) | Basic | 1,407 | 64 | 104.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.2 | 26.0 | 0.8 | D |
| 189 | SR-65 SB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 3,837 | 109 | 104.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51.8 | 0.3 | 38.5 | 1.2 | E |

[^17]Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| VISSIM Post-Processor Average Results from 10 Runs Freeway Operations Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SR 65 Widening Construction Year - No Build Alternative PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 1 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 7,543 | 182 | 100.4\% | 898 | 40 | 94.6\% |  |  |  | 36.9 | 16.6 | 72.4 | 36.2 | F |
| 2 | I-80 EB - Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd | Basic | 8,267 | 392 | 97.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31.1 | 10.7 | 80.7 | 26.3 | F |
| 3 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd Slip Off | Diverge | 8,210 | 427 | 97.0\% |  |  |  | 1,100 | 82 | 94.8\% | 29.3 | 3.8 | 75.8 | 11.7 | F |
| 4 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,053 | 375 | 96.6\% |  |  |  | 677 | 82 | 95.4\% | 22.6 | 0.9 | 129.9 | 7.5 | F |
| 5 | 1-80 EB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,266 | 378 | 95.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22.8 | 0.8 | 126.2 | 5.2 | F |
| 6 | I-80 EB - Douglas Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 6,220 | 410 | 94.4\% | 1,129 | 65 | 86.1\% |  |  |  | 15.2 | 1.4 | 128.6 | 5.3 | F |
| 7 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,300 | 389 | 92.4\% |  |  |  | 1,024 | 97 | 93.1\% | 19.9 | 1.6 | 106.0 | 4.5 | F |
| 8 | 1-80 EB - Eureka Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,286 | 298 | 92.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.8 | 0.5 | 125.2 | 3.8 | F |
| 9 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | 6,293 | 307 | 92.5\% | 320 | 22 | 103.1\% |  |  |  | 16.0 | 0.6 | 131.5 | 3.5 | F |
| 10 | I-80 EB - Eureka Rd to Taylor Rd | Weave | 6,629 | 300 | 93.2\% | 1,130 | 64 | 103.7\% | 519 | 57 | 89.5\% | 18.3 | 0.4 | 121.3 | 2.5 | F |
| 11 | 1-80 EB - Taylor Rd to SR-65 | Basic | 7,237 | 267 | 95.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19.1 | 1.6 | 109.0 | 5.0 | F |
| 17 | I-80 EB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,239 | 271 | 95.0\% |  |  |  | 3,883 | 90 | 96.1\% | 24.8 | 2.2 | 92.0 | 5.5 | F |
| 18 | 1-80 EB - SR-65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,347 | 203 | 93.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.4 | 17.0 | 1.0 | B |
| 19 | 1-80 EB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 3,343 | 204 | 93.4\% | 1,844 | 80 | 96.0\% |  |  |  | 62.3 | 0.9 | 23.1 | 0.9 | C |
| 21 | 1-80 EB - SR-65 to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 5,183 | 194 | 94.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.2 | 23.1 | 0.7 | C |
| 22 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,182 | 189 | 94.2\% |  |  |  | 1,619 | 82 | 95.8\% | 63.3 | 0.2 | 21.0 | 0.7 | C |
| 23 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,554 | 155 | 93.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.1 | 21.0 | 0.9 | C |
| 24 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,554 | 152 | 93.3\% | 280 | 26 | 107.8\% |  |  |  | 60.4 | 0.6 | 21.1 | 0.7 | C |
| 25 | 1-80 EB - Rocklin Rd to Sierra College Blvd | Basic | 3,825 | 150 | 94.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.1 | 21.9 | 0.7 | C |
| 26 | 1-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,823 | 151 | 93.9\% |  |  |  | 286 | 40 | 89.5\% | 62.3 | 0.5 | 23.4 | 0.9 | C |
| 27 | 1-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,534 | 156 | 94.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.4 | 20.7 | 0.8 | C |
| 28 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 3,533 | 154 | 94.2\% | 236 | 3 | 94.4\% |  |  |  | 61.3 | 0.5 | 19.7 | 0.9 | B |
| 29 | I-80 EB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 3,764 | 142 | 94.1\% | 579 | 24 | 96.5\% |  |  |  | 61.3 | 0.4 | 22.7 | 0.7 | C |
| 38 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,662 | 15 | 105.8\% |  |  |  | 584 | 42 | 106.2\% | 60.7 | 0.7 | 19.3 | 0.4 | B |
| 39 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,077 | 53 | 105.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.7 | 0.3 | 18.0 | 0.3 | B |
| 40 | 1-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd NB On-ramp | Merge | 3,076 | 48 | 105.7\% | 151 | 5 | 100.6\% |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.3 | 16.5 | 0.3 | B |
| 41 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd SB On-ramp | Merge | 3,227 | 57 | 105.5\% | 223 | 5 | 92.9\% |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.2 | 17.5 | 0.4 | B |
| 42 | I-80 WB - Sierra College Blvd to Rocklin Rd | Basic | 3,448 | 63 | 104.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.1 | 19.7 | 0.2 | C |
| 43 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,446 | 61 | 104.4\% |  |  |  | 283 | 39 | 104.7\% | 62.9 | 0.3 | 20.6 | 0.5 | C |
| 44 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,163 | 55 | 104.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.1 | 18.5 | 0.3 | C |
| 45 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,164 | 59 | 104.4\% | 1,323 | 50 | 97.3\% |  |  |  | 60.5 | 0.5 | 22.6 | 0.3 | C |
| 46 | I-80 WB - Rocklin Rd to HOV Lane Start | Basic | 4,478 | 85 | 102.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.3 | 24.2 | 0.4 | C |
| 47 | 1-80 WB - HOV Lane Start to SR-65 | Basic | 4,476 | 91 | 102.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.3 | 20.1 | 0.4 | C |
| 48 | 1-80 WB - SR-65 Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,474 | 90 | 101.9\% |  |  |  | 1,724 | 72 | 102.0\% | 63.9 | 0.2 | 18.1 | 0.4 | B |
| 49 | I-80 WB - SR-65 Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,743 | 78 | 101.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.1 | 15.5 | 0.4 | B |
| 50 | 1-80 WB - SR-65 On-ramp | Merge | 2,741 | 77 | 101.5\% | 3,213 | 108 | 100.1\% |  |  |  | 61.9 | 0.2 | 24.7 | 0.6 | C |
| 60 | I-80 WB - Taylor Rd On-ramp | Merge | 5,958 | 136 | 100.8\% | 425 | 43 | 78.8\% |  |  |  | 61.7 | 0.3 | 28.1 | 0.9 | D |
| 61 | 1-80 WB - Atlantic St WB Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,388 | 152 | 99.0\% |  |  |  | 390 | 31 | 102.5\% | 62.9 | 0.6 | 27.1 | 0.7 | C |
| 62 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St EB Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,000 | 143 | 98.8\% |  |  |  | 956 | 62 | 100.6\% | 62.8 | 0.4 | 28.1 | 0.8 | D |
| 63 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,039 | 135 | 98.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.1 | 20.4 | 0.5 | C |
| 64 | I-80 WB - Atlantic St On-ramp | Merge | 5,040 | 141 | 98.4\% | 1,394 | 70 | 102.5\% |  |  |  | 60.4 | 1.3 | 29.6 | 0.8 | D |
| 65 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 6,438 | 153 | 99.3\% |  |  |  | 904 | 71 | 98.3\% | 61.9 | 0.9 | 27.3 | 0.7 | C |
| 66 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 5,528 | 134 | 99.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.1 | 22.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 67 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 5,526 | 136 | 99.4\% | 1,411 | 70 | 100.1\% |  |  |  | 57.9 | 1.3 | 26.9 | 0.9 | C |
| 68 | 1-80 WB - Douglas Blvd Slip On | Merge | 6,929 | 171 | 99.4\% | 723 | 42 | 87.2\% |  |  |  | 60.2 | 1.6 | 30.7 | 1.3 | D |
| 69 | I-80 WB - Douglas Blvd to Riverside Ave | Basic | 7,662 | 162 | 98.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.3 | 30.2 | 0.8 | D |
| 70 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,666 | 154 | 98.3\% |  |  |  | 1,167 | 62 | 100.6\% | 62.7 | 0.1 | 31.2 | 0.7 | D |
| 71 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,494 | 175 | 97.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.1 | 24.9 | 0.7 | C |
| 72 | I-80 WB - Riverside Ave NB On-ramp | Merge | 6,488 | 173 | 97.7\% | 206 | 1 | 98.0\% |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.1 | 23.0 | 0.8 | C |
| 73 | 1-80 WB - Riverside Ave SB On-ramp | Merge | 6,693 | 178 | 97.7\% | 578 | 7 | 99.7\% |  |  |  | 61.5 | 1.2 | 27.2 | 0.8 | C |
| 74 | 1-80 WB - Riverside Ave to Antelope Rd | Basic | 7,267 | 178 | 97.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.6 | 28.1 | 0.8 | D |
| 75 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,274 | 155 | 97.9\% |  |  |  | 942 | 59 | 98.2\% | 61.9 | 1.4 | 29.3 | 1.0 | D |
| 76 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,334 | 149 | 97.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.4 | 24.4 | 0.7 | C |
| 77 | I-80 WB - Antelope Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 6,334 | 150 | 97.9\% | 373 | 8 | 98.2\% |  |  |  | 60.7 | 0.9 | 22.9 | 0.9 | C |
| 78 | 1-80 WB - Antelope Rd to Truck Scales | Weave | 6,702 | 151 | 97.8\% | 368 | 15 | 99.5\% | 61 | 15 | 100.8\% | 62.7 | 0.3 | 23.9 | 0.6 | C |
| 79 | I-80 WB - Truck Scales Off to On-ramp | Basic | 7,011 | 154 | 97.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.1 | 26.2 | 0.6 | D |
| 80 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales On-ramp | Merge | 7,015 | 152 | 98.0\% | 61 | 14 | 101.2\% |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.1 | 26.7 | 0.4 | C |
| 81 | 1-80 WB - Truck Scales to Elkhorn Blvd | Basic | 7,071 | 160 | 97.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.3 | 27.5 | 0.7 | D |
| 82 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 7,072 | 158 | 98.0\% |  |  |  | 1,047 | 65 | 95.1\% | 62.6 | 0.2 | 25.6 | 0.7 | C |
| 83 | 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 6,024 | 129 | 98.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.2 | 23.1 | 0.5 | C |
| 84 | 1-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 6,022 | 131 | 98.4\% | 898 | 3 | 99.8\% |  |  |  | 58.5 | 0.7 | 24.6 | 0.7 | C |
| 85 | I-80 WB - Elkhorn Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 6,925 | 133 | 98.6\% | 658 | 16 | 102.8\% |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.6 | 28.3 | 0.7 | D |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| VISSIM Post-Processor <br> Average Results from 10 Runs <br> Freeway Operations Summary $\qquad$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SR 65 Widening Construction Year - No Build Alternative PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
|  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 100 SR-65 NB - EB I-80 Connector | Basic | 3,881 | 86 | 96.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36.1 | 0.7 | 61.5 | 1.7 | F |
| 101 SR-65 NB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 1,724 | 72 | 102.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50.3 | 0.4 | 27.8 | 0.9 | D |
| 103 SR-65 NB - I-80 On-ramp | Merge | 3,879 | 85 | 96.0\% | 1,723 | 69 | 102.0\% |  |  |  | 60.2 | 0.5 | 32.3 | 0.4 | D |
| 104 SR-65 NB - I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Basic | 5,605 | 114 | 97.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.2 | 30.6 | 0.3 | D |
| 105 SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,604 | 115 | 97.8\% |  |  |  | 1,158 | 67 | 95.7\% | 62.1 | 0.5 | 29.5 | 0.2 | D |
| 106 SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,441 | 117 | 98.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 0.4 | 24.7 | 0.4 | C |
| 107 SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | 4,441 | 117 | 98.2\% | 904 | 44 | 97.2\% |  |  |  | 56.9 | 3.2 | 32.5 | 1.7 | D |
| 109 SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,338 | 110 | 98.0\% |  |  |  | 1,132 | 57 | 96.7\% | 58.3 | 1.0 | 35.8 | 1.1 | E |
| 110 SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,206 | 110 | 98.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.4 | 35.8 | 0.7 | E |
| 111 SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Weave | 4,207 | 110 | 98.3\% | 596 | 30 | 99.3\% | 1,786 | 85 | 99.2\% | 62.2 | 0.3 | 28.7 | 0.5 | D |
| 114 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,019 | 92 | 98.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.1 | 25.0 | 0.6 | C |
| 115 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 3,016 | 96 | 97.9\% | 488 | 36 | 101.6\% |  |  |  | 60.9 | 0.5 | 27.5 | 0.8 | C |
| 116 SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | 3,501 | 104 | 98.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.2 | 29.4 | 0.8 | D |
| 118 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,501 | 101 | 98.3\% |  |  |  | 609 | 30 | 101.6\% | 62.7 | 0.2 | 26.7 | 0.8 | C |
| 119 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,886 | 91 | 97.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.7 | 0.2 | 25.0 | 0.8 | C |
| 120 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 2,887 | 91 | 97.5\% | 135 | 16 | 103.5\% |  |  |  | 62.3 | 0.3 | 25.5 | 0.9 | C |
| 121 SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd to Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Weave | 3,020 | 98 | 97.7\% | 396 | 16 | 98.9\% | 469 | 52 | 95.8\% | 62.2 | 0.3 | 25.0 | 0.7 | C |
| 124 SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,940 | 84 | 98.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.6 | 0.1 | 25.5 | 0.5 | C |
| 125 SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy EB On-ramp | Merge | 2,941 | 85 | 98.0\% | 169 | 9 | 93.8\% |  |  |  | 62.3 | 0.2 | 26.0 | 0.5 | C |
| 126 SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,108 | 85 | 97.7\% | 267 | 15 | 102.7\% |  |  |  | 61.6 | 0.3 | 28.8 | 0.6 | D |
| 127 SR-65 NB - Whitney Ranch Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr | Basic | 3,369 | 85 | 97.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.1 | 29.1 | 0.5 | D |
| 128 SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,367 | 84 | 97.9\% |  |  |  | 719 | 54 | 104.2\% | 61.3 | 0.5 | 29.9 | 0.6 | D |
| 129 SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,645 | 72 | 96.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.2 | 23.3 | 0.5 | C |
| 130 SR-65 NB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Lincoln Blvd | Weave | 2,640 | 78 | 96.0\% | 268 | 24 | 92.5\% | 984 | 52 | 96.4\% | 63.3 | 0.2 | 19.4 | 0.4 | B |
| 133 SR-65 NB - Lincoln Blvd to Ferrari Ranch Rd | Basic | 1,922 | 67 | 95.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.1 | 18.5 | 0.6 | C |
| 134 SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 1,920 | 67 | 95.1\% |  |  |  | 1,331 | 64 | 95.1\% | 64.1 | 0.1 | 14.5 | 0.5 | B |
| 135 SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 588 | 41 | 94.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.5 | 0.2 | 5.4 | 0.3 | A |
| 136 SR-65 NB - Ferrari Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | 587 | 41 | 94.7\% | 83 | 5 | 92.0\% |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.2 | 5.6 | 0.2 | A |
| 150 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 950 | 36 | 101.1\% |  |  |  | 144 | 16 | 96.3\% | 64.5 | 0.2 | 8.2 | 0.2 | A |
| 151 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 806 | 35 | 102.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.5 | 0.2 | 6.9 | 0.2 | A |
| 152 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd WB On-ramp | Merge | 807 | 36 | 102.1\% | 475 | 17 | 101.1\% |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.3 | 7.8 | 0.2 | A |
| 153 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd EB On-ramp | Merge | 1,281 | 35 | 101.7\% | 326 | 16 | 93.0\% |  |  |  | 62.5 | 0.2 | 10.4 | 0.3 | B |
| 154 SR-65 SB - Ferrari Ranch Rd to Lane Drop | Basic | 1,605 | 36 | 99.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.1 | 0.2 | 13.6 | 0.3 | B |
| 155 SR-65 SB - Lane Drop to Lincoln Blvd | Basic | 1,605 | 38 | 99.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.2 | 0.2 | 13.6 | 0.3 | B |
| 156 SR-65 SB - Lincoln Blvd to Twelve Bridges Dr | Weave | 1,604 | 46 | 99.6\% | 700 | 43 | 98.6\% | 262 | 30 | 97.0\% | 62.5 | 0.3 | 14.4 | 0.3 | B |
| 159 SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,043 | 61 | 99.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.2 | 16.9 | 0.4 | B |
| 160 SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr On-ramp | Merge | 2,043 | 61 | 99.7\% | 391 | 17 | 97.7\% |  |  |  | 61.9 | 0.5 | 18.7 | 0.5 | B |
| 161 SR-65 SB - Twelve Bridges Dr to Placer Pkwy | Basic | 2,434 | 63 | 99.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.2 | 20.0 | 0.6 | C |
| 162 SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,432 | 66 | 99.2\% |  |  |  | 446 | 37 | 99.1\% | 63.4 | 0.2 | 18.9 | 0.5 | B |
| 163 SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy Off to On-ramp | Basic | 1,992 | 62 | 99.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6 | 0.2 | 16.5 | 0.6 | B |
| 164 SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy WB On-ramp | Merge | 1,991 | 62 | 99.6\% | 301 | 27 | 96.9\% |  |  |  | 62.3 | 0.7 | 18.2 | 0.7 | B |
| 165 SR-65 SB - Placer Pkwy to Sunset Blvd | Weave | 2,293 | 67 | 99.2\% | 284 | 27 | 94.6\% | 368 | 34 | 99.5\% | 62.8 | 0.2 | 17.9 | 0.4 | B |
| 168 SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,207 | 77 | 98.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.1 | 18.2 | 0.6 | C |
| 169 SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 2,206 | 78 | 98.5\% | 605 | 14 | 102.5\% |  |  |  | 61.3 | 0.3 | 21.1 | 0.5 | C |
| 170 SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 2,808 | 79 | 99.2\% | 533 | 28 | 100.5\% |  |  |  | 60.9 | 0.7 | 28.3 | 0.7 | D |
| 171 SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Basic | 3,340 | 83 | 99.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.4 | 28.6 | 0.7 | D |
| 172 SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,337 | 83 | 99.3\% |  |  |  | 620 | 49 | 93.9\% | 62.6 | 0.2 | 27.9 | 0.5 | C |
| 173 SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,715 | 92 | 100.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.2 | 22.6 | 0.8 | C |
| 174 SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 2,714 | 89 | 100.5\% | 343 | 1 | 90.4\% |  |  |  | 61.2 | 0.3 | 24.1 | 0.8 | C |
| 175 SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | 3,058 | 87 | 99.3\% | 1,180 | 77 | 96.7\% | 524 | 46 | 91.9\% | 59.7 | 0.7 | 26.3 | 0.8 | C |
| 178 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,718 | 116 | 99.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.0 | 0.5 | 31.2 | 0.9 | D |
| 179 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,717 | 115 | 99.7\% | 525 | 36 | 101.0\% |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.3 | 26.7 | 0.6 | C |
| 180 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 4,240 | 122 | 99.8\% | 799 | 44 | 97.4\% |  |  |  | 60.9 | 0.7 | 25.9 | 0.8 | C |
| 181 SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | 5,034 | 125 | 99.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.9 | 0.2 | 26.8 | 0.7 | D |
| 182 SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,034 | 124 | 99.3\% |  |  |  | 945 | 63 | 94.5\% | 64.9 | 0.1 | 27.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 183 SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,051 | 111 | 99.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.3 | 24.7 | 0.5 | C |
| 185 SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 4,049 | 108 | 99.5\% | 1,003 | 65 | 94.6\% |  |  |  | 55.9 | 3.7 | 33.2 | 2.4 | D |
| 186 SR-65 SB - l-80 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,050 | 131 | 98.4\% |  |  |  | 3,206 | 110 | 167.0\% | 60.8 | 0.8 | 28.3 | 0.6 | D |
| 187 SR-65 SB - EB I-80 Connector (2 lanes) | Basic | 1,850 | 71 | 96.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55.6 | 2.6 | 34.9 | 2.3 | D |
| 188 SR-65 SB - EB I-80 Connector (1 lane) | Basic | 1,847 | 76 | 96.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.1 | 0.5 | 32.7 | 1.0 | D |
| 189 SR-65 SB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 3,210 | 110 | 100.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52.6 | 0.3 | 31.6 | 0.8 | D |

[^18]Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 1 | Lincoln Blvd/Sterling Parkway |  | Signal | 1,890 | 2,073 | 109.7\% | 9.8 | 0.9 | A |
| 2 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 1,150 | 1,285 | 111.7\% | 8.6 | 0.6 | A |
| 3 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 1,285 | 1,372 | 106.7\% | 8.8 | 1.0 | A |
| 4 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 2,300 | 2,448 | 106.4\% | 10.4 | 0.4 | B |
| 5 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 2,585 | 2,790 | 107.9\% | 14.7 | 2.9 | B |
| 6 | SR-65 SB Ramps-Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 4,580 | 4,733 | 103.3\% | 51.8 | 17.7 | D |
| 7 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 3,040 | 3,270 | 107.6\% | 12.7 | 3.3 | B |
| 8 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 3,900 | 4,022 | 103.1\% | 5.9 | 0.4 | A |
| 9 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 2,985 | 3,028 | 101.4\% | 11.1 | 0.5 | B |
| 10 | Stanford Ranch Rd/Five Star Blvd | Signal | 2,885 | 2,990 | 103.6\% | 28.9 | 1.5 | C |
| 11 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Stanford Ranch Rd | Signal | 3,435 | 3,601 | 104.8\% | 17.5 | 16.8 | B |
| 12 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd | Signal | 3,675 | 3,781 | 102.9\% | 17.2 | 1.2 | B |
| 13 | Galleria Blvd/Antelope Creek Dr | Signal | 2,855 | 2,925 | 102.5\% | 13.9 | 2.1 | B |
| 14 | Galleria Blvd/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 5,195 | 5,528 | 106.4\% | 37.1 | 0.7 | D |
| 15 | Creekside Ridge Dr/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 3,550 | 3,736 | 105.2\% | 10.6 | 7.5 | B |
| 16 | Taylor Rd/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,530 | 4,773 | 105.4\% | 132.5 | 18.6 | F |
| 17 | North Sunrise Ave/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,325 | 4,588 | 106.1\% | 23.3 | 1.0 | C |
| 18 | Wills Rd/Atlantic St | Signal | 1,955 | 2,170 | 111.0\% | 18.9 | 2.6 | B |
| 19 | I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St | Signal | 3,395 | 3,628 | 106.9\% | 11.0 | 1.0 | B |
| 20 | Taylor Rd-I-80 EB Ramps/Eureka Rd | Signal | 4,385 | 4,628 | 105.5\% | 22.4 | 1.4 | C |
| 21 | North Sunrise Ave/Eureka Rd | Signal | 3,995 | 4,203 | 105.2\% | 26.0 | 2.3 | C |
| 22 | Harding Blvd/Wills Rd | Signal | 2,125 | 2,262 | 106.4\% | 14.3 | 1.6 | B |
| 23 | Harding Blvd/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 2,735 | 2,956 | 108.1\% | 36.2 | 18.8 | D |
| 24 | I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 3,680 | 3,953 | 107.4\% | 19.7 | 3.6 | B |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 76,435 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 80,742 |
| Percent Served | $105.6 \%$ |

Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 25 | I-80 EB Ramps/Douglas Blvd |  | Signal | 4,060 | 4,395 | 108.3\% | 11.5 | 8.6 | B |
| 26 | North Sunrise Ave/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 4,380 | 4,662 | 106.4\% | 28.3 | 1.3 | C |
| 27 | Pacific St/Woodside Dr | Signal | 1,700 | 1,869 | 109.9\% | 8.7 | 0.9 | A |
| 28 | Pacific St/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 2,600 | 2,863 | 110.1\% | 26.8 | 1.0 | C |
| 29 | Granite Dr/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,401 | 2,497 | 104.0\% | 19.3 | 1.9 | B |
| 30 | I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,655 | 2,771 | 104.4\% | 20.5 | 5.5 | C |
| 31 | I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,745 | 2,900 | 105.6\% | 36.5 | 21.4 | D |
| 32 | Aguilar Rd/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 1,930 | 2,050 | 106.2\% | 23.2 | 34.0 | C |
| 33 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 NB Off-Ramp | Signal | 1,835 | 2,011 | 109.6\% | 6.2 | 0.7 | A |
| 34 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 SB On-Ramp | Signal | 1,270 | 1,366 | 107.5\% | 20.4 | 2.4 | C |
| 35 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy | Signal | 1,690 | 1,734 | 102.6\% | 8.8 | 0.6 | A |
| 36 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Signal | 1,625 | 1,729 | 106.4\% | 10.8 | 6.8 | B |
| 40 | Galleria Blvd/Berry St | Signal | 1,965 | 2,076 | 105.7\% | 10.6 | 2.1 | B |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 30,856 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 32,922 |
| Percent Served | $106.7 \%$ |

[^19]| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 1 | Lincoln Blvd/Sterling Parkway |  | Signal | 2,455 | 2,413 | 98.3\% | 8.4 | 0.7 | A |
| 2 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 985 | 962 | 97.6\% | 6.8 | 0.9 | A |
| 3 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Twelve Bridges Dr | Signal | 1,430 | 1,433 | 100.2\% | 8.6 | 0.7 | A |
| 4 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 2,725 | 2,832 | 103.9\% | 12.2 | 6.3 | B |
| 5 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 2,725 | 2,832 | 103.9\% | 16.8 | 9.4 | B |
| 6 | SR-65 SB Ramps-Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 5,485 | 5,359 | 97.7\% | 125.7 | 14.8 | F |
| 7 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Blue Oaks Blvd | Signal | 3,725 | 3,791 | 101.8\% | 70.1 | 21.0 | E |
| 8 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 5,230 | 5,189 | 99.2\% | 6.6 | 0.7 | A |
| 9 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Pleasant Grove Blvd | Signal | 4,500 | 4,493 | 99.8\% | 11.6 | 3.0 | B |
| 10 | Stanford Ranch Rd/Five Star Blvd | Signal | 4,575 | 4,556 | 99.6\% | 48.3 | 2.8 | D |
| 11 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Stanford Ranch Rd | Signal | 5,410 | 5,375 | 99.4\% | 12.3 | 1.0 | B |
| 12 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Galleria Blvd | Signal | 5,465 | 5,396 | 98.7\% | 15.9 | 0.9 | B |
| 13 | Galleria Blvd/Antelope Creek Dr | Signal | 4,545 | 4,308 | 94.8\% | 24.4 | 1.9 | C |
| 14 | Galleria Blvd/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 7,650 | 7,502 | 98.1\% | 57.7 | 11.4 | E |
| 15 | Creekside Ridge Dr/Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 4,675 | 4,583 | 98.0\% | 25.7 | 5.1 | C |
| 16 | Taylor Rd/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 5,880 | 5,852 | 99.5\% | 42.4 | 3.2 | D |
| 17 | North Sunrise Ave/East Roseville Pkwy | Signal | 5,465 | 5,518 | 101.0\% | 30.0 | 2.4 | C |
| 18 | Wills Rd/Atlantic St | Signal | 2,945 | 3,047 | 103.5\% | 22.1 | 2.3 | C |
| 19 | I-80 WB Ramps/Atlantic St | Signal | 4,435 | 4,545 | 102.5\% | 11.8 | 1.2 | B |
| 20 | Taylor Rd-I-80 EB Ramps/Eureka Rd | Signal | 5,725 | 5,841 | 102.0\% | 40.9 | 6.5 | D |
| 21 | North Sunrise Ave/Eureka Rd | Signal | 5,595 | 5,832 | 104.2\% | 62.0 | 19.8 | E |
| 22 | Harding Blvd/Wills Rd | Signal | 2,990 | 3,069 | 102.6\% | 19.2 | 2.3 | B |
| 23 | Harding Blvd/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 3,785 | 3,616 | 95.5\% | 91.9 | 27.6 | F |
| 24 | I-80 WB Ramps/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 4,510 | 4,481 | 99.4\% | 30.8 | 5.1 | C |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 102,910 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 102,822 |
| Percent Served | $99.9 \%$ |

Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

| Intersection |  | Control | Volume (vph) |  | Percent Served | Delay (sec/veh) |  | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Served | Average |  | Std. Dev. |  |
| 25 | I-80 EB Ramps/Douglas Blvd |  | Signal | 5,245 | 5,188 | 98.9\% | 28.6 | 9.2 | C |
| 26 | North Sunrise Ave/Douglas Blvd | Signal | 5,870 | 5,874 | 100.1\% | 39.0 | 1.6 | D |
| 27 | Pacific St/Woodside Dr | Signal | 2,250 | 2,052 | 91.2\% | 8.5 | 1.2 | A |
| 28 | Pacific St/Sunset Blvd | Signal | 3,580 | 3,113 | 87.0\% | 85.7 | 1.6 | F |
| 29 | Granite Dr/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,740 | 3,655 | 97.7\% | 127.0 | 4.9 | F |
| 30 | I-80 WB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,770 | 3,766 | 99.9\% | 38.2 | 13.5 | D |
| 31 | I-80 EB Ramps/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 3,545 | 3,576 | 100.9\% | 32.7 | 7.2 | C |
| 32 | Aguilar Rd/Rocklin Rd | Signal | 2,415 | 2,453 | 101.6\% | 30.2 | 8.8 | C |
| 33 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 NB Off-Ramp | Signal | 2,315 | 2,271 | 98.1\% | 7.8 | 0.8 | A |
| 34 | Lincoln Blvd/SR-65 SB On-Ramp | Signal | 1,300 | 1,292 | 99.4\% | 21.4 | 3.0 | C |
| 35 | SR-65 SB Ramps/Placer Pkwy | Signal | 1,950 | 1,958 | 100.4\% | 8.5 | 0.6 | A |
| 36 | SR-65 NB Ramps/Whitney Ranch Pkwy | Signal | 1,945 | 1,953 | 100.4\% | 22.5 | 17.4 | C |
| 40 | Galleria Blvd/Berry St | Signal | 2,855 | 2,890 | 101.2\% | 9.5 | 2.0 | A |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Network Summary |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Demand Volume (veh/hr) | 40,780 |
| Total Volume Served (veh/hr) | 40,042 |
| Percent Served | $98.2 \%$ |

[^20]
## SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements

## OD Adjustment Methodology Memorandum

# FEHRやPEERS 

# MEMORANDUM 

Date: May 27, 2014

To: Matt Brogan, Mark Thomas

From: Ronald T. Milam, Fehr \& Peers

Subject: SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements Project - OD Adjustment Methodology

The purpose of this memorandum is to describe the methodology proposed to modify the preliminary traffic volume forecasts for the SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements Project (SR 65 COI). Preliminary forecasts were developed as part of the screening assessment for this project based on travel forecast modeling completed for the I-80/SR 65 Interchange project. The preliminary forecasts will be refined for the final alternatives that are carried forward from the screening assessment into final traffic operations analysis. Refinements are desired to better capture recent land use planning decisions that have occurred in the City of Lincoln.

## BACKGROUND

During the development of traffic forecasts for the I-80/SR 65 Interchange project, future development in the City of Lincoln was concentrated in the center and eastern portions of the City. Recent development plans show a shift in growth towards the western portion of the City along the new Lincoln Bypass. This change does not affect the I-80/SR 65 project because of the long distance between the development area and the interchange, but it does affect traffic volumes at the northern edge of the study area for the SR 65 COI project.

To confirm the level of change and how it could affect the SR 65 COI forecasts, we reviewed new land use and traffic volume forecasts being developed for the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA) fee study. While the overall land use growth projections were similar to those for the SR 65 COI project, the SPRTA growth allocations were higher near the Lincoln Bypass. A comparison of peak hour traffic volume assignments between the two projects revealed that the SPRTA fee program forecasts had more trips accessing SR 65 at interchanges north of Lincoln Boulevard. This results in more traffic on the SR 65 mainline entering the SR 65 COI study area instead of accessing the corridor at the Lincoln Boulevard interchange.

## FehrłPEERS

## PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS

In response the background findings above, Fehr \& Peers developed an origin-destination (OD) adjustment methodology to refine the peak hour forecasts that will be used in the final traffic operations analysis. The methodology starts with identifying the traffic volume distribution on SR 65 versus Lincoln Boulevard at the screenline intersect locations shown on the map below.


AM and PM peak hour traffic volume forecasts for design year (2040) conditions at the screenline locations (denoted by in purple circles in the above map) were compared from the SPRTA impact fee study and SR 65 COI project. . The results are shown in Table 1.

| TABLE 1 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Travel Direction | AM |  | PM |  |
|  | SPRTA Fee Study | SR 65 COI | SPRTA Fee Study | SR 65 COI |
| Northbound |  |  |  |  |
| - SR 65 (n/o Ferrari Ranch Rd) | 58\% | 45\% | 72\% | 39\% |
| - Lincoln Blvd (n/o Sterling Pkwy) | 42\% | 55\% | 28\% | 61\% |
| Total | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| - SR 65 (n/o Ferrari Ranch Rd) | 63\% | 42\% | 61\% | 40\% |
| - Lincoln Blvd (n/o Sterling Pkwy) | 37\% | 58\% | 39\% | 60\% |
| Total | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |

In general, the traffic patterns are almost reversed between the two models due to the difference in land use growth allocations. For the SR 65 COI, these differences only affect the start or end of trips at the northern end of the study area. Therefore, the proposed adjustment is to modify the origin-destination (OD) trip tables in the SR 65 COI models such that the final traffic volume distribution matches the SPRTA impact fee study distribution shown in Table 1. The adjustment process may result in a volume that is lower than the traffic counts collected in 2013. In this unlikely event, the existing count volume will be used as the forecasted value.

This adjustment will not change the OD trips but will influence the paths used by the trips. For example, a portion of the northbound SR 65 PM peak hour trips that exit at Lincoln Boulevard will be adjusted such that their final destination is a zone connecting to the SR 65 mainline north of Ferrari Ranch Road. This adjustment has the effect of keeping these trips on the mainline through the Lincoln Boulevard and Ferrari Ranch Road interchanges instead of exiting at the Lincoln Boulevard northbound off-ramp. A similar adjustment will be applied to the southbound direction. The adjustments will be applied to design year volumes and, if necessary, to the construction year volumes. Construction year volume adjustments would be based on a linear interpolation between existing traffic volumes and the final adjusted design year traffic volumes.

## SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements

## Alternatives Screening Assessment Memorandum

# MEMORANDUM 

Date: May 28, 2014<br>To: Matt Brogan, Mark Thomas<br>From: Allen Wang, David Stanek, \& Ronald T. Milam, Fehr \& Peers<br>Subject: SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements Project - Alternatives Screening Assessment

This memorandum describes the results of the SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements (COI) project alternatives screening assessment. This assessment was performed using the VISUM meso-scale models originally developed for the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements project and recently refined for the SR 65 COI project.

The key refinement was to include traffic counts collected at the Twelve Bridges Drive, Lincoln Boulevard, and Ferrari Ranch Road interchanges in Lincoln. Existing conditions for the I-80/SR 65 project was prior to the opening of the Lincoln Bypass. Compared to the I-80/SR 65 traffic forecasts, the traffic counts showed higher traffic volumes on the ramps to and from the north at Twelve Bridges Drive and Ferrari Ranch Road. As a result, the design year traffic forecasts were adjusted upward to account for the higher observed traffic volumes. Based on recent discussions with the City of Lincoln, the traffic forecasts will be adjusted further to account for a shift in planned development from northeast Lincoln to the west along the bypass. This adjustment process will be documented in a separate memorandum.

The following five alternatives were initially considered for the screening assessment.

- No Build
- GP - add a general purpose (GP) lane in each direction
- HOV - add a high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane in each direction
- Hybrid - add an HOV lane in the south that transitions to a GP lane north of Blue Oaks Boulevard
- Constrained - widening with fewer mainline or auxiliary lanes to minimize environmental or right-of-way impacts

A review of the proposed cross section and the existing right of way limits showed that the proposed improvements for the build alternatives are likely to be within the existing right of way. Additionally, no
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significant environmental constraints are anticipated within the existing right of way. Therefore, the Constrained alternative was eliminated from further consideration.

The alternatives assessment is based on 2040 design year conditions. Each of the four remaining alternatives is graphically represented in Figures 1 through 4. The diagrams show the mainline and auxiliary lanes added by the alternative and those assumed to be constructed by separate projects. These figures also show the AM and PM peak hour design year traffic volumes for the mainline and each ramp. The total HOV volume - in all lanes - is shown in the figures. Table 1 below reports the predicted volume in the HOV lane between interchanges (does not include entering or exiting HOV traffic).

| TABLE 1: HOV LANE VOLUME |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | No Build | GP | HOV | Hybrid |
| Northbound |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{I}-80 \text { to }$ <br> Stanford Ranch Rd | 500 (980) | $730(1,500)$ | $750(1,540)$ | $780(1,570)$ |
| Stanford Ranch Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | - | - | $680(1,520)$ | $790(1,710)$ |
| Pleasant Grove Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | - | - | 440 (1,150) | $510(1,310)$ |
| Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | - | - | 350 (980) | - |
| Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | - | - | 890 (1,010) | - |
| Blue Oaks Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | - | - | 1,130 (1,140) | 1,330 (1,330) |
| Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | - | - | 1,140 (1,060) | 1,250 (1,120) |
| Galleria Blvd to I-80 | 420 (300) | 720 (530) | 750 (550) | 790 (580) |
| Note: The AM and (PM) peak hour volumes are reported. <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2014 |  |  |  |  |

The build alternatives would increase the HOV volume in the HOV lane south of Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road compared to the No Build alternative. The higher capacity in the build alternatives provide more opportunity for HOVs to utilize the direct HOV-only ramps that will be built at the I-80/SR 65 interchange.


Figure 1
Design Year Peak Hour Traffic Volumes DRAFT



Figure 3
Design Year Peak Hour Traffic Volumes DRAFT and Lane Configurations HOV Alternative


Figure 4
Design Year Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Lane Configurations Hybrid Alternative
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Of the build alternatives, the Hybrid alternative shows the highest peak hour HOV lane volume. While the GP lanes have higher overall capacity, the lack of an exclusive HOV lane along the corridor gives no travel time advantage to HOVs. So, they are not more likely to use the facility. Not surprisingly, the HOV alternative has a higher HOV lane volume due to the travel time advantage. The HOV lane volume is highest in the Hybrid alternative because (1) a travel time advantage exists and (2) additional GP lane capacity at bottlenecks allows for more demand volume to be served.

Based on these volumes, the following network-wide performance metrics were collected for the mesoscopic analysis area shown in Figure 5.

- Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT)
- VMT by Speed Bin
- Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD)
- Vehicle Hours Travelled (VHT)
- Freeway VHD
- Freeway Travel Time

Table 2 contains a summary of the alternatives assessment results with the exception of VMT by speed bin, which is contained in the detailed results summary in Attachment A.

The following discussion highlights the key findings of the assessment.

- $\quad \underline{\text { VMT }}$ - In all three build scenarios, VMT is increasing above the projected no build level. This is to be expected due to induced travel resulting from improvements to the system. The Hybrid alternative had the smallest increase from the No Build alternative with an increase of 16,040 VMT. The HOV alternative produced the second lowest increase in VMT. This suggests that HOV lane effectiveness may decline in the northern portions of the corridor where peak hour demand and capacity utilization are lower.
- VHD - As expected, the greatest VHD were associated with the No Build alternative. The GP alternative had the lowest levels of delay followed by the Hybrid alternative.
- VHT - The Hybrid alternative had the greatest change in VHT from the No Build alternative, followed by the GP alternative. While GP had the lowest levels of delay, this scenario also produced the highest VMT, thereby inflating VHT.
LeGENO


## FEHR欠PEERS

| TABLE 2 <br> ALTERNATIVES ASSESSMENT SUMMARY |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metric (1) | No Build | GP | HOV | Hybrid |
| VMT | 4,440,670 | 4,469,450 | 4,451,490 | 4,468,570 |
| Change from No Build | -- | +28,780 | +10,820 | +27,900 |
| VHD (2) Change from No Build | 71,440 | 64,690 | 65,190 | 64,890 |
|  | -- | -6,750 | -6,250 | -6,550 |
| VHT Change from No Build | 164,260 | 157,010 | 157,260 | 157,230 |
|  | -- | -7,250 | -7,000 | -7,030 |
| Total Freeway VHD (3) Change from No Build | 10,240 | 7,350 | 7,590 | 7,440 |
|  |  | -2,890 | -2,650 | -2,800 |
| SR 65 Freeway VHD (3) Change from No Build | 3,430 | 420 | 680 | 720 |
|  |  | -3,010 | -2,750 | -2,710 |
| SOV Freeway Travel Time (4) |  |  |  |  |
| Northbound - PM | 19.7 | 12.4 | 14.4 | 12.9 |
| Southbound - AM | 17.7 | 10.9 | 12.9 | 10.9 |
| HOV Freeway Travel Time (4) |  |  |  |  |
| Northbound - PM | 19.2 | 11.6 | 10.3 | 10.9 |
| Southbound - AM | 17.0 | 10.6 | 9.5 | 10.5 |
| Notes: Bold indicates largest change or difference from No Build. <br> (1) Results are based on the sum of the AM and PM peak periods values. <br> (2) For VHD, delay is the additional travel time that occurs when traveling on all roadways less than the freeflow speed. <br> (3) Freeway VHD is the additional travel time only on freeways when traveling less than 35 mph . Total Freeway VHD includes both I-80 an d SR 65, while SR 65 Freeway VHD only includes the latter route. <br> (4) Travel time in minutes is measured between I-80 and Ferrari Ranch Road. The free-flow travel time (at 65 mph ) is 7.2 minutes. <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2014 |  |  |  |  |

- Freeway VHD - Freeway VHD was measured for freeway mainline links as the delay relative to a speed of 35 mph . Reductions in Freeway VHD from the No Build alternative produced the same results as VHD; the lowest levels of delay are associated with the GP alternative followed by the Hybrid alternative. The majority of Freeway VHD occurs on I-80. The build alternatives would reduce Freeway VHD on SR 65 by at least 79 percent.
- Freeway Travel Time - With the lowest VHD and greatest throughput by speed, the GP alternative had the lowest single occupancy vehicle (SOV) peak hour travel times in the peak direction. The Hybrid alternative was a very close runner up in the southbound direction during the AM peak hour. HOV travel times were consistently the lowest for the HOV alternative.
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In addition to the metrics summarized above, VMT by speed bin was estimated for purposes of emissions analysis. Morning and evening peak period VMT by speed bin shows more VMT in the high speed bins (i.e., greater than 50 miles per hour) in the GP alternative. This is expected since this scenario had the lowest level of delay. The Hybrid alternative had the second highest VMT in high speed bins. Speed is important because air pollution and greenhouse gas (GHG) emission rates are lowest in the 45-55 miles per hour range. The GP alternative had more VMT in this range and a quick assessment of GHG emissions revealed that this also resulted in the lowest levels of emissions among the build alternatives. All the build alternatives had higher levels of GHG emissions than the No Build alternative due to higher total VMT.
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ATTACHMENT A
DETAILED ASSESSMENT RESULTS

SR-65 WIDENING ALTERNATIVES DESIGN YEAR MESO-SCALE VMT COMPARISON



SR-65 WIDENING ALTERNATIVES DESIGN YEAR MESO-SCALE VHD COMPARISON



SR-65 WIDENING ALTERNATIVES DESIGN YEAR MESO-SCALE VHT COMPARISON


SR-65 WIDENING ALTERNATIVES DESIGN YEAR MESO-SCALE FREEWAY VHD COMPARISON



[^21]SR-65 WIDENING ALTERNATIVES DESIGN YEAR MESO-SCALE FREEWAY VHD COMPARISON
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SR-65 WIDENING ALTERNATIVES DESIGN YEAR MESO-SCALE TRAVEL TIME COMPARISON - SOV

| Alternative | Peak Hour Travel Time (min) |  |  |  | \% Change from No Build |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SB-AM | SB-PM | NB-AM | NB-PM | SB-AM | SB-PM | NB-AM | NB-PM |
| 1-No Build | 17.69 | 14.28 | 10.78 | 19.70 | - | - | - | - |
| 2 - Mixed Flow | 10.87 | 10.04 | 8.60 | 12.39 | -38.56\% | -29.70\% | -20.24\% | -37.14\% |
| 3 - HOV | 12.90 | 11.00 | 9.22 | 14.35 | -27.08\% | -23.01\% | -14.41\% | -27.14\% |
| 4 - Hybrid | 10.92 | 10.15 | 8.98 | 12.89 | -38.26\% | -28.97\% | -16.66\% | -34.58\% |

Note: Travel times are congested travel times in mixed flow lanes between Ferrari Ranch Rd and I-80 Ramps.



SR-65 WIDENING ALTERNATIVES DESIGN YEAR MESO-SCALE TRAVEL TIME COMPARISON - HOV

| Alternative | Peak Hour Travel Time (min) |  |  |  | \% Change from No Build |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SB-AM | SB-PM | NB-AM | NB-PM | SB-AM | SB-PM | NB-AM | NB-PM |
| 1 - No Build | 17.02 | 13.22 | 10.56 | 19.22 | - | - | - | - |
| 2 - Mixed Flow | 10.61 | 9.55 | 8.35 | 11.58 | -37.66\% | -27.74\% | -20.91\% | -39.74\% |
| $3-\mathrm{HOV}$ | 9.50 | 8.97 | 7.88 | 10.28 | -44.19\% | -32.15\% | -25.35\% | -46.52\% |
| 4 - Hybrid | 10.46 | 9.39 | 8.14 | 10.92 | -38.58\% | -28.96\% | -22.95\% | -43.18\% |

Note: Travel times are congested travel times for HOV vehicles that use HOV lanes between Ferrari Ranch Rd and I-80 Ramps.



## Attachment C

Traffic Analysis Memorandum - Phase 1

# Fehrf Peers 

## MEMORANDUM

Date: September 15, 2016<br>To: $\quad$ Andy Lee and Matt Brogan, Mark Thomas \& Company<br>From: David Stanek, Fehr \& Peers<br>Subject: SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements Project - Phase 1 (Revised)

This memorandum describes the results of the State Route (SR) 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements (COI) project Phase 1 analysis. The separately-planned I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Phase 1 project will reduce the majority of congestion that currently occurs on the SR 65 corridor in Roseville. This analysis looks at the additional benefit the SR 65 COI Phase 1 project would provide for SR 65 under construction year (2020) conditions.

Figure 1 shows the lane configuration for the SR 65 corridor between Roseville and Lincoln in Placer County. For information on the travel demand forecasts, please see the State Route 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements Transportation Analysis Report (Fehr \& Peers, September 2015). The volumes used in this analysis are for the No Build Alternative. Under construction year conditions, the separate project for the Whitney Ranch Parkway/Placer Parkway interchange and I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements are assumed to have been constructed for the baseline conditions.

The SR 65 COI Phase 1 project would widen northbound SR 65 to provide an additional lane from the Pleasant Grove Boulevard off-ramp to the Pleasant Grove Boulevard on-ramp, resulting in three lanes from I-80 to Blue Oaks Boulevard. In the southbound direction, a lane would be added between the Pleasant Grove Boulevard off-ramp and the Pleasant Grove Boulevard loop on-ramp, resulting in three lanes from Blue Oaks Boulevard to I-80. In addition, the Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road southbound off-ramp would be widened to two lanes, and auxiliary lanes would be constructed in both directions between Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road and Pleasant Grove Boulevard.

The baseline conditions were analyzed as the Build Alternative for the Stanford Ranch Road/Galleria Boulevard/State Route 65 Northbound Ramps Transportation Analysis Report (Fehr \& Peers, July 2015). This project was later incorporated into the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Phase 1 project. Under construction year (2020) conditions, the southbound direction during the AM peak period showed the most congestion. Minor congestion (about 40 mph for 15 minutes) occurred for the northbound direction during
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the PM peak period, and no congestion occurred for the off-peak directions (southbound during the PM peak period and northbound during the AM peak period). For this analysis, the AM peak period was selected for analysis because it has the highest level of congestion.

The AM peak period construction year conditions were be analyzed to determine the additional benefits to freeway operations provided by the SR 65 COI Phase 1 project. Overall network performance statistics for the Baseline and Phase 1 Alternatives are summarized in Table 1.

| TABLE 1: COMPARISON OF OVERALL NETWORK PERFORMANCE CONSTRUCTION YEAR AM PEAK PERIOD |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure |  | Existing Conditions | Construction Year Conditions |  |
|  |  | Baseline Alternative | Phase 1 Alternative |
| Volume Served (\% of total demand) |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 143,450 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 168,820 \\ (99 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 168,860 \\ (99 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) |  | 645,270 | 790,260 | 790,020 |
| Person Miles of Travel |  | 786,260 | 967,870 | 967,450 |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel (VHT) |  | 13,760 | 18,100 | 18,040 |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD) (\% of VHT) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2,670 \\ & (19 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,550 \\ & (25 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,490 \\ & (25 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| Average Delay per Vehicle (min) |  | 1.12 | 1.62 | 1.60 |
| Person Hours of Delay |  | 3,240 | 5,400 | 5,310 |
| Average Speed |  | 46.9 | 43.7 | 43.8 |
| Average Speed for HOVs |  | 47.0 | 46.0 | 46.2 |
| Travel Time: <br> Southbound SR 65 from <br> Sunset Blvd to I-80 | SOV | - | 5:11 | 4:21 |
|  | HOV | - | 5:11 | 4:21 |
| Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2016 |  |  |  |  |

The results presented in Table 1 are summarized below.

- The project alternatives would have similar network performance during the AM peak period.
- The Phase 1 Alternative would have a higher volume served and a lower overall delay although the difference would be small.
- The Baseline Alternative would have a higher average travel time for southbound SR 65. The average travel time savings under the Phase 1 Alternative would be about 50 seconds.
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## bASELINE ALTERNATIVE



## PHASE 1 ALTERNATIVE



Figure 2 - Northbound SR 65 Construction Year AM Peak Period Speed Contour Map

## FehrłPEERS

## baseline alternative



PHASE 1 ALTERNATIVE


Figure 3 - Southbound SR 65 Construction Year AM Peak Period Speed Contour Map

| Freeway | Location | Baseline Alternative |  | Phase 1 Alternative |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | LOS / Density | Type | LOS / Density |
| NB SR 65 | I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Basic | D / 27 | Basic | D / 26 |
|  | Stanford Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | C / 24 | Diverge | C / 24 |
|  | Stanford Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | D / 31 | - | - |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | E / 36 | - | - |
|  | Stanford Ranch Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | - | - | Weave | C / 23 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | E / 36 | Basic | C / 23 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Weave | C / 27 | - | - |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd On-ramp | - | - | Merge | D / 31 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | - | - | Diverge | C / 25 |
| SB SR 65 | Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | F/78 | Merge | E/ 40 |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | F/54 | - | - |
|  | Blue Oaks Blvd EB On-ramp | - | - | Merge | D / 32 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-ramp | - | - | Diverge | C / 27 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | E/ 36 | Basic | C / 24 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | D / 30 | Merge | C / 22 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | D / 29 | Merge | C / 24 |
|  | Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | D / 31 | Basic | D / 28 |
|  | Galleria Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | D / 32 | Diverge | C / 27 |
|  | Galleria Blvd On-ramp | Merge | E/ 37 | Merge | F/46 |
|  | I-80 Off-ramp | Diverge | D / 33 | Diverge | D / 33 |
| Notes: Bold and underline font indicate LOS F conditions. Shaded cells indicate a project impact. The level of service and average density for the study segment are reported. <br> The results for all locations are contained in the appendix. <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |

Detailed freeway operations analysis was completed for the peak hour (7:30 to 8:30 AM) of the four-hour AM peak period. Figures 2 and 3 display the average speed in the mixed-flow lanes for SR 65 during the peak periods for each alternative. The AM peak hour level of service (LOS) results for selected locations are reported in Table 2.

## Northbound SR 65

The northbound speed contour map (Figure 2) shows a half hour of slower speeds ( 50 to 60 mph ) from 7:45 to 8:15 AM under the Baseline Alternative between Stanford Ranch Road and Pleasant Grove Boulevard. Under the Phase 1 Alternative, all segments of northbound SR 65 north of I-80 have speeds greater than 60
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mph for the entire peak period. The freeway operations results in Table 2 show that the LOS E conditions at Pleasant Grove Boulevard under the Baseline Alternative would improve to LOS C conditions under the Phase 1 Alternative. While both alternatives would have uncongested conditions during the AM peak hour, the widening under the Phase 1 Alternative would provide additional capacity and result in better freeway operations.

## Southbound SR 65

The southbound speed contour map for the Baseline Alternative (Figure 3) shows congested conditions (speeds less than about 40 mph ) for 45 minutes at the Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange that extend about half-way to the Sunset Boulevard interchange. With the Phase 1 Alternative, the congested conditions would be reduced to 15 minutes at the Blue Oaks Boulevard on-ramps. However, lower speeds ( 50 to 60 mph ) would occur downstream at the Galleria Boulevard on-ramp during the peak interval from 8:00 to 8:15 AM. The freeway operations results (Table 2) show a similar pattern. The LOS F conditions at Blue Oaks Boulevard would improve to LOS E or better under the Phase 1 Alternative, but conditions at the Galleria Boulevard on-ramp would worsen from LOS E to F.

The widening under the Phase 1 Alternative would provide capacity at Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange to relieve the bottleneck under the Baseline Alternative. However, the additional capacity would deliver more traffic volume to the Galleria Boulevard interchange causing a minor bottleneck to form. This bottleneck will be addressed by a future phase of the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements project.

## Summary

The Phase 1 Alternative would improve AM peak period operations by serving more volume with a lower vehicle delay. The improvement would primarily occur in the southbound direction, where the peak hour travel time would be reduced by 50 seconds and the LOS F conditions at Blue Oaks Blvd would be improved to LOS E or better. Although not analyzed here, PM peak period operations would likely improve in the northbound direction since the lane addition at the Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange would increase capacity such that peak 15 -minute average speed of 40 mph under the Baseline Alternative would increase.


Figure 1
Freeway Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Lane Configurations Construction Year Conditions
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ATTACHMENT A
DETAILED ANALYSIS RESULTS

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Network Statistics

SR 65 Widening Construction Year - Baseline Conditions AM Peak Period

| Network Performance | Vehicle Types | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Vehicles Served | All Vehicles | 168,819 | 78 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | All Vehicles | 790,257 | 1,123 |
| Travel Time [h] | All Vehicles | 18,104 | 67.4 |
| Average Speed [mph] | All Vehicles | 43.7 | 0.2 |
| Total Delay [h] | All Vehicles | 4,548 | 76.2 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | All Vehicles | 95 | 1.6 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | All Vehicles | 0.35 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | HOV | 32,347 | 36 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | HOV | 159,735 | 454 |
| Travel Time [h] | HOV | 3,472 | 17 |
| Average Speed [mph] | HOV | 46.0 | 0.2 |
| Total Delay [h] | HOV | 756 | 14 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | HOV | 82 | 2 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | HOV | 0.28 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | Truck | 7,562 | 17 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | Truck | 37,925 | 293 |
| Travel Time [h] | Truck | 897 | 3 |
| Average Speed [mph] | Truck | 42.3 | 0 |
| Total Delay [h] | Truck | 241 | 3 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | Truck | 112 | 1 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | Truck | 0.38 | 0.01 |


| Performance Measure | Vehicle Types |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HOV | Truck | All |
|  | 32,350 | 7,560 | 168,820 |
| Demand Volume | 33,520 | 8,150 | 170,610 |
| Percent Demand Served | $96.5 \%$ | $92.8 \%$ | $99.0 \%$ |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel | 159,730 | 37,920 | 790,260 |
| Person Miles of Travel | 335,440 | 39,820 | 967,870 |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel | 3,470 | 900 | 18,100 |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay | 760 | 240 | 4,550 |
| VHD $\%$ of VHT | $21.9 \%$ | $26.7 \%$ | $25.1 \%$ |
| Average Delay per Vehicle $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.41 | 1.90 | 1.62 |
| Person Hours of Delay | 1,600 | 250 | 5,400 |
| Average Travel Speed | 46.0 | 42.3 | 43.7 |

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Peak Hour Travel Time

SR 65 Widening
Construction Year - Baseline Conditions
AM Peak Period

| Mode | Description | Distance (ft) | Volume (vehicles) |  | Travel Time (min.:sec.) |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Speed (mph) } \\ \hline \text { Average } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SOV | SR-65 at Blue Oaks to l-80 at Antelope | 43,046 | 836 | 10 | 09:08 | 00:17 | 21.4 |
|  | I-80 at Auburn to SR-65 at Blue Oaks | 32,881 | 1,494 | 18 | 07:06 | 00:02 | 21.0 |
|  | 1-80: Sierra College to Antelope | 45,827 | 1,127 | 16 | 08:43 | 00:15 | 23.9 |
|  | 1-80: Auburn to Sierra College | 36,777 | 685 | 12 | 06:38 | 00:02 | 25.2 |
|  | SR-65: I-80 to Sunset | 43,055 | 646 | 15 | 04:19 | 00:01 | 45.4 |
|  | SR-65: Sunset to Ferrari Ranch | 45,816 | 176 | 5 | 03:31 | 00:01 | 59.2 |
|  | SR-65: Ferrari Ranch to Sunset | 36,773 | 954 | 9 | 03:36 | 00:01 | 46.4 |
|  | SR-65: Sunset to I-80 | 32,882 | 1,228 | 18 | 05:11 | 00:26 | 28.8 |
| HOV | SR-65 at Blue Oaks to I-80 at Antelope | 43,046 | 253 | 5 | 08:50 | 00:10 | 45.4 |
|  | I-80 at Auburn to SR-65 at Blue Oaks | 32,881 | 370 | 9 | 07:03 | 00:02 | 59.2 |
|  | I-80: Sierra College to Antelope | 45,827 | 499 | 8 | 08:21 | 00:04 | 46.4 |
|  | 1-80: Auburn to Sierra College | 36,777 | 233 | 6 | 06:34 | 00:01 | 28.8 |
|  | SR-65: I-80 to Sunset | 43,055 | 159 | 5 | 04:19 | 00:01 | 22.1 |
|  | SR-65: Sunset to Ferrari Ranch | 45,816 | 35 | 3 | 03:30 | 00:02 | 21.2 |
|  | SR-65: Ferrari Ranch to Sunset | 36,773 | 107 | 4 | 03:36 | 00:02 | 25.0 |
|  | SR-65: Sunset to I-80 | 32,882 | 385 | 9 | 05:11 | 00:27 | 25.5 |

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Network Statistics

SR 65 Widening
Construction Year - Phase 1 Alternative AM Peak Period

| Network Performance | Vehicle Types | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Vehicles Served | All Vehicles | 168,857 | 77 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | All Vehicles | 790,017 | 1,095 |
| Travel Time [h] | All Vehicles | 18,037 | 202.5 |
| Average Speed [mph] | All Vehicles | 43.8 | 0.5 |
| Total Delay [h] | All Vehicles | 4,489 | 213.9 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | All Vehicles | 93 | 4.5 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | All Vehicles | 0.34 | 0.02 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | HOV | 32,351 | 42 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | HOV | 159,569 | 475 |
| Travel Time [h] | HOV | 3,456 | 26 |
| Average Speed [mph] | HOV | 46.2 | 0.4 |
| Total Delay [h] | HOV | 744 | 30 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | HOV | 81 | 3 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | HOV | 0.28 | 0.01 |
| Number of Vehicles Served | Truck | 7,561 | 8 |
| Travel Distance [mi] | Truck | 37,920 | 309 |
| Travel Time [h] | Truck | 893 | 12 |
| Average Speed [mph] | Truck | 42.5 | 1 |
| Total Delay [h] | Truck | 237 | 12 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle [s] | Truck | 110 | 6 |
| VHD/VMT [min/mile] | Truck | 0.38 | 0.02 |


| Performance Measure | Vehicle Types |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HOV | Truck | All |
|  | 32,350 | 7,560 | 168,860 |
| Percent Demand Served | 33,520 | 8,150 | 170,610 |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel | $96.5 \%$ | $92.8 \%$ | $99.0 \%$ |
| Person Miles of Travel | 159,570 | 37,920 | 790,020 |
| Vehicle Hours of Travel | 335,100 | 39,820 | 967,450 |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay | 740 | 890 | 18,040 |
| VHD \% of VHT | $21.4 \%$ | 240 | 4,490 |
| Average Delay per Vehicle $(\mathrm{min})$ | 1.37 | $27.0 \%$ | $24.9 \%$ |
| Person Hours of Delay | 1,550 | 1.90 | 1.60 |
| Average Travel Speed | 46.2 | 250 | 5,310 |

VISSIM Post-Processor
Average Values from 10 Runs
Peak Hour Travel Time

SR 65 Widening
Construction Year - Phase 1 Alternative
AM Peak Period

| Mode | Description | Distance <br> (ft) | Volume (vehicles) |  | Travel Time (min.:sec.) |  | Speed (mph) <br> Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | Std. Dev. | Average | Std. Dev. |  |
| SOV | SR-65 at Blue Oaks to I-80 at Antelope | 43,046 | 840 | 13 | 08:54 | 00:20 | 22.0 |
|  | I-80 at Auburn to SR-65 at Blue Oaks | 32,881 | 1,483 | 18 | 07:05 | 00:02 | 21.1 |
|  | I-80: Sierra College to Antelope | 45,827 | 1,129 | 13 | 08:43 | 00:19 | 23.9 |
|  | 1-80: Auburn to Sierra College | 36,777 | 684 | 13 | 06:39 | 00:02 | 25.1 |
|  | SR-65: I-80 to Sunset | 43,056 | 656 | 14 | 04:17 | 00:00 | 45.7 |
|  | SR-65: Sunset to Ferrari Ranch | 45,816 | 177 | 6 | 03:31 | 00:01 | 59.1 |
|  | SR-65: Ferrari Ranch to Sunset | 36,773 | 951 | 10 | 03:36 | 00:01 | 46.5 |
|  | SR-65: Sunset to I-80 | 32,882 | 1,231 | 19 | 04:21 | 00:05 | 34.3 |
| HOV | SR-65 at Blue Oaks to I-80 at Antelope | 43,046 | 252 | 6 | 08:37 | 00:11 | 45.7 |
|  | $1-80$ at Auburn to SR-65 at Blue Oaks | 32,881 | 372 | 10 | 07:01 | 00:02 | 59.1 |
|  | I-80: Sierra College to Antelope | 45,827 | 503 | 8 | 08:20 | 00:05 | 46.5 |
|  | 1-80: Auburn to Sierra College | 36,777 | 233 | 6 | 06:34 | 00:02 | 34.3 |
|  | SR-65: I-80 to Sunset | 43,056 | 159 | 5 | 04:17 | 00:01 | 22.7 |
|  | SR-65: Sunset to Ferrari Ranch | 45,816 | 36 | 3 | 03:31 | 00:02 | 21.3 |
|  | SR-65: Ferrari Ranch to Sunset | 36,773 | 109 | 4 | 03:35 | 00:01 | 25.0 |
|  | SR-65: Sunset to I-80 | 32,882 | 377 | 8 | 04:21 | 00:05 | 25.5 |


| Location |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 100 | SR-65 NB - EB I-80 Connector | Basic | 3,105 | 98 | 106.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 42.3 | 1.3 | 43.4 | 2.0 | E |
| 101 | SR-65 NB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 1,452 | 70 | 105.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51.4 | 0.4 | 23.8 | 1.1 | C |
| 103 | SR-65 NB - I-80 WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,104 | 100 | 106.3\% | 1,450 | 69 | 105.1\% |  |  |  | 60.9 | 0.7 | 28.0 | 0.9 | D |
| 104 | SR-65 NB - I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Basic | 4,554 | 113 | 105.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.2 | 26.6 | 0.7 | D |
| 105 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,554 | 114 | 105.9\% |  |  |  | 748 | 51 | 103.9\% | 62.7 | 0.6 | 24.1 | 0.9 | C |
| 106 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,814 | 113 | 106.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.2 | 0.2 | 22.9 | 0.6 | C |
| 107 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd On-ramp | Merge | 3,814 | 109 | 106.5\% | 770 | 51 | 106.9\% |  |  |  | 58.4 | 1.5 | 30.9 | 1.2 | D |
| 109 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,584 | 120 | 106.6\% |  |  |  | 718 | 51 | 99.7\% | 57.5 | 1.8 | 36.1 | 1.6 | E |
| 110 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,871 | 123 | 108.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.4 | 0.5 | 35.9 | 1.0 | E |
| 111 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Weave | 3,868 | 122 | 108.1\% | 230 | 25 | 100.2\% | 1,794 | 78 | 108.1\% | 62.6 | 0.3 | 26.9 | 0.7 | C |
| 114 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,307 | 87 | 107.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.5 | 0.2 | 20.2 | 0.7 | C |
| 115 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 2,308 | 90 | 107.3\% | 459 | 37 | 97.7\% |  |  |  | 60.8 | 0.4 | 22.4 | 1.0 | C |
| 116 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | 2,767 | 96 | 105.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.1 | 0.4 | 25.3 | 1.1 | C |
| 118 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,766 | 104 | 105.6\% |  |  |  | 1,195 | 59 | 105.8\% | 63.6 | 0.2 | 19.4 | 0.9 | B |
| 169 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,209 | 96 | 108.4\% | 297 | 22 | 114.3\% |  |  |  | 58.1 | 10.7 | 31.6 | 11.3 | D |
| 170 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 3,508 | 104 | 108.9\% | 343 | 16 | 100.9\% |  |  |  | 47.8 | 13.3 | 45.7 | 16.4 | F |
| 171 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Basic | 3,850 | 117 | 108.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 41.8 | 13.9 | 54.3 | 18.6 | F |
| 172 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,849 | 120 | 108.1\% |  |  |  | 651 | 47 | 108.5\% | 35.0 | 13.3 | 64.4 | 20.2 | F |
| 173 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,198 | 114 | 108.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19.4 | 8.2 | 93.9 | 20.7 | F |
| 174 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,188 | 108 | 107.7\% | 451 | 11 | 98.0\% |  |  |  | 22.3 | 2.0 | 77.8 | 4.8 | F |
| 175 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | 3,622 | 105 | 105.9\% | 1,212 | 57 | 101.9\% | 643 | 56 | 105.3\% | 35.7 | 1.5 | 53.6 | 2.4 | F |
| 178 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,188 | 77 | 104.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 59.4 | 1.2 | 36.2 | 0.9 | E |
| 179 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 4,186 | 75 | 104.6\% | 746 | 34 | 102.2\% |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.4 | 29.8 | 0.3 | D |
| 180 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 4,927 | 87 | 104.2\% | 651 | 34 | 101.7\% |  |  |  | 60.8 | 0.7 | 29.2 | 0.5 | D |
| 181 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | 5,575 | 93 | 103.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.5 | 0.6 | 31.4 | 0.4 | D |
| 182 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,574 | 94 | 103.8\% |  |  |  | 1,028 | 57 | 98.9\% | 62.2 | 0.3 | 31.8 | 0.4 | D |
| 183 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,543 | 85 | 104.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.6 | 0.9 | 29.3 | 0.5 | D |
| 185 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 4,544 | 88 | 105.0\% | 728 | 38 | 104.0\% |  |  |  | 57.0 | 6.4 | 37.4 | 6.7 | E |
| 186 | SR-65 SB - I-80 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,271 | 103 | 104.8\% |  |  |  | 3,865 | 93 | 105.3\% | 60.0 | 1.0 | 32.5 | 0.7 | D |
| 187 | SR-65 SB - EB I-80 Connector (2 lanes) | Basic | 1,413 | 70 | 104.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.3 | 0.6 | 27.0 | 0.8 | D |
| 188 | SR-65 SB - EB I-80 Connector (1 lane) | Basic | 1,415 | 74 | 104.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.8 | 0.2 | 26.3 | 0.9 | D |
| 189 | SR-65 SB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 3,869 | 96 | 105.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51.6 | 0.4 | 39.2 | 0.9 | E |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.

| Location |  | Facility | Mainline Volume (vph) |  |  | On-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Off-ramp Volume (vph) |  |  | Speed (mph) |  | Density (vplpm) |  | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | \% | Avg. | St. Dev. | Avg. | St. Dev. |  |
| 100 | SR-65 NB - EB I-80 Connector | Basic | 3,107 | 102 | 106.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 41.8 | 1.0 | 43.5 | 1.4 | E |
| 101 | SR-65 NB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 1,452 | 73 | 105.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51.5 | 0.4 | 23.7 | 0.9 | C |
| 103 | SR-65 NB - I-80 WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,107 | 102 | 106.4\% | 1,452 | 69 | 105.2\% |  |  |  | 61.3 | 0.4 | 27.7 | 0.7 | C |
| 104 | SR-65 NB - I-80 to Stanford Ranch Rd | Basic | 4,560 | 111 | 106.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.1 | 0.2 | 26.4 | 0.7 | D |
| 105 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,560 | 112 | 106.0\% |  |  |  | 740 | 53 | 102.8\% | 62.9 | 0.4 | 23.6 | 0.9 | C |
| 106 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,826 | 107 | 106.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.3 | 0.2 | 22.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 107 | SR-65 NB - Stanford Ranch Rd to Pleasant Grove Blvd | Weave | 3,827 | 102 | 106.9\% | 769 | 53 | 106.7\% | 718 | 56 | 99.7\% | 62.9 | 0.2 | 22.6 | 0.6 | C |
| 110 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,878 | 127 | 108.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.0 | 0.1 | 23.2 | 0.7 | C |
| 111 | SR-65 NB - Pleasant Grove Blvd on-ramp | Merge | 3,878 | 122 | 108.3\% | 233 | 25 | 101.1\% |  |  |  | 61.0 | 0.8 | 31.4 | 1.0 | D |
| 112 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,112 | 117 | 107.9\% |  |  |  | 1,800 | 73 | 108.4\% | 62.4 | 0.2 | 25.2 | 0.6 | C |
| 114 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 2,313 | 92 | 107.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.4 | 0.2 | 20.2 | 0.8 | C |
| 115 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 2,313 | 96 | 107.6\% | 463 | 36 | 98.5\% |  |  |  | 61.0 | 0.4 | 22.2 | 1.1 | C |
| 116 | SR-65 NB - Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd | Basic | 2,778 | 101 | 106.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.2 | 0.5 | 25.2 | 1.3 | C |
| 118 | SR-65 NB - Sunset Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 2,777 | 97 | 106.0\% |  |  |  | 1,200 | 63 | 106.2\% | 63.6 | 0.2 | 19.4 | 1.1 | B |
| 169 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,195 | 98 | 107.9\% | 293 | 24 | 112.5\% |  |  |  | 61.5 | 0.3 | 29.3 | 0.8 | D |
| 170 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 3,488 | 99 | 108.3\% | 345 | 17 | 101.3\% |  |  |  | 60.1 | 0.7 | 33.5 | 1.1 | D |
| 171 | SR-65 SB - Sunset Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd | Basic | 3,834 | 104 | 107.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.0 | 0.8 | 33.7 | 1.1 | D |
| 172 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 3,834 | 104 | 107.7\% |  |  |  | 650 | 43 | 108.3\% | 61.8 | 0.3 | 32.9 | 1.0 | D |
| 173 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 3,180 | 88 | 107.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55.3 | 5.6 | 30.7 | 3.5 | D |
| 174 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 3,178 | 85 | 107.4\% | 451 | 12 | 98.1\% |  |  |  | 46.0 | 3.7 | 39.6 | 4.2 | E |
| 175 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd WB to EB On-ramp | Basic | 3,632 | 89 | 106.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 57.4 | 6.0 | 34.0 | 5.3 | D |
| 176 | SR-65 SB - Blue Oaks Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 3,632 | 88 | 106.2\% | 1,218 | 55 | 26.5\% |  |  |  | 52.4 | 2.9 | 32.1 | 2.3 | D |
| 177 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 4,846 | 113 | 60.4\% |  |  |  | 648 | 54 | 88.7\% | 62.0 | 0.4 | 26.8 | 0.6 | C |
| 178 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,203 | 108 | 57.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.9 | 0.2 | 24.3 | 0.6 | C |
| 179 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd WB On-ramp | Merge | 4,205 | 100 | 57.7\% | 744 | 43 | 102.0\% |  |  |  | 62.4 | 0.2 | 21.5 | 0.5 | C |
| 180 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd EB On-ramp | Merge | 4,946 | 105 | 61.7\% | 653 | 37 | 102.0\% |  |  |  | 60.7 | 0.6 | 24.3 | 0.7 | C |
| 181 | SR-65 SB - Pleasant Grove Blvd to Galleria Blvd | Basic | 5,595 | 98 | 64.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.9 | 0.5 | 27.8 | 0.4 | D |
| 182 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,595 | 98 | 64.6\% |  |  |  | 1,030 | 53 | 99.0\% | 62.6 | 0.8 | 27.2 | 0.5 | C |
| 183 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd Off to On-ramp | Basic | 4,559 | 118 | 59.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58.9 | 4.2 | 31.3 | 2.8 | D |
| 185 | SR-65 SB - Galleria Blvd On-ramp | Merge | 4,560 | 122 | 59.8\% | 724 | 37 | 103.4\% |  |  |  | 45.9 | 9.8 | 49.0 | 13.6 | F |
| 186 | SR-65 SB - I-80 Off-ramp | Diverge | 5,284 | 136 | 63.5\% |  |  |  | 3,873 | 115 | 105.5\% | 59.6 | 1.0 | 33.1 | 0.8 | D |
| 187 | SR-65 SB - EB I-80 Connector (2 lanes) | Basic | 1,419 | 73 | 105.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.6 | 1.0 | 27.1 | 1.3 | D |
| 188 | SR-65 SB - EB I-80 Connector (1 lane) | Basic | 1,422 | 70 | 105.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.7 | 0.6 | 26.7 | 1.1 | D |
| 189 | SR-65 SB - WB I-80 Connector | Basic | 3,878 | 114 | 105.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51.4 | 0.4 | 39.8 | 1.7 | E |

Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.
Mainline volume is the upstream served volume for all lanes.
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## Introduction

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), in cooperation with the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA), Placer County, and the Cities of Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln, proposes to widen State Route 65 (SR-65) from north of Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road to Lincoln Boulevard. This project has been assigned the Project Development Processing Category 4A for widening the existing freeway without requiring a revised freeway agreement. The project is subject to federal as well as state environmental review requirements. Caltrans is the lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act and the California Environmental Quality Act. The project is listed in the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Draft 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) and Draft EIR released for public on September 2015. The project is programmed in the SACOG 2015/2018 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) for preliminary engineering.
Widening of SR-65 requires additional structure width at the Pleasant Grove Creek Bridge (Br. No. 19-0136R/L). The parallel structures were constructed in 1971 (Left) and 2001 (Right). The five-span bridges have similar span lengths, but the bents are not coincident.

Similarly, the widening of SR-65 requires additional roadway width under the existing Pleasant Grove Boulevard Overcrossing (Br. No. 19-0178). Ground anchor walls in front of both abutments are proposed. The ground anchored walls will retain the existing abutment embankment fills.


Location of Structures

## Proposed Structure Types

Two bridge structures and two ground anchored walls are proposed. Details of the structures are outlined below. Bridge superstructures are proposed to match the existing with cast-in-place, reinforced concrete slabs, and will be tied into the existing bridge with drill and bond dowels (per Memo to Designers 9-3). Abutments will be diaphragm type abutments supported with pile foundations. Piers will be supported on pile foundations.

## Structure Descriptions

## Pleasant Grove Creek Bridge (Widen)(Br. No. 19-0136L)

The existing bridge is a five-span cast-in-place reinforced concrete slab bridge constructed in 1971. The bridge crosses over Pleasant Grove Creek at an approximately 33 degree skew. The deck thickness is 1.29 feet. The total length of the bridge is 128.19 feet, with a maximum span length of 28 feet. The existing bridge is 42 feet wide which accommodates two 12 -foot lanes, two 8 -foot shoulders and two 1 -foot Type 9 bridge railings.

The existing bridge has four bents, each bent consists of five 16-inch diameter cast-in-drilled-hole (CIDH) concrete pile extensions. The bridge has pile supported end diaphragm abutments.

The project proposes to widen the existing bridge to the left by 12.48 feet, and in the median by 16.48 ft . In the Project Configuration, the bridge will accommodate three 12 -foot lanes, a 6 -foot inside shoulder and a 10 -foot outside shoulder. In the Ultimate Configuration, the bridge can accommodate four 12-foot lanes, a 10-foot inside shoulder and a 10-foot outside shoulder. Type 736 barriers will be used at each edge of deck. The median bridge widening is in advance of the median roadway widening, so a Concrete Barrier (Type K) will be used in the Project Configuration to avoid traffic moving onto the portion of median bridge that does not continue onto roadway.

The proposed widening will be a cast-in-place reinforced concrete slab. The slab thickness will match the existing slab thickness of 1.29 feet. The widening will match the existing bridge span configuration and each bent will be supported by two 24 -inch CIDH concrete pile extension. The existing abutments will be widened with similar pile supported end diaphragm abutments.

The existing bridge does not have approach slabs, the widening will match this condition.

## Pleasant Grove Creek Bridge (Widen)(Br. No. 19-0136R)

The existing bridge is a five-span cast-in-place reinforced concrete slab bridge constructed in 2001. The bridge crosses over Pleasant Grove Creek at approximately a 33 degree skew. The deck thickness is 1.33 feet. The total length of the bridge is 140 feet, with a maximum span length of 29 feet. The bridge is 42.50 feet wide which accommodates two 12 -foot lanes, a 5 -foot inside shoulder, a 10 -foot outside shoulder and two Type 25 bridge railings.

The existing bridge has four bents, each bent consists of five 15-inch diameter precast, prestressed concrete pile extensions. The bridge has pile supported end diaphragm abutments.

The project proposes to widen the existing bridge to the right by 11.73 feet, and in the median by 16.73 ft . In the Project Configuration, the bridge will accommodate three 12 -foot lanes, a 5 -foot inside shoulder and a 10 -foot outside shoulder. In the Ultimate Configuration, the bridge can accommodate four 12-foot lanes, a 10-foot inside shoulder and a 10 -foot outside shoulder. Type 736 barriers will be used at each edge of deck. The median bridge widening is in advance of the median roadway widening, so a Concrete Barrier (Type K) will be used in the Project Configuration to avoid traffic moving onto the portion of median bridge that does not continue onto roadway.

The proposed widening will be a cast-in-place reinforced concrete slab. The slab thickness will match the existing slab thickness of 1.33 feet. The widening will match the existing bridge span configuration and each bent will be supported by two 24 -inch CIDH concrete pile extensions. The existing abutments will be widened with similar pile supported end diaphragm abutments.

The existing bridge has approach slabs. The widening will have approach slabs and will match the existing paving notch.

## Pleasant Grove Boulevard (North) Ground Anchor Wall

The proposed wall will retain the abutment embankment in front of Abutment 3 of the existing bridge. This wall will allow for construction of the mainline outside lane and shoulder. The wall is approximately 200 feet in length. The existing abutment is founded on a spread footing, so will pose no conflict for proposed ground anchors. It is assumed that the ground anchors will be installed at an inclination of 20 degrees below horizontal. The maximum wall height is approximately 9 feet, this will allow adequate space for the stressing of the ground anchors without conflict with the existing bridge soffit above.

## Pleasant Grove Boulevard (South) Ground Anchor Wall

The proposed wall will retain the abutment embankment in front of Abutment 1 of the existing bridge. This wall will allow for construction of the mainline outside lane and shoulder. The wall is approximately 190 feet in length. The existing abutment is founded on a spread footing, so will pose no conflict for proposed ground anchors. It is assumed that the ground anchors will be installed at an inclination of 20 degrees below horizontal. The maximum wall height is approximately 9 feet, this will allow adequate space for the stressing of the ground anchors without conflict with the existing bridge soffit above.

## Corridor Aesthetics

## SR-65 Corridor

Adjacent structures to the proposed Pleasant Grove Creek Bridge (Widen) and the Pleasant Grove Boulevard Overcrossing Ground Anchor Walls are the Galleria Boulevard OC to the south, the Blue Oaks Boulevard Overcrossing between the proposed structures, and Sunset Boulevard Overcrossing to the north.

The superstructure of these structures all are prestressed, cast-in-place post-tensioned concrete box girders. They typically have rib texture inset into the barrier reveal and barrier mounted chain link fence. The structures have a forward sloping abutment faces, slope paving and round prismatic columns at the median bent.

Along the SR-65 Corridor there are currently no ground anchor walls. It is assumed that Caltrans will require some form of texture/architectural treatment to the wall faces. This has been shown on the planning study sheets, but the details of the treatment will be determined at a later date. An image of a nearby ground anchored retaining wall is provided as reference.


Galeria Boulevard OC looking north


Blue Oaks Boulevard Overcrossing, looking North


Pleasant Grove Boulevard Overcrossing, looking North


Sunset Boulevard Overcrossing, Looking South


Ground Anchor Texture on Taylor Road Overcrossing on I-80

## Design Assumptions

The following design assumptions were used in the development of the Advanced Planning Studies:

- Design of the bridge widenings will follow current Caltrans standard and design guidelines including Load and Resistance Factor Design (LRFD) Specifications, without re-analyzing the existing structure for LRFD loads (Memo to Designers 9-3).
- Per Memo to Designers 20-12, "Seismic Design Criteria for Bridge Widenings," widening of Pleasant Grove Creek Bridge is classified as a major modification project because the deck area is increased by more than $20 \%$ and pier columns are being added. Seismic retrofit requirements will be considered during the design phase for the structures being widened. The design will comply with Memo to Designers 20-7, "Seismic Design for Slab Bridges."
- There are no existing utilities carried on Pleasant Grove Creek Bridge.
- There is currently no lighting on the Pleasant Grove Creek Bridge. Widening of the bridge may accommodate electroliers if they are needed as determined in the design phase.


## Preliminary Structure Foundations

The Pleasant Grove Creek Bridge (Left) structure is supported on 16-inch Cast-In-Drilled-Hole (CIDH) concrete piles at the abutments and bent pile extensions. The piles are Class 45 ( 45 ton). The Pleasant Grove Creek Bridge (Right) structure is supported on driven 15-inch octagonal precast, prestressed concrete piles at the abutments and pier pile extensions. The abutment piles are Class 45 and pier pile extensions are Class 70. Although not indicated on the as-built plans, it is likely that undersize drilling to assist driving was necessary since it was recommended in the foundation report.

The subsurface conditions encountered in the existing borings indicate that the site is conducive for either driven or CIDH piles. Caltrans Memo to Designers 20-7 requires precast piles to have a minimum diameter of 18 inches when they are used as pile extensions for slab bridges. The larger diameter pile may be difficult to drive considering the blow counts shown on the existing borings. Therefore, 24 -inch CIDH concrete pile extensions are recommended at each bent. It is noted that CIDH pile installation will require the "wet" method due to high groundwater and surface water intrusion.

The following table summarizes the suitable foundation types anticipated for each planned structure location.

| PRELIMINARY STRUCTURE FOUNDATION TYPES |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Structure | Proposed Abutment Type | Proposed Bent Type |
| Pleasant Grove Creek <br> Bridge (Left) | Driven precast, prestressed <br> concrete piles | 24" CIDH concrete pile <br> extensions |
| Pleasant Grove Creek <br> Bridge (Right) | Driven precast, prestressed <br> concrete piles | 24" CIDH concrete pile <br> extensions |

## Construction Cost Summary

A summary of relative construction costs is provided below. Structure costs listed below are based on 2015 Caltrans Statistics (current at the time of estimate). See Attachment B for additional details.
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|c|}\hline \text { Structure } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Area } \\ \text { (Sq. Ft.) }\end{array} & \text { Cost/Sq. Ft. } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Demolition } \\ \text { Cost }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Total } \\ \text { Cost }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Pleasant Grove Creek } \\ \text { Bridge (Widen) } \\ \text { Br. No. 19-0136L - Left }\end{array} & 1,600 & \$ 237 & \begin{array}{c}\text { (barrier } \\ \text { removal } \\ \text { included) }\end{array} & \$ 380,000 \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Pleasant Grove Creek } \\ \text { Bridge (Widen) } \\ \text { Br. No. 19-0136L - Right }\end{array} & 2,112 & \$ & 262 & \begin{array}{c}\text { (barrier } \\ \text { removal } \\ \text { included) }\end{array}\end{array}\right\} \$ 553,000$

## Consultant Prepared Advance Planning Study (APS) Checklist

Sheet 1 of 2


## Part A Items to collect and considerations prior to beginning the APS

All items listed in Part A are to be made available and submitted if requested by the Liaison Engineer. (Mark N/A if not applicable)
® Preliminary profile grade of proposed structure.
$\boxtimes \quad$ Typical section of the proposed structure. (Including barrier type, sidewalks, cross slope \%, etc.)
N/A Grades or spot elevations of roadway below the structure.
N/A Typical section of roadway below the structure. (Including shoulders, gutters, embankment slope.)
$\boxtimes \quad$ Site map: including horizontal alignment of new structure and the roadway below, topo, contours, etc.
$\boxtimes \quad$ Stage construction or detour plan for traffic on the structure.
(number of lanes to remain open, Temp Railing, etc.)
N/A Stage construction or detour plan for the roadway below the structure.
(falsework openings for each stage and any restrictions.)
】 "As Built" plans for existing structures.
$\boxtimes \quad$ Future widening plans of upper and lower roadway (verify with Route Concept Report).
$\boxtimes \quad$ Site aerial photograph (at the proposed structure).
$\boxtimes$ Environmental and/or permit requirements (areas of potential impact, construction windows, etc.)
Overhead and underground utility plans
N/A Any other information that you feel is necessary to complete the study. (Other concerns that may affect the APS: local agency requirements such as aesthetics, improvements in vicinity of structure, airspace usage, other obstructions, etc.)

## Consultant Prepared Advance Planning Study (APS) Checklist

Sheet 2 of 2

Part B Considerations during the APS design and cost estimate preparation

| 1. | Has this project been discussed with: <br> the OSFP Liaison Engineer? <br> the Caltrans District Project Manager? the roadway consultant? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \boxtimes \\ & \text { Yes } \boxtimes \\ & \text { Yes } \boxtimes \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \square \\ & \text { No } \square \\ & \square \\ & \text { No } \square \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. | Have the Caltrans Structures Maintenance records been reviewed? <br> If the records recommend any work for the structure, is it included in the APS? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \boxtimes \\ & \text { Yes } \square \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \square \\ & \text { No } \square \end{aligned}$ |
| 3. | Are there special aesthetic considerations? <br> Route aesthetics to be determined during design phase. | Yes $\boxtimes$ | No $\square$ |
| 4. | (Widenings and Modifications) <br> Has this project been reviewed for seismic retrofit requirements? <br> Are seismic retrofit requirements included in the APS? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \boxtimes \\ & \text { Yes } \square \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \square \\ & \text { No } \boxed{⿴} \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Any special Railroad requirements? <br> Shoofly required? <br> Cost of shoofly included as a separate item in the project cost estimate? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \square \\ & \text { Yes } \square \\ & \text { Yes } \square \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \boxtimes \\ & 1 \\ & \text { No } \boxtimes \\ & \text { No } \boxtimes \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Any special foundation requirements, including scour critical work, special excavation such as Type A, Type D, and/or hazardous or contaminated material? | Yes $\square$ | No 区 |
| 7. | Any special construction requirements, including limited site accessibility or seasonal Seasonal Work in Pleasant Grove Creek | rk? $\text { Yes } \boxtimes$ | No $\square$ |
| 8. | Other items to be included in the cost such as slope paving, approach slabs, and/or adjacent retaining walls? <br> Approach Slabs are included in the cost of Br. No. 19-0136R. | Yes $\boxtimes$ | No $\square$ |
| 9. | Remove existing bridge? Total Deck Area: | Yes $\square$ | No $\boxtimes$ |
| 10. | Any other unusual or special requirements? | Yes $\square$ | No $\boxtimes$ |
| 11. | Provide and attach a consultant prepared Design Memo to summarize and document important assumptions, discussions, decisions, unusual items, local agency requireme such as aesthetics, improvements in vicinity of the structure, airspace usage, other obstructions, or any items noted above. <br> Summary attached? | $\text { Yes } \boxtimes$ | No $\square$ |


| Designer: (Printed Name) | Designer's Signature: | Date: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jennifer Elwood | gennifer Elword | 12/15/15 |

## Attachment B

## Advance Planning Study Cost Estimates



|  | GENERAL PLAN ESTIMATE |  | x | ADVANCE PLANNING ESTIMATE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Revised - December 3, 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | RCVD BY: |  |  | IN EST: |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | OUT EST: |  |  |
| BRIDGE: | Pleasant Grove Creek Bridge (Left) (Widen) - Right | BR. No.: | 19-0136L |  | DISTRICT: | 03 |  |
| TYPE: | CIP Slab |  |  |  | RTE: | 65 |  |
| CU: |  |  |  |  | CO: | PLA |  |
| EA: |  |  |  |  | PM: |  |  |
|  | LENGTH: | 128.2 | WIDTH: | 16.5 | AREA (SF)= |  | 2,112 |
|  | DESIGN SECTION: | ch2m |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \# OF STRUCTURES IN PROJECT : |  | EST. NO. |  |  |  |  |
|  | PRICES BY : | J. Elwood |  | COST INDEX: | 2015 |  |  |
|  | PRICES CHECKED BY: | M. Brady |  | DATE: | Mar-17 |  |  |
|  | QUANTITIES BY: | J. Elwood |  | DATE: | Mar-17 |  |  |
|  | CONTRACT ITEMS | TYPE | UNIT | QUANTITY | PRICE | AMOUNT |  |
| 1 | REFINISH BRIDGE DECK |  | SQFT | 193 | \$ 20.00 | \$ | 3,860.00 |
| 2 | STRUCTURE EXCAVATION (BRIDGE) |  | CY | 18 | \$ 100.00 | \$ | 1,832.46 |
| 3 | STRUCTURE BACKFILL (BRIDGE) |  | CY | 27 | \$ 80.00 | \$ | 2,160.00 |
| 4 | FURNISH PILING (CLASS 90) |  | LF | 132 | \$ 30.00 | \$ | 3,960.00 |
| 5 | DRIVE PILE (CLASS 90) |  | EA | 8 | \$ 2,275.00 | \$ | 18,200.00 |
| 6 | 24" CAST-IN-DRILLED-HOLE CONCRETE PILING |  | LF | 532 | \$ 180.00 | \$ | 95,760.00 |
| 7 | STRUCTURAL CONCRETE, BRIDGE |  | CY | 130 | \$ 800.00 | \$ | 104,000.00 |
| 8 | DRILL AND BOND DOWEL |  | LF | 780 | \$ 35.00 | \$ | 27,300.00 |
| 9 | JOINT SEAL (MR = $1^{1} 2{ }^{\prime \prime}$ ) |  | LF | 30 | \$ 30.00 | \$ | 900.00 |
| 10 | BAR REINFORCING STEEL (BRIDGE) |  | LBS | 34,167 | \$ 1.25 | \$ | 42,708.75 |
| 11 | BRIDGE REMOVAL (PORTION) |  | LS | 1 | \$ 6,409.38 | \$ | 6,409.38 |
| 12 | CONCRETE BARRIER | TYPE 736 | LF | 129 | \$ 100.00 | \$ | 12,900.00 |
| 13 | CONCRETE BARRIER | TYPE K | LF | 140 | \$ 100.00 | \$ | 14,000.00 |
| 14 | ROCK SLOPE PROTECTION |  | CY | 139 | \$ 200.00 | \$ | 27,887.74 |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$ | 361,878 |
|  |  | TIME RELATE | OVERHEAD |  |  | \$ | 36,188 |
|  | ROUTING | MOBILIZATIO | ( @ 10 \%) |  |  | \$ | 44,230 |
|  | 1. Des section | SUBTOTAL B | IDGE ITEMS |  |  | \$ | 442,296 |
|  | 2. OfFICE OF BRIDGE DESIIGN - NORTH | CONTINGENC |  | (@ 25\%) |  | \$ | 110,574 |
|  | 3. Office of bridge design - Central | BRIDGE TOT | COST |  |  | \$ | 552,870 |
|  | 4. Office of bridge design - South | COST PER SQ | FOOT |  |  | \$ | 261.72 |
|  | 5. OFFICE OF BRIDGE DESIGN - WEST | BRIDGE REM | VAL (CONTING | ENCIES INCL.) |  |  |  |
|  | 6. OFFICE OF BRIDGE DESIGN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA | WORK BY RA | ROAD OR UTIL | ITY FORCES |  |  |  |
|  |  | GRAND TOTAL |  |  |  | \$ | 552,870 |
| COMMENTS: |  | BUDGET EST | MATE AS OF |  |  | \$ | 553,000 |






## Attachment C

## Advance Planning Study Plans






## Attachment E <br> Right-of Way Data Sheets (DRAFT)

| To: | District Division Chief <br> Division of Right of Way and Land Surveys | Date: $11 / 03 / 16$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Attention: | District Branch Chief <br> R/W Local Programs | Co. PLA <br> Subject: |
| RIGHT OF WAY DATA SHEET - LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCIES |  |  |

Project Description:

## Alternative 1: Carpool Lane

Right of way necessary for the subject project will be the responsibility of the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA).
The information in this data sheet was developed by Andy Lee, Mark Thomas \& Company.

## I. Right of Way Engineering

Will Right of Way Engineering be required for this project?

- No X
- Yes $\qquad$
- Hard copy (base map)
- Appraisal map
- Acquisition Documents $\qquad$
- R/W Record Map
- Record of Survey


## II. Engineering Surveys

1. Is any surveying or photogrammetric mapping required?

No X
Yes $\qquad$ (Complete the following.)
2. Datum Requirements

Yes X Project will adhere to the following criteria:

- Horizontal - datum policy is NAD 83, CA-HPGN, EPOCH 1991.35 and English system of units and measures.
- Vertical - datum policy is NAVD 88.
- Units - metric is not required.

No $\qquad$ Provide an explanation on additional page.
3. Will land survey monument perpetuation be scoped into the project, if required?

Yes $\quad \mathrm{X}$, However, it is not anticipated that this will be needed.
No $\qquad$ Provide explanation on additional page.

## III. Parcel Information (Land and Improvements)

Are there any property rights required within the proposed project limits?

$$
\text { No } \quad \mathrm{X} \quad \text { Yes ___ (Complete the following.) }
$$

Part Take
A. Number of Vacant Land Parcels
B. Number of Single Family Residential Units
C. Number of Multifamily Residential Units
D. Number of Commercial/Industrial Parcels
E. Number of Farm/Agricultural Parcels
F. Permanent and/or Temporary Easements
G. Other Parcels (define in "Remarks" section)

Totals
Some of the parcels being acquired are currently of properties that are located within the "sphere of influence" of the City of Roseville. They are urban reserve and have potential for mixed use development. Other parcels include vacant and improved industrial parks, UPRR, baseball field, and a biomass facility. Significant curable and non-curable severance damages will be associated with the biomass facility; Fixtures \& Equipment appraisal will be needed.

## IV. Dedications

Are there any property rights which have been acquired, or anticipate will be acquired, through the "dedication" process for the Project?

$$
\text { No } \quad \mathrm{X} \quad \text { Yes ___ (Complete the following.) }
$$

Number of dedicated parcels $\qquad$
Have the dedication parcel(s) been accepted by the municipality involved?

## V. Excess Lands / Relinquishments

Are there Caltrans property rights which may become excess lands or potential relinquishment areas?

$$
\text { No } \quad \mathrm{X} \quad \text { Yes ____ (Provide an explanation on additional page.) }
$$
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## VI. Relocation Information

Are relocation displacements anticipated?

$$
\text { No } \quad \mathrm{X} \quad \text { Yes ___ (Complete the following.) }
$$

A. Number of Single Family Residential Units

Estimated RAP Payments $\qquad$
B. Number of Multifamily Residential Units

Estimated RAP Payments
$\qquad$
\$ $\qquad$
C. Number of Business/Nonprofit

Estimated RAP Payments
$\qquad$
\$
$\qquad$
Estimated RAP Payments
D. Number of Farms
E. Other (define in the "Remarks" section)

Estimated RAP Payments
$\qquad$
\$ $\qquad$

Totals

* Possible Relocation Assistance Payment claim for re-establishment estimated for biomass facility.


## VII. Utility Relocation Information

Do you anticipate any utility facilities or utility rights of way to be affected?
No $\qquad$ Yes X (Complete the following.)

|  |  |  | ated Relocation | ense |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Facility |  | State <br> Obligation | Local Obligation | Utility Owner Obligation |
| A. Electric OH | PG\&E | \$ | \$50,000* | \$50,000* |
| B. |  | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| C. |  | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| D. |  | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| E. |  | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| F. |  | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Totals |  | \$ | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| Number of facilities |  | 1 |  |  |

*This amount is based on 50-50 liability per the Master Agreement between State and PG\&E.

## VIII. Rail Information

Are railroad facilities or railroad rights of way affected?
No $\quad \mathrm{X} \quad$ Yes ___ (Complete the following.)
Describe railroad facilities or railroad rights of way affected.

| Owner's Name | Transverse Crossing | Longitudinal Encroachment |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A. |  |  |
| B. |  |  |

At grade crossing will require a service contract.

## IX. Clearance Information

Are there improvements that require clearance?

$$
\text { No } \quad \mathrm{X} \quad \text { Yes ___ (Complete the following.) }
$$

A. Number of Structures to be Demolished Estimated Cost of Demolition
\$ $\qquad$
X. Hazardous Materials/Waste

Are there any site(s) and/or improvements(s) in the Project Limits that are known to contain hazardous materials? None X_Y_ (Explain in the "Remarks" section.)

Are there any site(s) and/or improvement(s) in the Project Limits that are suspected to contain
hazardous waste? None X__ Yes ___ (Explain in the "Remarks" section.)

## XI. Project Scheduling

|  | Proposed lead time | Completion date |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| * Preliminary Engineering, Surveys | (months) |  |
| * R/W Engineering Submittals | (months) | - |
| * R/W Appraisals/Acquisition | (months) | TBD <br> Proposed Environmental Clearance <br> Proposed R/W Certification |

## XII. Proposed Funding

|  | Local | State | Federal | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquisition |  |  |  |  |
| Utilities | \$50,000 |  |  |  |
| Relocation Assistance Program |  |  |  |  |
| R/W Support |  |  |  |  |
| Cost (Eng. Appraisals, etc.) |  |  |  |  |

## XIII. Remarks

Project Sponsor Consultant
Prepared by:

Andy Lee, Mark Thomas \& Company

## Date

Project Sponsor
Reviewed and Approved by:
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Date

Caltrans
Reviewed and approved based on information provided to date:

| Caltrans District Branch Chief | Date |
| :--- | :--- |
| Local Programs |  |
| Division of Right of Way |  |

Local Programs
Division of Right of Way

| To: | District Division Chief <br> Division of Right of Way and Land Surveys | Date: $11 / 03 / 16$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Attention: | District Branch Chief <br> R/W Local Programs | Co. PLA <br> Subject: |
| RIGHT OF WAY DATA SHEET - LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCIES |  |  |

Project Description:

## Alternative 2: General Purpose Lane

Right of way necessary for the subject project will be the responsibility of the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA).
The information in this data sheet was developed by Andy Lee, Mark Thomas \& Company.

## I. Right of Way Engineering

Will Right of Way Engineering be required for this project?

- No X
- Yes $\qquad$
- Hard copy (base map)
- Appraisal map
- Acquisition Documents $\qquad$
- R/W Record Map
- Record of Survey


## II. Engineering Surveys

1. Is any surveying or photogrammetric mapping required?

No X
Yes $\qquad$ (Complete the following.)
2. Datum Requirements

Yes X Project will adhere to the following criteria:

- Horizontal - datum policy is NAD 83, CA-HPGN, EPOCH 1991.35 and English system of units and measures.
- Vertical - datum policy is NAVD 88.
- Units - metric is not required.

No $\qquad$ Provide an explanation on additional page.
3. Will land survey monument perpetuation be scoped into the project, if required?

Yes $\quad \mathrm{X}$, However, it is not anticipated that this will be needed.
No $\qquad$ Provide explanation on additional page.

## III. Parcel Information (Land and Improvements)

Are there any property rights required within the proposed project limits?

$$
\text { No } \quad \mathrm{X} \quad \text { Yes ___ (Complete the following.) }
$$

Part Take
A. Number of Vacant Land Parcels
B. Number of Single Family Residential Units
C. Number of Multifamily Residential Units
D. Number of Commercial/Industrial Parcels
E. Number of Farm/Agricultural Parcels
F. Permanent and/or Temporary Easements
G. Other Parcels (define in "Remarks" section)

Totals
Some of the parcels being acquired are currently of properties that are located within the "sphere of influence" of the City of Roseville. They are urban reserve and have potential for mixed use development. Other parcels include vacant and improved industrial parks, UPRR, baseball field, and a biomass facility. Significant curable and non-curable severance damages will be associated with the biomass facility; Fixtures \& Equipment appraisal will be needed.

## IV. Dedications

Are there any property rights which have been acquired, or anticipate will be acquired, through the "dedication" process for the Project?

$$
\text { No } \quad \mathrm{X} \quad \text { Yes ___ (Complete the following.) }
$$

Number of dedicated parcels $\qquad$
Have the dedication parcel(s) been accepted by the municipality involved?

## V. Excess Lands / Relinquishments

Are there Caltrans property rights which may become excess lands or potential relinquishment areas?

$$
\text { No } \quad \mathrm{X} \quad \text { Yes ____ (Provide an explanation on additional page.) }
$$
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## VI. Relocation Information

Are relocation displacements anticipated?

$$
\text { No } \quad \mathrm{X} \quad \text { Yes ___ (Complete the following.) }
$$

A. Number of Single Family Residential Units

Estimated RAP Payments $\qquad$
B. Number of Multifamily Residential Units

Estimated RAP Payments
$\qquad$
\$ $\qquad$
C. Number of Business/Nonprofit

Estimated RAP Payments
$\qquad$
\$
$\qquad$
Estimated RAP Payments
D. Number of Farms
E. Other (define in the "Remarks" section)

Estimated RAP Payments
$\qquad$
\$ $\qquad$

Totals

* Possible Relocation Assistance Payment claim for re-establishment estimated for biomass facility.


## VII. Utility Relocation Information

Do you anticipate any utility facilities or utility rights of way to be affected?
No $\qquad$ Yes X (Complete the following.)

|  |  |  | ted Relocatio | se |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Facility |  | State <br> Obligation | Local Obligation | Utility Owner Obligation |
| A. Electric | PG\&E | \$ | \$50,000* | \$50,000* |
| B. |  | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| C. |  | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| D. |  | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| E. |  | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| F. |  | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Totals |  | \$ | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| Number of facilities |  | 1 |  |  |

*This amount is based on 50-50 liability per the Master Agreement between State and PG\&E.

## VIII. Rail Information

Are railroad facilities or railroad rights of way affected?
No $\quad \mathrm{X} \quad$ Yes ___ (Complete the following.)
Describe railroad facilities or railroad rights of way affected.

| Owner's Name | Transverse Crossing | Longitudinal Encroachment |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A. |  |  |
| B. |  |  |

At grade crossing will require a service contract.

## IX. Clearance Information

Are there improvements that require clearance?

$$
\text { No } \quad \mathrm{X} \quad \text { Yes ___ (Complete the following.) }
$$

A. Number of Structures to be Demolished Estimated Cost of Demolition
\$ $\qquad$
X. Hazardous Materials/Waste

Are there any site(s) and/or improvements(s) in the Project Limits that are known to contain hazardous materials? None X_Y_ (Explain in the "Remarks" section.)

Are there any site(s) and/or improvement(s) in the Project Limits that are suspected to contain
hazardous waste? None X__ Yes ___ (Explain in the "Remarks" section.)

## XI. Project Scheduling

|  | Proposed lead time | Completion date |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| * Preliminary Engineering, Surveys | (months) |  |
| * R/W Engineering Submittals | (months) | - |
| * R/W Appraisals/Acquisition | (months) | TBD <br> Proposed Environmental Clearance <br> Proposed R/W Certification |

## XII. Proposed Funding

|  | Local | State | Federal | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquisition |  |  |  |  |
| Utilities | \$50,000 |  |  |  |
| Relocation Assistance Program |  |  |  |  |
| R/W Support |  |  |  |  |
| Cost (Eng. Appraisals, etc.) |  |  |  |  |

## XIII. Remarks

Project Sponsor Consultant
Prepared by:

Andy Lee, Mark Thomas \& Company

## Date

Project Sponsor
Reviewed and Approved by:
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Date

Caltrans
Reviewed and approved based on information provided to date:

| Caltrans District Branch Chief | Date |
| :--- | :--- |
| Local Programs |  |
| Division of Right of Way |  |

Local Programs
Division of Right of Way

## Attachment F <br> Storm Water Data Report (DRAFT)

Dist-County-Route: 03-PLA-65
Post Mile Limits: PM 6.5/12.8
Project Type: Widening Freeway
Project ID (or EA): 03-1F170K
Program Identification: $\qquad$
Phase:

PID
PA/ED

Regional Water Quality Control Board(s): Central Valley Regional Water Control Board
Is the Project required to consider Treatment BMPs?
If yes, can Treatment BMPs be incorporated into the project?

Yes $\boxtimes \quad$ No
Yes $\boxtimes$ No

No

If No, a Technical Data Report must be submitted to the RWQCB at least 30 days prior to the projects RTL date.

List RTL Date: $\qquad$

Total Disturbed Soil Area: 55.05 acres (GP)
Risk Level: 2
Estimated: Construction Start Date: 2020
Construction Completion Date: 2025
Notification of Construction (NOC) Date to be submitted: TBD

Erosivity Waiver
Notification of ADL reuse (if Yes, provide date)
Separate Dewatering Permit (if yes, permit number)

Yes
Yes $\boxtimes$ Yes

Date:
Date:TBD in PS\&E
Permit \# $\qquad$ No $\boxtimes$

This Report has been prepared under the direction of the following Licensed Person. The Licensed Person attests to the technical information contained herein and the date upon which recommendations, conclusions, and decisions are based. Professional Engineer or Landscape Architect stamp required at PS\&E.

I have reviewed the stormwater quality design issues and find this report to be complete, current and accurate:

| [Name),, Project Manager | Date |
| :--- | :--- |
| [Name), Designated Maintenance Representative | Date |
|  |  |
| James Williamson, Designated Landscape Architect <br> Representative | Date |
| Wes Faubel, District/Regional Design SW Coordinator or Designee | Date |

## STORM WATER DATA INFORMATION

## 1. Project Description

Caltrans in cooperation with Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA), Placer County, and the Cities of Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln proposes to widen State Route (SR) 65 north of Galleria Blvd/Stanford Ranch Rd to Lincoln Blvd. In addition to the No Build Alternative, the project will consider two build alternatives, Carpool Lane and General Purpose Lane Alternatives. Both build alternatives would meet the project need and purpose and the preferred alternative has not been officially identified. For the purposes of the SWDR, the analysis will be based on the General Purpose Lane Alternative, whose project footprint yields slightly more area of disturbance.

The Carpool Lane Alternative propose to add a 12-foot carpool/high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane in the southbound direction of SR 65 in the median from north of Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road interchange to Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange. A new carpool lane in the northbound direction of SR 65 from Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road interchange to Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange will not be included in this project and is deferred to the future project when it will be included in the next MTP update. The carpool/HOV lanes would connect to the carpool/HOV lanes proposed from the I-80/SR 65 interchange project.

Other capacity improvements on SR 65 include adding one 12-foot general purpose lane in each direction of SR 65 from Galleria Boulevard interchange to Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange and adding auxiliary lane in each direction of SR 65 from Galleria Boulevard interchange to Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange, from Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange to Sunset Boulevard interchange, and from Placer Pkwy interchange to Twelve Bridges Drive.

Per recommendation from the VA study, this alternative will also include ramp metering modifications for the slip on-ramps to a $2+1$ configuration ( 2 metered lanes plus 1 carpool preferential lane) and a 1+1 (1 metered lane plus 1 carpool preferential lane) for the loop on-ramps along SR 65 from Galleria Boulevard interchange to Lincoln Boulevard. Ramps to be modified include southbound Pleasant Grove Boulevard slip and loop on-ramps, Blue Oaks Boulevard slip and loop on-ramps, and Lincoln Boulevard slip on-ramp

The General Purpose Lane Alternative proposes to add a 12-foot general purpose lane in southbound direction of SR 65 from north of Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road interchange to Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange, and in northbound direction from Galleria Boulevard interchange to Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange. For added capacity on southbound SR 65 as recommended by the VA study, this alternative also includes additional general purpose lane from Galleria Boulevard interchange to Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange.

The alternative also include extending/adding auxiliary lanes and modifying slip and loop on-ramps for ramp metering as described in the Carpool Lane Alternative.

Both build alternatives will allow inside widening as future projects along SR 65 from north of Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange to Lincoln Blvd and will accommodate the I80/SR 65 project and will take into consideration the carpool/HOV lane restrictions and weaving volumes from the carpool/HOV lanes proposed by the I-80/SR 65 project.

The amount of impervious area and the total disturbed soil area is summarized in the table below. The Disturbed Soil Area (DSA) includes all grading area, surface area of cut and fill, all clearing and grubbing area, and anticipated Contractor's staging area and area for equipment storage. The impervious area was calculated based on existing and proposed pavement areas affected by project improvements.

Table 1. Impervious Area and Disturbed Soil Totals

| Description | General Purpose Alternative |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Area (Acres) |
| Impervious Area - Existing Condition | 80.29 |
| New Impervious Area - with Project | 16.93 |
| Total Impervious Area - with Project | 97.22 |
| Disturbed Soil Area | 55.05 |

The project is located within the cities of Rocklin, Roseville, and Lincoln and Placer County Urban MS4 areas.

## 2. Site Data and Storm Water Quality Design Issues (refer to Checklists SW-1, SW-2, and SW-3)

## - Hydrologic Units

According to the Water Quality Planning Tool the project limits extends through Hydrological Sub Area 519.22, Pleasant Grove, of the Coon-American Hydrologic Area and the Valley-American Hydrologic Unit.

## - Receiving Water Bodies

There are two major waterbodies that cross SR 65 within the project limits. Orchard Creek is the receiving water body that contributes from watershed areas in the northern portion project limits ( 0.5 mile south of Placer Parkway to Lincoln Blvd). The other waterbody, Pleasant Grove Creek, is the receiving water body for the watershed areas in the southern portion of the project limits (Galleria Blvd to 0.5 mile south of Placer Pkwy). Orchard Creek is a tributary to Auburn Ravine which ultimately discharges to the Sacramento River via the Natomas North Canal, and the Natomas Cross Canal. Pleasant Grove Creek discharges to the Sacramento River via the Pleasant Grove Canal and the Natomas Cross Canal.

## - Land Use

General plan for the Cities of Roseville, Rocklin and Lincoln and Placer County were reviewed. Currently, the existing land use adjacent to the project site is a mixture of industrial and commercial parks, community commercial, business professional and agricultural open space.

- 2010 Clean Water Act 303(d) List

Pleasant Grove Creek is listed as a 303(d) listed impaired water body. Pollutants of concern are Oxygen, dissolved, Pyrethroids, and Sediment toxicity.

## - Climatic Summary

The project site is located within the Cities of Roseville, Rocklin, Lincoln and Placer County. The climate is characterized by mild fall and spring temperatures in the 70's and warm summers. The Water Planning Tool averages the rainfall to be 21 inches.
According to Caltrans Stormwater Quality Handbooks, rainy season is estimated from October 15 to April 15.

## - Topographic Summary

The terrain is rolling hills ranging from 135 feet to 220 feet above sea level within the project area. Extensive urban development exists on the southern end of the project site within the Cities of Roseville and Rocklin. The topography of the northern side of the project can be characterized as flat, gently sloping down to Orchard Creek.

## - Soil Characteristics

Soils information for this project has been obtained from the US Department of Agriculture, National Resource Conservation Service. The soils within the project limits are described in Table 2 below.

Hydrological Group A soils have the lowest runoff potential and high infiltration rates when thoroughly wetted. Hydrological Group B soils have moderate infiltration rates when thoroughly wetted. Hydrological Group $C$ have low infiltration rates when thoroughly wetted. Hydrological Group D soils have the highest runoff potential, very low infiltration rates when thoroughly wetted, and may be subject to erosion by water.

Table 2. Soil Group Characteristics

| Map Unit Name | Map Unit Symbol | Hydrological Soil <br> Group |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Alamo - Fiddyment complex, 0 - 5\% slope | 104 | C/D |
| Alamo variant clay, 2 - 15\% slopes | 105 | D |
| Cometa sandy loam, 1 - 5\% slopes | 140 | D |
| Cometa - Fiddyment complex, 1-5\% slopes | 141 | D |
| Exchequer very stony loam, 2 - 15\% slopes | 144 | D |
| Exchequer - Rock Outcrop complex, 2 - 30\% <br> slopes | 145 | D |
| Fiddyment - Kaseberg loams, 2 - 9\% slopes | 147 | C/D |
| Inks - Exchequer complex, 2 - 25\% slopes | 154 | D |
| Xerofluvents, occasionally flooded | 193 | A |
| Xerofluvents, frequently flooded | 194 | B |
| Water | 198 | - |

The soils within the project limits can be generalized as being in hydrological soil group D.

## - Risk Assessment

## Pleasant Grove Creek

The R factor was determined from the EPA's "Rainfall Erosivity Factor Calculator for Small Construction Sites to be 249.76 based on approximate construction duration of five years. The K factor yielded an average of 0.27 . The LS factor was determined using cross section information considering the length and slope of the slopes being disturbed and yielded an average of 1.05.

The product of these values ( $\mathrm{R}, \mathrm{K}$, and LS ) is 70.81 tons/acre. Because this value is between 15 tons/acre and 75 tons/acre, the project site is classified as having medium sediment risk.

The receiving water risk is classified as high because portion of the disturbed area discharges directly to the Pleasant Grove Creek, which is a 303(d) Listed waterbody impaired by sediment.

The combined medium sediment risk and high receiving water risk results in the project being classified as Risk Level 2.

## Orchard Creek

The R factor was determined from the EPA's "Rainfall Erosivity Factor Calculator for Small Construction Sites to be 249.76 based on approximate construction duration of five years. The K factor yielded an average of 0.38 . The LS factor was determined using cross section information considering the length and slope of the slopes being disturbed and yielded an average of 0.51 .

The product of these values ( $\mathrm{R}, \mathrm{K}$, and LS ) is 48.40 tons/acre. Because this value is between 15 tons/acres and 75 tons/acres, the project site is classified as having a medium sediment risk.

Orchard Creek is not on the 303(d) List for impaired water body and has no beneficial uses of spawn \& cold migratory. However, this water body is high risk based on the Water Board Prescriptive mapping.

The combined medium sediment risk and low receiving water risk results in the project being classified as Risk Level 2.

## - Right-of-way Requirements

The project is primarily within the Caltrans R/W; no R/W acquisition is expected. It is anticipated that treatment BMPs will be installed at location where there is adequate room within the R/W.

- 401 Certification

A 401 certification is needed for the work within Pleasant Grove Creek when Pleasant Grove Creek Bridges (Br. No. 19-0136 L/R) is widened as well as other water bodies' locations where existing culverts will be extended.

## 3. Regional Water Quality Control Board Agreements

There are no known RWQCB special requirements. There are no negotiated understandings or agreements with Central Valley RWQCB that are expected pertaining to this project at this time.

## 4. Proposed Design Pollution Prevention BMPs to be used on the Project.

The Low Impact Development/Design (LID) will be incorporated into the development of permanent best management practices during the design phase to maximum extent practicable. Incorporating LID in the design includes minimizing the new impervious areas by maximizing the use of existing pavement for the widening, reducing amount of inlets and pipes, and increasing the areas for biostrips and bioretention swales to promote hydrologic functions similar to the existing hydrology.

The proposed project will create additional 17 acres of impervious area and therefore there will be an increase of storm water runoff. The increase of runoff will be directed into drainage toe ditches connected to the proposed bioswales. Both diches and bioswales will be long and flat in longitudinal slope to increase the contact time, to promote infiltration, and to reduce the runoff velocity and minimize impacts downstream. The existing drainage pattern will be kept after construction. Flared end sections, rock lined channel and paved channel will be used at culvert and channel outlets to minimize the increase of velocity.

There is potential for increased sediment loading. All graded slopes, either cut or fill, will be constructed with proper erosion control and permanent plantings. Hydroseeding with California native seed mix including California Brome, California Poppy, Creeping Wildrye, and Small Fescue that have been used successfully in the adjacent highway projects will be considered as the erosion control measure for this project. Ditches will be vegetated but if erosive velocities are anticipated, ditches will be constructed with rock lining to prevent scour. Storm water runoff conveyed through drainage culverts will outfall into a flared end section and a Rock Slope Protection (RSP) pad before continuing flowing downstream. This slows the flow and reduces the potential to erode the ditch and convey sediment downstream.

## Slope/Surface Protection Systems, Checklist DPP-1, Parts 1 and 3

Proposed fill slopes will be kept between 3:0 and 4:1 ( $\mathrm{H}: \mathrm{V}$ ) or flatter and cut slopes will be limited at a maximum of $2: 1(\mathrm{H}: \mathrm{V})$. To minimize erosion from any of the new slopes mitigating design features have been considered. All graded slopes, either cut or fill, will be vegetated. The slope and surface protection systems selected for use include slope rounding, seeding and planting, and erosion control. During construction, embankment slopes will be roughened by either track-walking or rolling with a sheepsfoot roller to receive erosion control (hydroseeding). Excavation Slopes will be roughened by scarifying to a depth of 6 inches. Sequencing steps after hydroseeding will include applying compost and hydromulch and installing rolled erosion control netting to complete the erosion control. Quantity of erosion control will be calculated and paid by the square feet of areas receiving the hydrossed, compost, hydromulch, and netting.

Areas of the project that will be hardscaped as required for safety (ramp gores) and maintenance (pullout areas) include the SR65/Pleasant Grove Boulevard Interchange and SR65/Blue Oaks Boulevard Interchange. To maintain consistency with the hardscape along the SR65 corridor, ramp gores will be constructed with minor concrete (textured paving) that matches color and pattern of adjacent interchanges along the corridor. Riprap under the Pleasant Grove Creek Bridges for scour and slope stability will be included in the project design.

## Concentrated Flow Conveyance Systems, Checklist DPP-1, Parts 1 and 4

There are a variety of concentrated flow conveyance devices along the length of the project. The concentrated flow conveyance devices include unlined ditches, drainage inlets, culverts, asphalt concrete dikes and overside drains, flared end sections and RSP pads which are stabilized to carry runoff without causing erosion.

For this project, the planned drainage pattern will replicate as much as possible the existing runoff pattern that convey storm runoff into Orchard Creek and Pleasant Grove Creek.

## Preservation of Existing Vegetation, Checklist DPP-1, Parts 1 and 5

Construction of the project will remove some amount of existing vegetation within the project right-of-way. Clearing and grubbing is primarily limited to areas within existing median area and outside pavement where the widening will occur. Vegetation clearing and construction operations will be limited to the direct conflict with the improvements and to the minimum necessary in areas of temporary construction access and staging areas. The exclusion fencing consisting of orange construction barrier and erosion control fencing or combination fencing will be installed along the edge of the construction limits. Vegetation to be protected will be surveyed before the construction by the project biologist who will direct the Contractor install orange fencing for protection. The fencing will be buried a minimum of 6 inches to prevent sediment runoff into adjacent wetlands.

The vegetation composition adjacent to the disturbed areas typically consists of nonnative species, particularly annual grasses and weedy forbs, with scattered trees and shrubs. Where existing vegetation is impacted by the construction activities, proper vegetation will be placed, monitored, and maintained to establish permanent cover at direction of the project biologist. The Contractor will be prohibited from clearing and grubbing outside the slope catch point.

Some cross drainage including reinforced box culverts and large diameter culverts will be extended from roadway widening. Therefore the work zone within the tributary riparian zone will be limited to what is necessary to perform the work and provide a temporary bypass. Additional Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) exist within the project limits that are potentially impacted by the project. ESA protection measures (i.e. ESA fencing) are included in the project plans. Areas outside of the active work area are excluded from construction access.

## 5. Proposed Permanent Treatment BMPs to be used on the Project

## Treatment BMP Strategy, Checklist T-1

The project is required to consider treatment BMPs because it involves new construction and the creation of more than one acre of impervious area. The total impervious area created by the proposed project is about 17 acres and the goal is to treat $100 \%$ of new
impervious area. To consider appropriate types of treatment BMPs for this project, the T1 Part 1 checklist is used for each drainage sheds within the project.

After eliminating dry weather flow diversion, gross solids removal, infiltration, detention, traction sand traps, multi-chambered treatment train devices, and wet basins, the biofiltration swales and media filters are the preferred permanent treatment BMPs for this project.

## Biofiltration Swales/Strips, Checklist T-1, Parts 1 and 2

A total of six (6) biofiltration swales are proposed using the design criteria specified in the Caltrans Biofiltration Swale Design Guidance. The parameter for each bioswale including the bottom width, side slope, longitudinal slope, hydraulic residence time at WQF, length of flow path, flow depth during WQF, and velocity is documented and included in the attachment.

To quantify percentage of WQV that can be infiltrated, Caltrans T-1 Infiltration Tool and Basin Sizer are used. Because of the soil characteristics at the bioswale site, the infiltration is proved to be unfeasible ( 0 percent of WQV will be infiltrated). The infiltration rate is increased with soil amendments and the rate ranges from 10 to 28 percent. The results of infiltration percentage for each bioswale is documented and included in the attachment.

## Dry Weather Diversion, Checklist T-1, Parts 1 and 3

Dry weather flow is not persistent or anticipated; therefore, dry weather diversion will not be used on the project.

## Infiltration Devices - Checklist T-1, Parts 1 and 4

Infiltration devices are not feasible due to the soil type which is classified as NRCS Hydrologic Soil Group D with poor infiltration rate.

## Detention Devices, Checklist T-1, Parts 1 and 5

Detention basins are feasible based on the fact that the volume of the detention devices is at least equal to the WQV and the basin invert is greater than the 10 feet above seasonally high groundwater. However, no adequate area exists within the existing right of way for placement without encroaching into environmentally sensitive wetlands, vernal pools, or preserved jurisdictional areas. The installation of detention devices will not be cost effective and will not be considered for this project.

## Gross Solids Removal Devices (GSRDs), Checklist T-1, Parts 1 and 6

GSRDs have not been incorporated into the project because Pleasant Grove Creek and Orchard Creek are not on 303(d) list as impaired water receiving body nor has a TMDL for trash or litter.

## Traction Sand Traps, Checklist T-1, Parts 1 and 7

Traction Sand Traps are not incorporated into the project because Traction Sand or other abrasives are not applied to the roadway more than twice per year.

## Media Filters, Checklist T-1, Parts 1 and 8

Austin Sand Filter is feasible due to its Water Quality Volume capacity and sufficient hydraulic head. However, no adequate area exists within the existing right of way for placement without encroaching into environmentally sensitive wetlands, vernal pools, or preserved jurisdictional areas. The installation of media filter will not be cost effective and will not be considered for this project.

## Multi-Chambered Treatment Trains (MCTTs), Checklist T-1, Parts 1 and 9

There are no critical source areas within the project limits. MCTT are not feasible.

## Wet Basins, Checklist T-1, Parts 1 and 10

Wet Basins are not incorporated into the project because there is not a permanent water source available in sufficient quantities to maintain the permanent pool.

## 6. Proposed Temporary Construction Site BMPs to be used on Project

As presented in Section 2 of the report, this project is classified as Risk Level 2. This section presents the proposed temporary construction BMP strategy to be implemented for this project to meet Caltrans criteria.

## - Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan

The project has a DSA of 55.05 acres. Because this project disturbs more than one acre of soil, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) must be submitted for this project by the Contractor prior to the start of construction. The SWPPP must be prepared by a qualified SWPPP Developer (QSD), submitted to the CVRWQCB and monitored by a qualified SWPPP practioner (QSP) prior to construction. Also, the SWPPP will need to comply with all requirements of the Caltrans Storm Water Quality Handbook - Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan Preparation Manual.

## - Rain Event Action Plan

Risk Level 2 projects are required to prepare a Rain Event Action Plan (REAP). The number of REAPs anticipated for this project is shown in Table 3. The quantities for REAPs are based on precipitation data from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration website.

## - Construction Site BMP Strategy

The construction work for this project is scheduled to cover five construction seasons. To mitigate any potential run-off or run-on within the project area, construction site BMPs will be installed prior to the start of construction or as early as feasibly possible during construction.

Since construction is scheduled for five years, there is potential for erosion to occur on existing and newly formed slopes. Multiple mobilization Move-In/Move-Out locations are proposed for the project to implement temporary erosion control and construction site measures throughout the project.

Temporary Hydraulic Mulch will be placed on any exposed disturbed soil, stockpile of soil and unprotected slopes that may be susceptible to erosion from either runoff or wind.

Temporary fiber rolls and temporary silt fence will be utilized as a sediment control measure to minimize both sediment laden sheet flows and concentrated flows from discharging offsite.

Temporary drainage inlet protection prevents sediment from entering current or proposed storm drains.

Offsite tracking of sediment is limited by placing stabilized construction entrances in combination with regular street sweeping. Stabilized construction roadways are used to provide access for construction activities. Street sweeping is also utilized to remove tracked sediment.

Concrete wastes are managed through the use of both portable and non-portable concrete washout facilities.

The design of all Construction BMPs complies with the design requirements found in the Caltrans Storm Water Quality Handbook - Construction Site Best Management Practices Manual.

## - Storm Water Sampling and Analysis

The project is required to perform stormwater sampling at all discharge locations. Storm water sampling and analysis requirements will be specified in the project Special Provisions during PS\&E Phase. The estimated costs for sampling related items were estimated using the Caltrans "Estimating Guidance for GCP."

## - Dewatering and Temporary Stream Diversion

It is uncertain if dewatering will be necessary for construction of the project improvements. It is anticipated that a stream flow diversion will be constructed to perform the culvert extension in case there is any stream flow.

## - Construction Site BMP Quantity Estimate

The construction site BMPs used in the strategy described above were applied to the project and the quantities listed in Table 3 were estimated for the project.

Table 3: Quantities for Construction Site BMPs

| BEES | Temporary BMPs - PPDG Appendix C | Unit | Quantity |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 130505 | Move-In/Move-Out (Temporary Erosion Control) | EA | 6 |
| 130520 | Temporary Hydraulic Mulch | SQYD | 99800 |


| BEES | Temporary Sediment Control | Unit | Quantity |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 130640 | Temporary Fiber Roll | LF | 56010 |
| 130680 | Temporary Silt Fence | LF | 9800 |
| 130730 | Street Sweeping | LS | 1 |


| BEES | Temporary Tracking Control | Unit | Quantity |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 130710 | Temporary Construction Entrance | EA | 10 |


| BEES | Temporary Waste Management Control | Unit | Quantity |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 130900 | Temporary Concrete Washout | LS | 1 |


| BEES | Miscellaneous Items | Unit | Quantity |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 130300 | Prepare Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan | LS | 1 |
| 130310 | Rain Event Action Plan | EA | 252 |
| 130320 | Storm Water Sampling and Analysis Day | EA | 124 |
| 130330 | Storm Water Annual Report | EA | 3 |

## 7. Maintenance BMPs (Drain Inlet Stenciling)

All work will be done along SR 65 and there will be no pedestrian access; therefore, no drain inlet stenciling will be required.

## Required Attachments

- Project Vicinity Map
- Evaluation Documentation Form (EDF)
- Risk Level Determination Documentation


## Supplemental Attachments

- Checklist SW-1, Site Data Sources
- Checklist SW-2, Storm Water Quality Issues Summary
- Checklist SW-3, Measures for Avoiding or Reducing Potential Storm Water BMPs
- Checklists DPP-1, Parts 1-5 (Design Pollution Prevention BMPs) [only those parts that are applicable]
- Checklists T-1, Parts 1 and 2 (Treatment BMPs)
- Biofiltration Swale Calculations
- Checklists T-1, Part 5 (Treatment BMPs)
- Checklists T-1, Part 8 (Treatment BMPs)


## Attachments

Caltrans Storm Water Quality Handbooks
Project Planning and Design Guide
May 2012

## Project Vicinity Map

Caltrans Storm Water Quality Handbooks
Project Planning and Design Guide
May 2012


## Evaluation Documentation Form

Caltrans Storm Water Quality Handbooks
Project Planning and Design Guide
July 2010

DATE: _ 09/15/16
Project ID ( or EA): _03-1F170K

| NO. | CRITERIA | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { YES } \\ \checkmark \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { NO } \\ \checkmark \end{gathered}$ | SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FOR EVALUATION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Begin Project Evaluation regarding requirement for consideration of Treatment BMPs | $\checkmark$ |  | See Figure 4-1, Project Evaluation Process for Consideration of Permanent Treatment BMPs. Go to 2 |
| 2. | Is this an emergency project? |  | $\checkmark$ | If Yes, go to 10. If No, continue to 3. |
| 3. | Have TMDLs or other Pollution Control Requirements been established for surface waters within the project limits? Information provided in the water quality assessment or equivalent document. | $\checkmark$ |  | If Yes, contact the District/Regional NPDES Coordinator to discuss the Department's obligations under the TMDL (if Applicable) or Pollution Control Requirements, go to 9 or 4 . $\qquad$ (Dist./Reg. SW Coordinator initials) If No, continue to 4. |
| 4. | Is the project located within an area of a local MS4 Permittee? | $\checkmark$ |  | If Yes. (Cities of Roseville, Rocklin, Lincoln \& Placer County), go to 5. <br> If No, document in SWDR go to 5. |
| 5. | Is the project directly or indirectly discharging to surface waters? | $\checkmark$ |  | If Yes , continue to 6. If No , go to 10 . |
| 6. | Is it a new facility or major reconstruction? | $\checkmark$ |  | If Yes, continue to 8. If No , go to 7 . |
| 7. | Will there be a change in line/grade or hydraulic capacity? |  |  | If Yes, continue to 8. If No , go to 10. |
| 8. | Does the project result in anet increase of one acre or more of new impervious surface? | $\checkmark$ |  | If Yes, continue to 9 . If No, go to 10 . <br> (16.93) Net Increase New Impervious Surface in General Purpose Alternative) |
| 9. | Project is required to consider approved Treatment BMPs. | $\checkmark$ | See Sections 2.4 and either Section 5.5or 6.5 for BMP Evaluation and Selection Process. Complete Checklist $\mathrm{T}-1$ in this Appendix E. |  |
| 10. | Project is not required to consider Treatment BMPs. $\qquad$ (Dist./Reg. Design SW Coord. $\qquad$ $\qquad$ (Project Engineer Initials) $\qquad$ (Date) |  | Document for Project Files by completing this form, and attaching it to the SWDR. |  |

See Figure 4-1, Project Evaluation Process for Consideration of Permanent Treatment BMPs

Caltrans Storm Water Quality Handbooks
Project Planning and Design Guide
July 2010

## Risk Level Determination Documentation

Caltrans Storm Water Quality Handbooks
Project Planning and Design Guide
May 2012


| Receiving Water (RW) Risk Factor Worksheet (Pleasant Grove Creek) | Entry | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. Watershed Characteristics | yes/no |  |
| A.1. Does the disturbed area discharge (either directly or indirectly) to a 303(d)-listed waterbody impaired by sediment (For help with impaired waterbodies please visit the link below) or has a USEPA approved TMDL implementation plan for sediment?: <br> http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water issues/programs/tmdl/integrated2010.shtml |  |  |
| OR | yes | High |
| A.2. Does the disturbed area discharge to a waterbody with designated beneficial uses of SPAWN \& COLD \& MIGRATORY? (For help please review the appropriate Regional Board Basin Plan) <br> http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterboards map.shtml |  |  |
| Region 1 Basin Plan |  |  |
| Region 2 Basin Plan |  |  |
| Region 3 Basin Plan |  |  |
| Region 4 Basin Plan |  |  |
| Region 5 Basin Plan |  |  |
| Region 6 Basin Plan |  |  |
| Region 7 Basin Plan |  |  |
| Region 8 Basin Plan |  |  |
| Region 9 Basin Plan |  |  |



## A) R Factor

Analyses of data indicated that when factors other than rainfall are held constant, soil loss is directly proportional to a rainfall factor composed of total storm kinetic energy (E) times the maximum 30-min intensity (I30) (Wischmeier and Smith, 1958). The numerical value of $R$ is the average annual sum of El 30 for storm events during a rainfall record of at least 22 years. "Isoerodent" maps were developed based on $R$ values calculated for more than 1000 locations in the Western U.S. Refer to the link below to determine the $R$ factor for the project site.
http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/stormwater/LEW/lewCalculator.cfm

|  | R Factor Value | 249.76 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |

B) K Factor (weighted average, by area, for all site soils)

The soil-erodibility factor K represents: (1) susceptibility of soil or surface material to erosion, (2) transportability of the sediment, and (3) the amount and rate of runoff given a particular rainfall input, as measured under a standard condition. Fine-textured soils that are high in clay have low K values (about 0.05 to 0.15 ) because the particles are resistant to detachment. Coarse-textured soils, such as sandy soils, also have low $K$ values (about 0.05 to 0.2 ) because of high infiltration resulting in low runoff even though these particles are easily detached. Medium-textured soils, such as a silt loam, have moderate K values (about 0.25 to 0.45 ) because they are moderately susceptible to particle detachment and they produce runoff at moderate rates. Soils having a high silt content are especially susceptible to erosion and have high K values, which can exceed 0.45 and can be as large as 0.65 . Silt-size particles are easily detached and tend to crust, producing high rates and large volumes of runoff. Use Site-specific data must be submitted.
Site-specific K factor quidance
C) LS Factor (weighted average, by area, for all slopes)

The effect of topography on erosion is accounted for by the LS factor, which combines the effects of a hillslope-length factor, L, and a hillslope-gradient factor, S. Generally speaking, as hillslope length and/or hillslope gradient increase, soil loss increases. As hillslope length increases, total soil loss and soil loss per unit area increase due to the progressive accumulation of runoff in the downslope direction. As the hillslope gradient increases, the velocity and erosivity of runoff increases. Use the LS table located in separate tab of this spreadsheet to determine LS factors. Estimate the weighted LS for the site prior to construction.

LS Table

| LS Factor Value |  | 0.51 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Watershed Erosion Estimate (=RxKxLS) in tons/acre |  |  |
| Site Sediment Risk Factor <br> Low Sediment Risk: < 15 tons/acre Medium Sediment Risk: >=15 and < $<75$ tons/acre High Sediment Risk: >= 75 tons/acre |  |  |


| Receiving Water (RW) Risk Factor Worksheet (Orchard Creek) | Entry | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. Watershed Characteristics | yes/no |  |
| A.1. Does the disturbed area discharge (either directly or indirectly) to a 303(d)-listed waterbody impaired by sediment (For help with impaired waterbodies please visit the link below) or has a USEPA approved TMDL implementation plan for sediment?: |  |  |
| http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water issues/programs/tmdl/integrated2010.shtml |  |  |
| OR | yes | High |
| A.2. Does the disturbed area discharge to a waterbody with designated beneficial uses of SPAWN \& COLD \& MIGRATORY? (For help please review the appropriate Regional Board Basin Plan) |  |  |
| http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterboards map.shtml |  |  |
| Region 1 Basin Plan |  |  |
| Region 2 Basin Plan |  |  |
| Region 3 Basin Plan |  |  |
| Region 4 Basin Plan |  |  |
| Region 5 Basin Plan |  |  |
| Region 6 Basin Plan |  |  |
| Region 7 Basin Plan |  |  |
| Region 8 Basin Plan |  |  |
| Region 9 Basin Plan |  |  |


| Combined Risk Level Matrix |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Orchard Creek <br> Sediment Risk |  |  |
|  | Low |  | High |
|  | Level 1 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Level 3 |


| Project Sediment Risk: | Medium |
| ---: | ---: |
| Project RW Risk: | High |
| Project Combined Risk: | Level 2 |
|  |  |




| LEARN THE ISSUES SCIEN |
| :--- |
| Water: Stormwater |
| Water Home |
| Drinking Water |
| Education \& Training |
| Grants \& Funding |
| Iaws \& Regulations |
| Our Waters |
|  |
| Control |
| Applications \& Databases |
| Low Impact Development |
| Impaired Waters \& TMDLs |
| Permitting (NPDES |
| Pollited Runofi |
| Sediments |
| Source Water Protection |
| Stormwater |
| Vessel Discharge |
| Wastewater Programs |
| Whtershed Management |
| Resources \& Performance |
| Science \& Technology |
| Water Infrastructure |
| What You Can Do |



## LEW Results

## Rainfall Erosivity Factor Calculator for Small Construction Sites

## Facility Information

| Start Date: | $06 / 11 / 2020$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| End Date: | $06 / 11 / 2025$ |
| Latitude: | 38.8056 |
| Longitude: | -121.3001 |

## Erosivity Index Calculator Results

AN EROSIVITY INDEX VALUE OF $\mathbf{2 4 9 . 7 6}$ HAS BEEN DETERMINED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION PERIOD OF 06/11/2020 06/11/2025.

A rainfall erosivity factor of 5.0 or greater has been calculated for your site and period of construction. You do NOT qualify for a waiver from NPDES permitting requirements.

```
Start Over
```
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## Storm Water Checklist SW - 1

Caltrans Storm Water Quality Handbooks
Project Planning and Design Guide
July 2010

## Checklist SW-1, Site Data Sources

Prepared by:__MTCo Date:_12/11/14 District-Co-Route:_03-PLA-65
PM : 6.5/12.8 Project ID (or EA):_03-1F170K_RWQCB:_ Central Valley

Information for the following data categories should be obtained, reviewed and referenced as necessary throughout the project planning phase. Collect any available documents pertaining to the category and list them and reference your data source. For specific examples of documents within these categories, refer to Section 5.5 of this document. Example categories have been listed below; add additional categories, as needed. Summarize pertinent information in Section 2 of the SWDR.

| DATA CATEGORY/SOURCES | Date |
| :---: | :---: |
| Topographic |  |
| - Site Survey |  |
| - Aerial Topography for plans background |  |
| - USGS Topographic Map - Cities of Roseville, Rocklin, Lincoln and Placer County |  |
| Hydraulic |  |
| - Preliminary Drainage Evaluation for the Widening SR 65 Project |  |
| - Water Planning Tool http://svctenvims.dot.ca.gov/wqpt/wapt.aspx |  |
| Soils |  |
| - Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States <br> Department of Agriculture, Web Soil Survey; from <br> http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx |  |
| Climatic |  |
| - NOAA IDF Information: from <br> http://hdsc.nws.noaa.gov/hdsc/pfds/pfds_map_cont.html?bkmrk =ca |  |
| - Raining season designation can be found at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/construc/stormwater/Rainy_Season_Gr aphic Figure 1-1 Designation of Rainy Season Corrected.pdf |  |
| - NOAA, Monthly Station Climate Summaries, 1971-2000 http://cdo.ncdc.noaa.gov/climatenormals/clim20/statepdf/ca.pdf |  |
| Water Quality |  |
| - Water Planning Tool http://svctenvims.dot.ca.gov/wapt/wapt.aspx |  |
| Other Data Categories |  |
| - |  |
| - |  |

## Storm Water Checklist SW - 2

Caltrans Storm Water Quality Handbooks
Project Planning and Design Guide
July 2010

## Checklist SW－2，Storm Water Quality Issues Summary

Prepared by：＿＿MTCo＿Date：＿＿＿District－Co－Route：＿＿03－PLA－65

PM ：6．5／12．8 Project ID（or EA）：＿03－1F170K＿RWQCB：Central Valley

The following questions provide a guide to collecting critical information relevant to project stormwater quality issues．Complete responses to applicable questions，consulting other Caltrans functional units（Environmental， Landscape Architecture，Maintenance，etc．）and the District／Regional Storm Water Coordinator as necessary． Summarize pertinent responses in Section 2 of the SWDR．

1．Determine the receiving waters that may be affected by the project throughout the project life cycle（i．e．，construction，maintenance and operation）．

2．For the project limits，list the 303（d）impaired receiving water bodies and their constituents of concern．
3．Determine if there are any municipal or domestic water supply reservoirs or groundwater percolation facilities within the project limits．Consider appropriate spill contamination and spill prevention control measures for these new areas．
4．Determine the RWQCB special requirements，including TMDLs，effluent limits， etc．
5．Determine regulatory agencies seasonal construction and construction exclusion dates or restrictions required by federal，state，or local agencies．
6．Determine if a 401 certification will be required．
7．List rainy season dates．
8．Determine the general climate of the project area．Identify annual rainfall and rainfall intensity curves．
9．If considering Treatment BMPs，determine the soil classification，permeability， erodibility，and depth to groundwater．
10．Determine contaminated soils within the project area．
11．Determine the total disturbed soil area of the project．
12．Describe the topography of the project site．
13．List any areas outside of the Caltrans right－of－way that will be included in the project（e．g．contractor＇s staging yard，work from barges，easements for staging，etc．）．
14．Determine if additional right－of－way acquisition or easements and right－of－entry will be required for design，construction and maintenance of BMPs．If so，how much？
15．Determine if a right－of－way certification is required．
16．Determine the estimated unit costs for right－of－way should it be needed for Treatment BMPs，stabilized conveyance systems，lay－back slopes，or interception ditches．
17．Determine if project area has any slope stabilization concerns．
18．Describe the local land use within the project area and adjacent areas．
19．Evaluate the presence of dry weather flow．

| 区Complete | $\square$ NA |
| :---: | :---: |
| 区Complete | $\square$ NA |
| $\square$ Complete | \NA |
| $\square$ Complete | \NA |
| \Complete | $\square$ NA |
| 区Complete | $\square$ NA |
| ХComplete | $\square$ NA |
| \Complete | $\square$ NA |
| $\triangle$ Complete | $\square$ NA |
| \Complete | $\square$ NA |
| 区Complete | NA |
| 区Complete | $\square$ NA |
| $\square$ Complete | \NA |
| $\square$ Complete | \NA |
| $\square$ Complete | \NA |
| $\square$ Complete | \NA |
| \Complete | $\square$ NA |
| ХComplete | $\square$ NA |
| $\square$ Complete | 【NA |

[^23]July 2010

## Storm Water Checklist SW -3
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# Checklist SW-3, Measures for Avoiding or Reducing Potential Storm Water Impacts 



The PE must confer with other functional units, such as Landscape Architecture, Hydraulics, Environmental, Materials, Construction and Maintenance, as needed to assess these issues. Summarize pertinent responses in Section 2 of the SWDR.

Options for avoiding or reducing potential impacts during project planning include the following:

1. Can the project be relocated or realigned to avoid/reduce impacts to receiving waters or to increase the preservation of critical (or problematic) areas such as floodplains, steep slopes, wetlands, and areas with erosive or unstable soil conditions?
2. Can structures and bridges be designed or located to reduce work in live streams and minimize construction impacts?
3. Can any of the following methods be utilized to minimize erosion from slopes:
a. Disturbing existing slopes only when necessary?
b. Minimizing cut and fill areas to reduce slope lengths?
c. Incorporating retaining walls to reduce steepness of slopes or to shorten slopes?
d. Acquiring right-of-way easements (such as grading easements) to reduce steepness of slopes?
e. Avoiding soils or formations that will be particularly difficult to restabilize?
f. Providing cut and fill slopes flat enough to allow re-vegetation and limit erosion to pre-construction rates?
g. Providing benches or terraces on high cut and fill slopes to reduce concentration of flows?
h. Rounding and shaping slopes to reduce concentrated flow?
i. Collecting concentrated flows in stabilized drains and channels?
4. Does the project design allow for the ease of maintaining all BMPs?
5. Can the project be scheduled or phased to minimize soil-disturbing work during the rainy season?
6. Can permanent storm water pollution controls such as paved slopes, vegetated slopes, basins, and conveyance systems be installed early in the construction process to provide additional protection and to possibly utilize them in addressing construction storm water impacts?
[^24]
## Checklist DPP - 1, Part 4
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# Design Pollution Prevention BMPs Checklist DPP-1, Part 4 

Prepared by: $\qquad$ Date: $\qquad$ District-Co-Route:_03-PLA-65

PM : $\qquad$ Project ID (or EA): $\qquad$ RWQCB: Central Valley

## Concentrated Flow Conveyance Systems

Ditches, Berms, Dikes and Swales

1. Consider Ditches, Berms, Dikes, and Swales as per Topics 813, 834.3, and 835,
and Chapter 860 of the HDM.
2. Evaluate risks due to erosion, overtopping, flow backups or washout.
3. Consider outlet protection where localized scour is anticipated.
4. Examine the site for run-on from off-site sources.
5. Consider channel lining when velocities exceed scour velocity for soil.

## Overside Drains

1. Consider downdrains, as per Index 834.4 of the HDM.
2. Consider paved spillways for side slopes flatter than $4: 1 \mathrm{~h}: \mathrm{v}$.
$\boxtimes$ Complete
$\boxtimes$ Complete
$\boxtimes$ Complete
】Complete
【Complete
$\boxtimes$ Complete
$\boxtimes$ Complete
$\boxtimes$ Complete

## Outlet Protection/Velocity Dissipation Devices

1. Consider outlet protection/velocity dissipation devices at outlets, including cross drains, as per Chapters 827 and 870 of the HDM.
$\boxtimes$ Complete

Review appropriate SSPs for Concentrated Flow Conveyance Systems.
$\boxtimes$ Complete

## Checklist DPP - 1, Part 5
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# Design Pollution Prevention BMPs Checklist DPP-1, Part 5 

Prepared by: MTCo
Date: $\qquad$ District-Co-Route: $\qquad$
PM : $\qquad$ Project ID (or EA): $\qquad$ RWQCB: $\qquad$ Central Valley

## Preservation of Existing Vegetation

1. Review Preservation of Property, (Clearing and Grubbing) to reduce clearing and grubbing and maximize preservation of existing vegetation.

】Complete
2. Has all vegetation to be retained been coordinated with Environmental, and identified and defined in the contract plans?
3. Have steps been taken to minimize disturbed areas, such as locating temporary roadways to avoid stands of trees and shrubs and to follow existing contours to reduce cutting and filling?
$\boxtimes$ Complete
4. Have impacts to preserved vegetation been considered while work is occurring in disturbed areas?
$\boxtimes$ Yes $\quad \square$ No
5. Are all areas to be preserved delineated on the plans?

ХYes

## Checklist T - 1, Part 1

| Treatment BMPs |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prepared by:__MTCo | __Date: | __District-Co-Route: | 03-PLA-65 |
| PM : 6.5/12.8 | Project ID (or EA) : | 03-1F170K _ RWQCB: | al Valley |

## Consideration of Treatment BMPs

This checklist is used for projects that require the consideration of Approved Treatment BMPs, as determined from the process described in Section 4 (Project Treatment Consideration) and the Evaluation Documentation Form (EDF). This checklist will be used to determine which Treatment BMPs should be considered for each watershed and sub-watershed within the project. Supplemental data will be needed to verify siting and design applicability for final incorporation into a project.

Complete this checklist for each phase of the project, when considering Treatment BMPs. Use the responses to the questions as the basis when developing the narrative in Section 5 of the Storm Water Data Report to document that Treatment BMPs have been appropriately considered.

Answer all questions, unless otherwise directed. Questions 14 through 16 should be answered after all subwatershed (drainages) are considered using this checklist.

1. Is the project in a watershed with prescriptive TMDL treatment BMP requirements in an adopted TMDL implementation plan or does the project have a dual purpose facility requirement (e.g. flood control and water quality treatment or Design Pollution Prevention BMPs that provide infiltration and treatment)?

If Yes, consult the District/Regional Storm Water Coordinator to determine whether the T-1 checklist should be used to propose alternative BMPs because the prescribed BMPs may not be feasible or other BMPs may be more costeffective. Special documentation and regulatory response may be necessary.
2. Dry Weather Flow Diversion
(a) Are dry weather flows generated by Caltrans anticipated to be persistent?
(b) Is a sanitary sewer located on or near the site?

If Yes to both $2(\mathrm{a})$ and (b), continue to (c). If No to either, skip to question 3.
(c) Is connection to the sanitary sewer possible without extraordinary plumbing, features or construction practices?
(d) Is the domestic wastewater treatment authority willing to accept flow?


If Yes was answered to all of these questions consider Dry Weather Flow
Diversion, complete and attach Part 3 of this checklist.
3. Is the receiving water on the 303(d) list for litter/trash or has a TMDL been issued for litter/trash?

If Yes, consider Gross Solids Removal Devices (GSRDs). Complete and attach Part 6 of this checklist. Note: Infiltration Devices, Detention Devices, Media Filters, MCTTs, and Wet Basins also can capture litter. Before considering GSRDs for stand-alone installation or in sequence with other BMPs, consult with District/Regional NPDES Storm Water Coordinator to determine whether Infiltration Devices, Detention Devices, Media Filters, MCTTs, and Wet Basins should be considered instead of GSRDs to meet litter/trash TMDL.
4. Is the project located in an area (e.g., mountain regions) where traction sand is applied more than twice a year?

If Yes, consider Traction Sand Traps Complete and attach Part 7 of this checklist.
5. Maximizing Biofiltration Strips and Swales

Objectives:

1) Quantify infiltration from biofiltration alone
2) Identify highly infiltrating biofiltration (i.e. > 90\%) and skip further BMP consideration.
3) Identify whether amendments can substantially improve infiltration.
(a) Have biofiltration strips and swales been designed for runoff from all project areas, including sheet flow and concentrated flow conveyance? If no, document justification in Section 5 of the SWDR.
(b) Based on existing site conditions, estimate what percentage of the WQV ${ }^{1}$ can be infiltrated. When calculating the WQV, use a drawdown time appropriate for the site conditions..
$-X \_<20 \%$
$-\quad 20 \%-50 \%$
$-\quad 50 \%-90 \%$
$>90 \%$
$\boxtimes$ Yes $\quad \square$ No
$\square$ Yes $\quad$ No正 ,

$\square$
(d) Can the infiltration ranking in question 5(b) above be increased by using soil amendments?
If Yes, consider including soil amendments (increasing the infiltration ranking of strips and swales shows performance comparable to other BMPs). Record the new infiltration estimate below. If No, continue to 5 (e).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \_<20 \% \text { (skip to 6) } \\
& \ldots \quad 20 \%-50 \% \text { (skip to 6) } \\
& \ldots \\
& 50 \%-90 \% \text { (skip to 6) } \\
& >90 \%
\end{aligned}
$$

(e) Is infiltration greater than 90 percent? If Yes, skip to question 13. If No, continue to 5 (f).
(f) Is infiltration greater than 50 percent and is biofiltration preferred? If yes to both, skip to question 13.
6. Biofiltration in Rural Areas

Is the project in a rural area (outside of urban areas that is covered under an NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit ${ }^{2}$ )? If Yes, proceed to question 13.
7. Estimating Infiltration for BMP Combinations

Objectives:

1) Identify high-infiltration biofiltration or biofiltration and infiltration BMP combinations and skip further BMP consideration.
2) If high infiltration is infeasible, then identify the infiltration level of all feasible BMP combinations for use in the subsequent BMP selection matrices.
(a) Has concentrated infiltration (i.e., via earthen basins) been prohibited? Consult your District/Regional Storm Water Coordinator and/or environmental documents.

If No, continue to 7 (b); if Yes, skip to question 8 and do not consider earthen basin-type BMPs

[^25]Caltrans Storm Water Quality Handbooks
Project Planning and Design Guide
May 2012
(b) Can the infiltration ranking be increased by infiltrating the un-infiltrated remaining WQV from question 5 , with an infiltration $\mathrm{BMP}^{1}$ ? If yes, record the $\square$ Yes $\square$ N new infiltration estimate below. If no, proceed to 7(c).
$\ldots<20 \%$ (do not consider this BMP combination)
_ 20\% - 50\%
_50\%-90\%
___ $>90 \%$
Is at least 90 percent infiltration estimated? If Yes, proceed to 13. If No, proceed to 7(c).
(c) Assess infiltration of biofiltration combined with an approved earthen BMP. This assessment will be used in subsequent BMP selection matrices.

Earthen Detention Basin

```
    < 20%
    Complete
    20% - 50%
__> 50%
```


## Continue to Question 8

8. Identifying BMPs based on the Target Design Constituents
(a) Does the project discharge to a 303(d) impaired water body or a water body that has a TMDL adopted? If "No," use Matrix A to select BMPs, consider
$\square$ Yes $\quad \square$ No designing to treat $100 \%$ of the WQV, then skip to question 12.
If Yes, is the identified pollutant(s) considered a Targeted Design Constituent (TDC) (check all that apply below)?
$\square$ sediments
$\square$ copper (dissolved or total)
$\square$ phosphorus
$\square$ nitrogen
$\square$ lead (dissolved or total)
$\square$ zinc (dissolved or total)
$\square$ general metals (dissolved or total) ${ }^{2}$
(b) Treating Sediment. Is sediment a TDC? If Yes, use Matrix A to select BMPs, $\quad \square$ Yes $\quad \square$ No then skip to question 12. Otherwise, proceed to question 9.

[^26] constraints allow, size the infiltration BMP up to the un-infiltrated WQV remaining after the biofiltration BMP.
${ }^{2}$ General metals is a designation used by Regional Water Boards when specific metals have not yet been identified as causing the impairment.
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## BMP Selection Matrix A: General Purpose Pollutant Removal

Consider approaches to treat the remaining WQV with combinations of the BMPs in this table. The PE should select at least one BMP for the project; preference is for Tier 1 BMPs, followed by Tier 2 BMPs when Tier 1 BMPs are not feasible. Within each Tier, BMP selection will be determined by the site-specific determination of feasibility (Section 2.4.2.1). BMPs are chosen based on the infiltration category determined in question 7. BMPs in other categories should be ignored.

9. Treating both Metals and Nutrients.

Is copper, lead, zinc, or general metals AND nitrogen or phosphorous a TDC? If Yes, use Matrix D to select BMPs, then skip to question 12. Otherwise, proceedYesto question 10.
10. Treating Only Metals.

Are copper, lead, zinc, or general metals listed TDCs? If Yes, use Matrix B below to select BMPs, and skip to question 12. Otherwise, proceed to question 11.

## BMP Selection Matrix B: Any metal is the TDC, but not nitrogen or phosphorous

Consider approaches to treat the remaining WQV with combinations of the BMPs in this table. The PE should select at least one BMP for the project; preference is for Tier 1 BMPs, followed by Tier 2 BMPs when Tier 1 BMPs are not feasible. Within each Tier, BMP selection will be determined by the site-specific determination of feasibility (Section 2.4.2.1). BMPs are chosen based on the infiltration category determined in question 7. BMPs in other categories should be ignored.

|  | BMP ranking for infiltration category: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Infiltration < 20\% | Infiltration 20\%-50\% | Infiltration > 50\% |
| Tier 1 | MCTT <br> Wet basin Austin filter (earthen) Austin filter (concrete) Delaware filter | Austin filter (earthen) <br> Detention (unlined) <br> Infiltration basins* <br> Infiltration trenches* <br> MCTT <br> Wet basin | Austin filter (earthen) Detention (unlined) Infiltration basins* Infiltration trenches* MCTT <br> Biofiltration Strip Biofiltration Swale Wet basin |
| Tier 2 | Strip: HRT > 5 <br> Strip: HRT < 5 <br> Biofiltration Swale <br> Detention (unlined) | Austin filter (concrete) <br> Delaware filter <br> Biofiltration Strip <br> Biofiltration Swale | Austin filter (concrete) Delaware filter |

HRT = hydraulic residence time (min)
*Infiltration BMPs that infiltrate the water quality volume were considered previously, so only undersized infiltration BMPs or hybrid designs are considered where infiltration is less than $90 \%$ of the water quality volume.
11. Treating Only Nutrients.

Are nitrogen and/or phosphorus listed TDCs? If "Yes," use Matrix C to select BMPs. If "No", please check your answer to 8(a). At this point one of the matrices $\quad \square$ Yes $\square$ No should have been used for BMP selection for the TDC in question, unless no BMPs are feasible.

## BMP Selection Matrix C: Phosphorous and / or nitrogen is the TDC, but no metals are the TDC

Consider approaches to treat the remaining WQV with combinations of the BMPs in this table. The PE should select at least one BMP for the project; preference is for Tier 1 BMPs, followed by Tier 2 BMPs when Tier 1 BMPs are not feasible. Within each Tier, BMP selection will be determined by the site-specific determination of feasibility (Section 2.4.2.1). BMPs are chosen based on the infiltration category determined in question 7. BMPs in other categories should be ignored.

|  | BMP ranking for infiltration category: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Infiltration 20\% - 50\% | Infiltration > 50\% |  |
|  | Austin filter (earthen) <br> Austin filter (concrete) <br> Delaware filter** | Austin filter (earthen) <br> Detention (unlined) <br> Infiltration basins* <br> Infiltration trenches* | Austin filter (earthen) <br> Detention (unlined) <br> Infiltration basins* <br> Infiltration trenches* <br> Biofiltration Strip <br> Biofiltration Swale |
|  | Wet basin <br> Biofiltration Strip <br> Biofiltration Swale <br> Detention (unlined) | Austin filter (concrete) <br> Delaware filter <br> Biofiltration Strip <br> Biofiltration Swale <br> Wet basin | Austin filter (concrete) <br> Delaware filter <br> Wet basin |

* Infiltration BMPs that infiltrate the water quality volume were considered previously, so only undersized infiltration BMPs or hybrid designs are considered where infiltration is less than $90 \%$ of the water quality volume.
** Delaware filters would be ranked in Tier 2 if the TDC is nitrogen only, as opposed to phosphorous only or both nitrogen and phosphorous.

BMP Selection Matrix D: Any metal, plus phosphorous and / or nitrogen are the TDCs

Consider approaches to treat the remaining WQV with combinations of the BMPs in this table. The PE should select at least one BMP for the project; preference is for Tier 1 BMPs, followed by Tier 2 BMPs when Tier 1 BMPs are not feasible. Within each Tier, BMP selection will be determined by the site-specific determination of feasibility (Section 2.4.2.1). BMPs are chosen based on the infiltration category determined in question 7. BMPs in other categories should be ignored.

|  | BMP ranking for infiltration category: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Tier 1 | Infiltration < 20\% | Infiltration $20 \%-50 \%$ | Infiltration > 50\% |
|  | Austin filter (earthen) <br> Austin filter (concrete) <br> Delaware filter** | Wet basin* <br> Austin filter (earthen) <br> Detention (unlined) <br> Infiltration basins*** <br> Infiltration trenches*** | Wet basin* <br> Austin filter (earthen) <br> Detention (unlined) <br> Infiltration basins*** <br> Infiltration trenches*** <br> Biofiltration Strip <br> Biofiltration Swale |
| Tier 2 | Biofiltration Strip <br> Biofiltration Swale <br> Detention (unlined) | Austin filter (concrete) <br> Delaware filter <br> Biofiltration Strip <br> Biofiltration Swale | Austin filter (concrete) <br> Delaware filter |

12. Does the project discharge to a 303(d) waterbody that is listed for mercury or low dissolved oxygen?
If Yes, contact the District/Regional NPDES Storm Water Coordinator to determine if standing water in a Delaware filter, wet basin, or MCTT would be a risk to downstream water quality.
13. After completing the above, identify and attach the checklists shown below for every Treatment BMP under consideration. (use one checklist every time the BMP is considered for a different drainage within the project)

X_Biofiltration Strips and Biofiltration Swales: Checklist T-1, Part 2
___ Dry Weather Diversion: Checklist T-1, Part 3
$\qquad$ Infiltration Devices: Checklist T-1, Part 4
Detention Devices: Checklist T-1, Part 5
GSRDs: Checklist T-1, Part 6
$\qquad$
Traction Sand Traps: Checklist T-1, Part 7
X_ Media Filter [Austin Sand Filter and Delaware Filter]: Checklist T-1, Part 8 Multi-Chambered Treatment Train: Checklist T-1, Part 9
$\qquad$ Wet Basins: Checklist T-1, Part 10
14. Estimate what percentage of the net WQV (for all new impervious surfaces within the project) or WQF (depending upon the Treatment BMP selected) will be treated by the preferred Treatment BMP(s): $\qquad$ \%*
15. Estimate what percentage of the net WQV (for all new impervious surfaces within the project) that will be infiltrated by the preferred treatment BMP(s):
$\qquad$ \%**
16. Prepare cost estimate, including right-of-way, and site specific determination of feasibility (Section 2.4.2.1) for selected Treatment BMPs and include as supplemental information for SWDR approval.
*Note: The amount of treatment should be calculated for each BMP and each subwatershed, unless all BMPs within a project are the same. Document in SWDR.
**Note: The Water Quality Volume infiltrated should be documented for the entire project and also for each subwatershed. Document in SWDR.

## Checklist T - 1, Part 2
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Biofiltration Swales / Biofiltration Strips

## Feasibility

1. Do the climate and site conditions allow vegetation to be established?

2. Are flow velocities from a peak drainage facility design event < 4 fps (i.e. low enough to prevent scour of the vegetated biofiltration swale as per HDM Table 873.3E)?

If "No" to either question above, Biofiltration Swales and Biofiltration Strips are not feasible.
3. Are Biofiltration Swales proposed at sites where known contaminated soils or groundwater plumes exist?
If "Yes", consult with District/Regional NPDES Coordinator about how to proceed.
4. Does adequate area exist within the right-of-way to place Biofiltration device(s)? If "Yes", continue to Design Elements section. If "No", continue to Question 5.
5. If adequate area does not exist within right-of-way, can suitable, additional right- $\square \mathrm{Yes} \boxtimes \mathrm{No}$ of-way be acquired to site Biofiltration devices and how much right-of-way would be needed to treat WQF? $\qquad$ acres
If "Yes", continue to Design Elements section. If "No", continue to Question 6.
6. If adequate area cannot be obtained, document in Section 5 of the SWDR that

区Complete the inability to obtain adequate area prevents the incorporation of these Treatment BMPs into the project.

## Design Elements

* Required Design Element - A "Yes" response to these questions is required to further the consideration of this BMP into the project design. Document a "No" response in Section 5 of the SWDR to describe why this Treatment BMP cannot be included into the project design.
** Recommended Design Element - A "Yes" response is preferred for these questions, but not required for incorporation into a project design.

1. Has the District Landscape Architect provided vegetation mixes appropriate for $\square$ Yes $\quad$ No climate and location? *
2. Can the biofiltration swale be designed as a conveyance system under any $\boxtimes$ Yes $\quad \square$ No expected flows > the WQF event, as per HDM Chapter 800? * (e.g. freeboard, minimum slope, etc.)
3. Can the biofiltration swale be designed as a water quality treatment device under the WQF while meeting the required HRT, depth, and velocity criteria? (Reference Appendix B, Section B.2.3.1)*
4. Is the maximum length of a biofiltration strip $\leq 100 \mathrm{ft}$ ? Strips $>100 \mathrm{ft}$. may still be considered as long as potential erosion issues have been addressed. ${ }^{* *}$
5. Has the minimum width (perpendicular to flow) of the invert of the biofiltration swale received the concurrence of Maintenance? *
6. Can biofiltration swales be located in natural or low cut sections to reduce maintenance problems caused by animals burrowing through the berm of the swale? **
7. Has the infiltration rate of the bio-filtration device been calculated and maximized through amendments where appropriate. **

8. Have Biofiltration Systems been considered for locations upstream of other Treatment BMPs, as part of a treatment train? **

## BIOSWALE 1



## BIOSWALE 2



## BIOSWALE 3



## BIOSWALE 4



## BIOSWALE 5



## BIOSWALE 6


Strip and Swale Infiltration Tool Results
PROJECT INFORMATION

| Project | PCTPA - SR 65 Widening |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sub-watershed | Pleasant Grove Creek Subwatershed |
| BMP type | Biofiltration Swale |


| USER INPUT AND INTERMEDIATE CALCULATIONS | Units | Existing | Proposed Design | Isolated <br> NNI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Input from Basin Sizer |  |  |  |  |
| Unit basin storage volume from Basin Sizer, where C = 1.0 | in | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.09 |
| Drawdown time used in Basin Sizer | hr | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| Rainfall rate from Basin Sizer "Caltrans Water Quality Flows" | in/hr | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| Drainage and Runoff to the Strip or Swale |  |  |  |  |
| Contributing drainage area (CDA), including all impervious area | ac | 0 | 8.57202034 | 4.190165865 |
| Total impervious area | ac | 0 | 4.190165865 | 4.190165865 |
| Net new impervious (NNI) area | ac | 0 | 4.190165865 | 4.190165865 |
| Additional impervious area seeking treatment credit | ac | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CDA runoff volume (including WQV) | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 0 | 23243 | 14921 |
| WQV | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 0 | 14921 | 14921 |
| Native Soil |  |  |  |  |
| Pervious area for non-amended infiltration | ac | 0 | 0.204545455 | 0.204545455 |
| Native or fill (underlying) HSG soil type | - | D | D | D |
| Bulk density of native soil or fill | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Specific gravity of soil particles | - | 2.65 | 2.65 | 2.65 |
| Infiltration rate of native soil or fill | in/hr | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| Amended Soil |  |  |  |  |
| BMP amendment area | ac | 0 | 0.204545455 | 0.204545455 |
| Depth of amendment placement | in | 0 | 18 | 18 |
| Depth of incorporation | in | 0 | 18 | 18 |
| Specific gravity of amendment particles | - | 2.65 | 2.65 | 2.65 |
| Bulk density of amendment | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ | 1.70 | 1.70 | 1.70 |
| Final bulk density of amended soil | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ | N/A | 2.04 | 2.04 |
| Infiltration rate of amended soil | in/hr | N/A | 8.00 | 8.00 |


| RESULTS: Native Soil or Fill (rate-based calculation) | Units | Existing | Proposed Design | Isolated <br> NNI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Runoff coefficient for downstream BMP with no amendment | - | N/A | 0.69 | 0.89 |
| Volume of total runoff from CDA infiltrated | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percentage of WQV from net new impervious area that is infiltrated with native soil or fill (use for T-1, 5b) | - | N/A | 0\% | 0\% |
| RESULTS: Amended Soil (volume-based calculation) | Units | Existing | Proposed Design | Isolated <br> NNI |
| Runoff coefficient for downstream BMP after amendment | - | N/A | 0.62 | 0.76 |
| Volume of total runoff infiltrated, $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | N/A | 1763 | 1763 |


| Percentage of WQV from net new impervious area that is infiltrated with <br> amended soil (use for T-1, 5d) |
| :--- |

## PROJECT INFORMATION

| Project | PCTPA - SR 65 Widening |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sub-watershed | Pleasant Grove Creek Subwatershed |
| BMP type | Biofiltration Swale "A5" 200+00-208+00, "P5" 207+00-219+00 SB |


| USER INPUT AND INTERMEDIATE CALCULATIONS | Units | Existing | Proposed <br> Design | Isolated <br> NNI |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Input from Basin Sizer | in | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.09 |
| Unit basin storage volume from Basin Sizer, where C $=1.0$ | hr | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| Drawdown time used in Basin Sizer | $\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 |

Drainage and Runoff to the Strip or Swale

| Contributing drainage area (CDA), including all impervious area | ac | 0 | 6.924357133 | 2.974405078 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total impervious area | ac | 0 | 2.974405078 | 2.974405078 |
| Net new impervious (NNI) area | ac | 0 | 2.974405078 | 2.974405078 |
| Additional impervious area seeking treatment credit | ac | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CDA runoff volume (including WQV) | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 0 | 18094 | 10592 |
| WQV | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 0 | 10592 | 10592 |

Native Soil

| Pervious area for non-amended infiltration | ac | 0 | 0.242424242 | 0.242424242 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Native or fill (underlying) HSG soil type | - | D | D | D |
| Bulk density of native soil or fill | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Specific gravity of soil particles | - | 2.65 | 2.65 | 2.65 |
| Infiltration rate of native soil or fill | $\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 |

Amended Soil

| BMP amendment area | ac | 0 | 0.242424242 | 0.242424242 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Depth of amendment placement | in | 0 | 18 | 18 |
| Depth of incorporation | in | 0 | 18 | 18 |
| Specific gravity of amendment particles | - | 2.65 | 2.65 | 2.65 |
| Bulk density of amendment | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ | 1.70 | 1.70 | 1.70 |
| Final bulk density of amended soil | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 2.04 | 2.04 |
| Infiltration rate of amended soil | $\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 8.00 | 8.00 |


| RESULTS: Native Soil or Fill (rate-based calculation) | Units | Existing | Proposed Design | Isolated <br> NNI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Runoff coefficient for downstream BMP with no amendment | - | N/A | 0.66 | 0.88 |
| Volume of total runoff from CDA infiltrated | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percentage of WQV from net new impervious area that is infiltrated with native soil or fill (use for T-1, 5b) | - | N/A | 0\% | 0\% |
| RESULTS: Amended Soil (volume-based calculation) | Units | Existing | Proposed Design | Isolated NNI |
| Runoff coefficient for downstream BMP after amendment | - | N/A | 0.56 | 0.67 |
| Volume of total runoff infiltrated, $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | N/A | 2089 | 2089 |
| Percentage of WQV from net new impervious area that is infiltrated with amended soil (use for T-1, 5d) | - | N/A | 20\% | 20\% |

PROJECT INFORMATION

| Project | PCTPA - SR 65 Widening |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sub-watershed | Pleasant Grove Creek Subwatershed |
| BMP type | Biofiltration Swale "A5" 190+50-193+50 NB |


| USER INPUT AND INTERMEDIATE CALCULATIONS | Units | Existing | Proposed <br> Design | Isolated <br> NNI |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Input from Basin Sizer | in | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.09 |
| Unit basin storage volume from Basin Sizer, where C =1.0 | hr | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| Drawdown time used in Basin Sizer | $\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| Rainfall rate from Basin Sizer "Caltrans Water Quality Flows" |  |  |  |  |
| Drainage and Runoff to the Strip or Swale | ac | 0 | 8.549990684 | 4.139378315 |
| Contributing drainage area (CDA), including all impervious area | ac | 0 | 4.139378315 | 4.139378315 |
| Total impervious area | ac | 0 | 4.139378315 | 4.139378315 |
| Net new impervious (NNI) area | ac | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Additional impervious area seeking treatment credit | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 0 | 23117 | 14740 |
| CDA runoff volume (including WQV) | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 0 | 14740 | 14740 |

Native Soil

| Pervious area for non-amended infiltration | ac | 0 | 0.176767677 | 0.176767677 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Native or fill (underlying) HSG soil type | - | D | D | D |
| Bulk density of native soil or fill | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Specific gravity of soil particles | - | 2.65 | 2.65 | 2.65 |
| Infiltration rate of native soil or fill | $\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 |

Amended Soil

| BMP amendment area | ac | 0 | 0.176767677 | 0.176767677 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Depth of amendment placement | in | 0 | 18 | 18 |
| Depth of incorporation | in | 0 | 18 | 18 |
| Specific gravity of amendment particles | - | 2.65 | 2.65 | 2.65 |
| Bulk density of amendment | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ | 1.70 | 1.70 | 1.70 |
| Final bulk density of amended soil | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 2.04 | 2.04 |
| Infiltration rate of amended soil | $\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 8.00 | 8.00 |


| RESULTS: Native Soil or Fill (rate-based calculation) | Units | Existing | Proposed Design | Isolated NNI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Runoff coefficient for downstream BMP with no amendment | - | N/A | 0.68 | 0.89 |
| Volume of total runoff from CDA infiltrated | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percentage of WQV from net new impervious area that is infiltrated with native soil or fill (use for T-1, 5b) | - | N/A | 0\% | 0\% |
| RESULTS: Amended Soil (volume-based calculation) | Units | Existing | Proposed Design | Isolated NNI |
| Runoff coefficient for downstream BMP after amendment | - | N/A | 0.63 | 0.77 |
| Volume of total runoff infiltrated, $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | N/A | 1523 | 1523 |
| Percentage of WQV from net new impervious area that is infiltrated with amended soil (use for T-1, 5d) | - | N/A | 10\% | 10\% |

PROJECT INFORMATION

| Project | PCTPA - SR 65 Widening |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sub-watershed | Pleasant Grove Creek Subwatershed |
| BMP type | Biofiltration Swale "A5" 199-202+50 NB |


| USER INPUT AND INTERMEDIATE CALCULATIONS | Units | Existing | Proposed <br> Design | Isolated <br> NNI |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Input from Basin Sizer | in | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.09 |
| Unit basin storage volume from Basin Sizer, where C $=1.0$ | hr | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| Drawdown time used in Basin Sizer | $\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 |

Drainage and Runoff to the Strip or Swale

| Contributing drainage area (CDA), including all impervious area | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 0 | 1.497828742 | 0.704770025 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total impervious area | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 0 | 0.704770025 | 0.704770025 |
| Net new impervious (NNI) area | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 0 | 0.704770025 | 0.704770025 |
| Additional impervious area seeking treatment credit | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CDA runoff volume (including WQV) | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WQV | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Native Soil

| Pervious area for non-amended infiltration | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 0 | 0.080348944 | 0.080348944 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Native or fill (underlying) HSG soil type | - | D | D | D |
| Bulk density of native soil or fill | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Specific gravity of soil particles | - | 2.65 | 2.65 | 2.65 |
| Infiltration rate of native soil or fill | $\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 |

Amended Soil

| BMP amendment area | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 0 | 0.080348944 | 0.080348944 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Depth of amendment placement | in | 0 | 18 | 18 |
| Depth of incorporation | in | 0 | 18 | 18 |
| Specific gravity of amendment particles | - | 2.65 | 2.65 | 2.65 |
| Bulk density of amendment | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ | 1.70 | 1.70 | 1.70 |
| Final bulk density of amended soil | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 2.04 | 2.04 |
| Infiltration rate of amended soil | $\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 8.00 | 8.00 |


| RESULTS: Native Soil or Fill (rate-based calculation) | Units | Existing | Proposed Design | Isolated NNI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Runoff coefficient for downstream BMP with no amendment | - | N/A | 0.68 | 0.88 |
| Volume of total runoff from CDA infiltrated | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percentage of WQV from net new impervious area that is infiltrated with native soil or fill (use for T-1, 5b) | - | N/A | 0\% | 0\% |
| RESULTS: Amended Soil (volume-based calculation) | Units | Existing | Proposed Design | Isolated NNI |
| Runoff coefficient for downstream BMP after amendment | - | N/A | 0.53 | 0.58 |
| Volume of total runoff infiltrated, $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | N/A | 0 | 0 |
| Percentage of WQV from net new impervious area that is infiltrated with amended soil (use for T-1, 5d) | - | N/A | 28\% | 28\% |

## PROJECT INFORMATION

| Project | PCTPA - SR 65 Widening |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sub-watershed | Pleasant Grove Creek Subwatershed |
| BMP type | Biofiltration Swale "A5" 200+00-208+00, "P5" 207+00-219+00 SB |


| USER INPUT AND INTERMEDIATE CALCULATIONS | Units | Existing | Proposed <br> Design | Isolated <br> NNI |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Input from Basin Sizer | in | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.09 |
| Unit basin storage volume from Basin Sizer, where C $=1.0$ | hr | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| Drawdown time used in Basin Sizer | $\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 |

Drainage and Runoff to the Strip or Swale

| Contributing drainage area (CDA), including all impervious area | ac | 0 | 6.924357133 | 2.974405078 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total impervious area | ac | 0 | 2.974405078 | 2.974405078 |
| Net new impervious (NNI) area | ac | 0 | 2.974405078 | 2.974405078 |
| Additional impervious area seeking treatment credit | ac | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CDA runoff volume (including WQV) | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 0 | 18094 | 10592 |
| WQV | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 0 | 10592 | 10592 |

Native Soil

| Pervious area for non-amended infiltration | ac | 0 | 0.242424242 | 0.242424242 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Native or fill (underlying) HSG soil type | - | D | D | D |
| Bulk density of native soil or fill | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Specific gravity of soil particles | - | 2.65 | 2.65 | 2.65 |
| Infiltration rate of native soil or fill | $\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 |

Amended Soil

| BMP amendment area | ac | 0 | 0.242424242 | 0.242424242 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Depth of amendment placement | in | 0 | 18 | 18 |
| Depth of incorporation | in | 0 | 18 | 18 |
| Specific gravity of amendment particles | - | 2.65 | 2.65 | 2.65 |
| Bulk density of amendment | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ | 1.70 | 1.70 | 1.70 |
| Final bulk density of amended soil | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 2.04 | 2.04 |
| Infiltration rate of amended soil | $\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 8.00 | 8.00 |


| RESULTS: Native Soil or Fill (rate-based calculation) | Units | Existing | Proposed Design | Isolated <br> NNI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Runoff coefficient for downstream BMP with no amendment | - | N/A | 0.66 | 0.88 |
| Volume of total runoff from CDA infiltrated | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percentage of WQV from net new impervious area that is infiltrated with native soil or fill (use for T-1, 5b) | - | N/A | 0\% | 0\% |
| RESULTS: Amended Soil (volume-based calculation) | Units | Existing | Proposed Design | Isolated NNI |
| Runoff coefficient for downstream BMP after amendment | - | N/A | 0.56 | 0.67 |
| Volume of total runoff infiltrated, $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | N/A | 2089 | 2089 |
| Percentage of WQV from net new impervious area that is infiltrated with amended soil (use for T-1, 5d) | - | N/A | 20\% | 20\% |

PROJECT INFORMATION

| Project | PCTPA - SR 65 Widening |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sub-watershed | Orchard Creek Subwatershed |
| BMP type | Biofiltration Swale "A3" 630+00-672+50.00 SB |


| USER INPUT AND INTERMEDIATE CALCULATIONS | Units | Existing | Proposed <br> Design | Isolated <br> NNI |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Input from Basin Sizer | in | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.09 |
| Unit basin storage volume from Basin Sizer, where C =1.0 | hr | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| Drawdown time used in Basin Sizer | $\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| Rainfall rate from Basin Sizer "Caltrans Water Quality Flows" |  |  |  |  |
| Drainage and Runoff to the Strip or Swale | ac | 0 | 12.33811438 | 4.346210174 |
| Contributing drainage area (CDA), including all impervious area | ac | 0 | 4.346210174 | 4.346210174 |
| Total impervious area | ac | 0 | 4.346210174 | 4.346210174 |
| Net new impervious (NNI) area | ac | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Additional impervious area seeking treatment credit | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 0 | 30655 | 15477 |
| CDA runoff volume (including WQV) | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 0 | 15477 | 15477 |

Native Soil

| Pervious area for non-amended infiltration | ac | 0 | 0.220385675 | 0.220385675 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Native or fill (underlying) HSG soil type | - | D | D | D |
| Bulk density of native soil or fill | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Specific gravity of soil particles | - | 2.65 | 2.65 | 2.65 |
| Infiltration rate of native soil or fill | $\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 |

Amended Soil

| BMP amendment area | ac | 0 | 0.220385675 | 0.220385675 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Depth of amendment placement | in | 0 | 18 | 18 |
| Depth of incorporation | in | 0 | 18 | 18 |
| Specific gravity of amendment particles | - | 2.65 | 2.65 | 2.65 |
| Bulk density of amendment | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ | 1.70 | 1.70 | 1.70 |
| Final bulk density of amended soil | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 2.04 | 2.04 |
| Infiltration rate of amended soil | $\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 8.00 | 8.00 |


| RESULTS: Native Soil or Fill (rate-based calculation) | Units | Existing | Proposed Design | Isolated NNI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Runoff coefficient for downstream BMP with no amendment | - | N/A | 0.63 | 0.89 |
| Volume of total runoff from CDA infiltrated | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percentage of WQV from net new impervious area that is infiltrated with native soil or fill (use for T-1, 5b) | - | N/A | 0\% | 0\% |
| RESULTS: Amended Soil (volume-based calculation) | Units | Existing | Proposed Design | Isolated NNI |
| Runoff coefficient for downstream BMP after amendment | - | N/A | 0.58 | 0.75 |
| Volume of total runoff infiltrated, $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ | N/A | 1899 | 1899 |
| Percentage of WQV from net new impervious area that is infiltrated with amended soil (use for T-1, 5d) | - | N/A | 12\% | 12\% |

## Checklist T - 1, Part 5

Caltrans Storm Water Quality Handbooks
Project Planning and Design Guide
May 2012


## Detention Devices

## Feasibility

1. Is there sufficient head to prevent objectionable backwater conditions in the $\boxtimes$ Yes $\quad \square$ No upstream drainage systems?
2. 2a) Is the volume of the Detention Device equal to at least the WQV? (Note: the WQV must be $\geq 4,356 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$ [ 0.1 acre-feet]). If the BMP is used in series with a biofiltration device, then does the total upstream infiltration plus the Detention Device volume at least equal the WQV?.

Only answer (b) if the Detention Device is being used also to capture traction sand.

2b) Is the total volume of the Detention Device at least equal to the WQV plus the anticipated volume of traction sand, while maintaining a minimum 12 inch freeboard ( 1 ft )?
3. Is basin invert $\geq 10 \mathrm{ft}$ above seasonally high groundwater or can it be designed with an impermeable liner? (Note: If an impermeable liner is used, the seasonally high groundwater elevation must not encroach within 12 inches of the invert.)

If No to any question above, then Detention Devices are not feasible.
4. Does adequate area exist within the right-of-way to place Detention Device(s)?

If Yes, continue to the Design Elements section. If No, continue to Question 5.
5. If adequate area does not exist within right-of-way, can suitable, additional right-of-way be acquired to site Detention Device(s) and how much right-of way would be needed to treat WQV? $\qquad$ acres
If Yes, continue to the Design Elements section. If No, continue to Question 6.
6. If adequate area cannot be obtained, document in Section 5 of the SWDR that the inability to obtain adequate area prevents the incorporation of this Treatment BMP into the project.

## Design Elements

* Required Design Element - A "Yes" response to these questions is required to further the consideration of this BMP into the project design. Document a "No" response in Section 5 of the SWDR to describe why this Treatment BMP cannot be included into the project design.
** Recommended Design Element - A "Yes" response is preferred for these questions, but not required for incorporation into a project design.

1. Has the geotechnical integrity of the site been evaluated to determine potential impacts to surrounding slopes due to incidental infiltration? If incidental infiltration through the invert of an unlined Detention Device is a concern, consider using an impermeable liner. *
2. Has the location of the Detention Device been evaluated for any effects to the adjacent roadway and subgrade? *
3. Can a minimum freeboard of 12 inches be provided above the overflow event elevation? *
4. Is an overflow outlet provided? *

5. Is the drawdown time of the Detention Device within 24 to 72 hours? *
6. Is the basin outlet designed to minimize clogging (minimum outlet orifice
 diameter of 0.5 inches)? *
7. Are the inlet and outlet structures designed to prevent scour and re-suspension of settled materials, and to enhance quiescent conditions? *
8. Can vegetation be established in an earthen basin at the invert and on the side slopes for erosion control and to minimize re-suspension? Note: Detention Basins may be lined, in which case no vegetation would be required for lined areas.*
9. Has sufficient access for Maintenance been provided? *

10. Is the side slope $4: 1$ (h:v) or flatter for interior slopes? ** (Note: Side slopes up to 3:1 (h:v) allowed with approval by District Maintenance.)
11. If significant sediment is expected from nearby slopes, can the Detention Device $\quad \square$ Yes $\quad \square$ No be designed with additional volume equal to the expected annual loading? **
12. Is flow path as long as possible ( $\geq 2: 1$ length to width ratio at WQV elevation is $\quad \square \mathrm{Yes} \quad \square$ No recommended)? ${ }^{* *}$

## Checklist T - 1, Part 8

Caltrans Storm Water Quality Handbooks
Project Planning and Design Guide
May 2012

| Treatment BMPs |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Checklist T-1, Part 8 |  |  |  |
| Prepared by:__MTCo | Date: | _District-Co-Route: | 03-PLA-65 |
| PM : 6.5/12.8 | Project ID (or EA): | 03-1F170K RWQCB:C | I Valley |

## Media Filters

Caltrans has approved two types of Media Filter: Austin Sand Filters and Delaware Filters. Austin Sand filters are typically designed for larger drainage areas, while Delaware Filters are typically designed for smaller drainage areas. The Austin Sand Filter is constructed with an open top and may have a concrete or earthen invert, while the Delaware is always constructed as a vault. See Appendix B, Media Filters, for a further description of Media Filters.

## Feasibility - Austin Sand Filter

1. Is the volume of the Austin Sand Filter equal to at least the WQV using a 24 hour drawdown? (Note: the WQV must be $\geq 4,356 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$ [ 0.1 acre-feet])
2. Is there sufficient hydraulic head to operate the device (minimum 3 ft between the inflow and outflow chambers)?
3. If initial chamber has an earthen bottom, is initial chamber invert $\geq 3 \mathrm{ft}$ above seasonally high groundwater?
4. If a vault is used for either chamber, is the level of the concrete base of the vault above seasonally high groundwater or is a special design provided?
If No to any question above, then an Austin Sand Filter is not feasible.
5. Does adequate area exist within the right-of-way to place an Austin Sand

Filter(s)?
If Yes, continue to Design Elements sections. If No, continue to Question 6.
6. If adequate area does not exist within right-of-way, can suitable, additional right- $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes N o$ of-way be acquired to site the device and how much right-of way would be needed to treat WQV? $\qquad$ acres
If Yes, continue to the Design Elements section.
If No, continue to Question 7.
7. If adequate area cannot be obtained, document in Section 5 of the SWDR that $\boxtimes$ Complete the inability to obtain adequate area prevents the incorporation of this Treatment BMP into the project.
If an Austin Sand Filter meets these feasibility requirements, continue to the Design Elements - Austin Sand Filter below.

## Feasibility-Delaware Filter

1. Is the volume of the Delaware Filter equal to at least the WQV using a 48 hour drawdown? (Note: the WQV must be $\geq 4,356 \mathrm{ft}^{3}$ [ 0.1 acre-feet], consult with District/Regional Design Storm Water Coordinator if a lesser volume is under consideration.)
2. Is there sufficient hydraulic head to operate the device (minimum 3 ft between the inflow and outflow chambers)?
3. Would a permanent pool of water be allowed by the local vector control agency? Confirm that check valves and vector proof lid as shown on standard detail sheets will be allowed, is used.

If No to any question, then a Delaware Filter is not feasible
4. Does adequate area exist within the right-of-way to place a Delaware Filter(s)? If Yes, continue to Design Elements sections. If No, continue to Question 5.
5. If adequate area does not exist within right-of-way, can suitable, additional right-of-way be acquired to site the device and how much right-of way would be needed to treat WQV? $\qquad$ acres
If Yes, continue to the Design Elements section. If No, continue to Question 6.
6. If adequate area cannot be obtained, document in Section 5 of the SWDR that the inability to obtain adequate area prevents the incorporation of this Treatment BMP into the project.
7. Does the project discharge to a waterbody that has been placed on the 303-d list or has had a TMDL adopted for bacteria, mercury, sulfides, or low dissolved oxygen?
If yes, contact the Regional/District NPDES Storm Water Coordinator to determine if standing water in this treatment BMP would be a risk to downstream water quality. If standing water is a potential issue, consider use of another treatment BMP.

If a Delaware Filter is still under consideration, continue to the Design Elements - Delaware Filter section.

## Design Elements - Austin Sand Filter

* Required Design Element - A "Yes" response to these questions is required to further the consideration of this BMP into the project design. Document a "No" response in Section 5 of the SWDR to describe why this Treatment BMP cannot be included into the project design.
** Recommended Design Element - A "Yes" response is preferred for these questions, but not required for incorporation into a project design.

1. Is the drawdown time of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ chamber 24 hours? *
2. Is access for Maintenance vehicles provided to the Austin Sand Filter? *
3. Is a bypass/overflow provided for storms > WQV? *
4. Is the flow path length to width ratio for the sedimentation chamber of the "full" Austin Sand Filter $\geq 2: 1$ ? **
5. Can pretreatment be provided to capture sediment and litter in the runoff (such as using vegetation)? **
6. Can the Austin Sand Filter be placed using an earthen configuration? **If No, go to Question 9.
7. Is the Austin Sand Filter invert separated from the seasonally high groundwater$\square$ Yes
 table by $\geq 10 \mathrm{ft}$ ) ? If $N o$, design with an impermeable liner.
8. Are side slopes of the earthen chamber $3: 1$ (h:v) or flatter? *
9. Is maximum depth $\leq 13 \mathrm{ft}$ below ground surface? *No
10. Can the Austin Sand Filter be placed in an offline configuration? **$\square$ No

## Design Elements - Delaware Filter

* Required Design Element - $A$ "Yes" response to these questions is required to further the consideration of this BMP into the project design. Document a "No" response in Section 5 of the SWDR to describe why this Treatment BMP cannot be included into the project design.
** Recommended Design Element - A "Yes" response is preferred for these questions, but not required for incorporation into a project design.

1. Is the drawdown time of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ chamber between 40 and 48 hours, typically 40 -Yes hrs? *
2. Is access for Maintenance vehicles provided to the Delaware Filter? *$\square \mathrm{No}$
3. Is a bypass/overflow provided for storms > WQV? **No
4. Can pretreatment be provided to capture sediment and litter in the runoff (such $\square$ Yes$\square \mathrm{No}$ as using vegetation)? **
5. Is maximum depth $\leq 13 \mathrm{ft}$ below ground surface? * $\square$ Yes $\square$ No

## Attachment G <br> Preliminary Cost Estimate

## Preliminary Cost Estimate

## Project ID: 03-1F1700

| Type of Estimate : <br> Program Code : <br> Project Limits : | Draft Project Report |
| :---: | :--- |
| Description: | PLA-65-PM 6.5/12.8 |
|  | Widen SR 65 from north of Galleria Blvd Interchange to Lincoln Blvd in Placer County |
| This alternative would add a carpool/HOV lane in the southbound direction of SR 65 in the |  |
| median from the Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange to north of Galleria Boulevard/Stanford |  |
| Ranch Road, a general purpose lane in each direction of SR 65 from Galleria Boulevard |  |
| interchange to the Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange and intermittent auxiliary lanes from |  |
| the Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road interchange to the Twelve Bridge Drive |  |
| interchange. Additional improvements include ramp reconfigurations and metering to |  |
| appliable ramps. |  |$\quad$| Alternative 1-Carpool Lane |
| :--- |
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## I. ROADWAY ITEMS SUMMARY

| Section |  | Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Earthwork | \$ | 5,895,000 |
| 2 | Pavement Structural Section | \$ | 15,160,100 |
| 3 | Drainage | \$ | 767,800 |
| 4 | Specialty Items | \$ | 1,523,500 |
| 5 | Environmental | \$ | 1,102,800 |
| 6 | Traffic Items | \$ | 5,319,000 |
| 7 | Detours | \$ | - |
| 8 | Minor Items | \$ | 2,976,900 |
| 9 | Roadway Mobilization | \$ | 3,274,600 |
| 10 | Supplemental Work | \$ | 1,784,500 |
| 11 | State Furnished | \$ | 1,637,300 |
| 12 | Contingencies | \$ | 8,236,400 |
| 13 | Overhead | \$ | 1,740,500 |

## TOTAL ROADWAY ITEMS

\$ 49,418,400

Estimate Prepared By

| Bernice Chan, P.E. | $10 / 14 / 2015$ | $916-563-2591$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Name and Title | Date | Phone |

Estimate Reviewed By

| Leo Heuston, P.E. | 10/28/2015 | 916-208-1814 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Name and Title | Date | Phone |

By signing this estimate you are attesting that you have discussed your project with all functional units and have incorporated all their comments or have discussed with them why they will not be incorporated.

## SECTION 1: EARTHWORK

| Item code |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 160101 | Clearing \& Grubbing |
| 170101 | Develop Water Supply |
| 190101 | Roadway Excavation |
| 190103 | Roadway Excavation (Type Y) ADL |
| 190105 | Roadway Excavation (Type Z-2) ADL |
| 192037 | Structure Excavation (Retaining Wall) |
| 193013 | Structure Backfill (Retaining Wall) |
| 193031 | Pervious Backfill Material (Retaining Wall) |
| 194001 | Ditch Excavation |
| 198001 | Impored Borrow |
| 198007 | Imported Material (Shoulder Backing) |


| Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LS | 1 | x | 100,000.00 | $=\$$ | 100,000 |
| LS | 1 | x | 20,000.00 | $=\$$ | 20,000 |
| CY | 231,000 | x | 25.00 | = \$ | 5,775,000 |
| CY |  | x |  | $=\$$ |  |
| CY |  | x |  | = \$ |  |
| CY |  | x |  | $=\$$ |  |
| CY |  | X |  | $=\$$ |  |
| CY |  | x |  | = \$ |  |
| CY |  | x |  | = \$ |  |
| CY |  | x |  | $=\$$ |  |
| TON |  | x |  | $=\$$ |  |

## SECTION 2: PAVEMENT STRUCTURAL SECTION

| Item code |  | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 150771 | Remove Asphalt Concrete Dike | LF |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 150860 | Remove Base and Surfacing | CY |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 153103 | Cold Plane Asphalt Concrete Pavement | SQYD |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 1532XX | Remove Concrete (type) | CY |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 250401 | Class 4 Aggregate Subbase | CY |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 260201 | Class 2 Aggregate Base | CY | 125,700 | x | 40.00 | \$ | 5,028,000 |
| 290201 | Asphalt Treated Permeable Base | CY |  | x |  | \$ |  |
| 365001 | Sand Cover | TON |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 374002 | Asphaltic Emulsion (Fog Seal Coat) | TON |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 374492 | Asphaltic Emulsion (Polymer Modified) | TON |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 3750XX | Screenings (Type XX) | TON |  | X |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 377501 | Slurry Seal | TON |  | x |  | $=\$$ |  |
| 390095 | Replace Asphalt Concrete Surfacing | CY |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 390132 | Hot Mix Asphalt (Type A) | TON | 86,900 | x | 100.00 | $=\$$ | 8,690,000 |
| 390401 | Hot Mix Asphalt (OGFC) | TON | 12,300 | x | 100.00 | \$ | 1,230,000 |
| 390136 | Minor Hot Mix Asphalt | TON |  | x |  | \$ |  |
| 390137 | Rubberized Hot Mix Asphalt (Gap Graded) | TON |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 393003 | Geosynthetic Pavement Interlayer | SQYD |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 39405X | Shoulder Rumber Strip (HMA, Type XX Inden | STA |  | x |  | \$ |  |
| 394071 | Place Hot Mix Asphalt Dike | LF |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 394090 | Place Hot Mix Asphalt (Misc. Area) | SQYD |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 397005 | Tack Coat | TON |  | x |  | $=\$$ |  |
| 401000 | Concrete Pavement | CY |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 401108 | Replace Concrete Pavement (Rapid Strength | CY |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 404092 | Seal Pavement Joint | LF |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 404094 | Seal Longitudinal Isolation Joint | LF |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 413112A | Repair Spalled Joints (Polyester Grout) | SQYD |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 413115 | Seal Existing Concrete Pavement Joint | LF |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 420102 | Groove Existing Concrete Pavement | SQYD |  | X |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 420201 | Grind Existing Concrete Pavement | SQYD |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 731502 | Minor Concrete (Misc. Const) | CY |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 731530 | Minor Concrete (Textured Paving) | SQFT | 17,400 | x | 10.00 | $=\$$ | 174,000 |
| XXXXXX | Remove Pavement | SQFT | 7,605 | X | 5.00 | \$ | 38,025 |

## SECTION 3: DRAINAGE

Item code
150206 Abandon Culvert
150805 Remove Culvert
150820 Modify Inlet
152430 Adjust Inlet
155003 Cap Inlet
193114 Sand Backfill
510502 Minor Concrete (Minor Structure - headwall \& wingwall)
510512 Minor Concrete (Box Culvert)
$62 X X X X$ XXX" APC Pipe
$64 X X X X ~ X X X " ~ P l a s t i c ~ P i p e ~$
$65 X X X X ~ 72 " ~ R C P ~ P i p e ~$
$66 X X X X ~ X X X " ~ C S P ~ P i p e ~$
$68 X X X X ~ E d g e ~ D r a i n ~$
$69 X X X X ~ X X X " ~ P i p e ~ D o w n d r a i n ~$
$70 X X X X ~ X X X " ~ P i p e ~ I n l e t ~$
$70 X X X X ~ X X X " ~ P i p e ~ R i s e r ~$
$70 X X X X ~ X X X " ~ F l a r e d ~ E n d ~ S e c t i o n ~$
703233 Grated Line Drain
$72 X X X X$ Rock Slope Protection (Type and Method)
721420 Concrete (Ditch Lining)
721430 Concrete (Channel Lining)
729010 Rock Slope Protection Fabric
750001 Miscellaneous Iron and Steel
XXXXXX Onsite Drainage Systems
XXXXXX Some Item


TOTAL DRAINAGE ITEMS $\$ \mathbf{7 6 7 , 8 0 0}$

## SECTION 4: SPECIALTY ITEMS

Item code
070012
Progress Schedule (Critical Path Method)
150662 Remove Metal Beam Guard Railing

| Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LS | 1 | x | 20,000.00 | $=$ | \$ | 20,000 |
| LF | 1,125 | x | 10.00 | $=$ | \$ | 11,250 |
| EA | 14 | x | 550.00 | $=$ | \$ | 7,700 |
| LF | 8,630 | x | 25.00 | $=$ | \$ | 215,750 |
| SQFT |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LS |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LF |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| SQFT | 1,502 | x | 205.00 | $=$ | \$ | 307,910 |
| SQFT | 1,382 | x | 224.00 | $=$ | \$ | 309,568 |
| CY |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| CY |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| SQFT |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| SQFT |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ |  |
| SQFT |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| SQFT |  | X |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LB |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LF |  | X |  | = | \$ | - |
| LF | 1,340 | X | 40.00 | $=$ | \$ | 53,600 |
| LF |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LF |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| EA | 4 | X | 4,500.00 | = | \$ | 18,000 |
| EA |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| EA | 19 | x | 3,000.00 | $=$ | \$ | 57,000 |
| EA |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| EA |  | X |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| EA |  | x |  | = | \$ | - |
| LF | 8,630 | X | 50.00 | $=$ | \$ | 431,500 |
| LF | 270 | X | 150.00 | = | \$ | 40,500 |
| LF | 390 | x | 130.00 | $=$ | \$ | 50,700 |

## SECTION 5: ENVIRONMENTAL

## 5A - ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION

| Item code |  | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Biological Mitigation | LS |  | X |  | $=$ | \$ |  |
| 071325 | TEMPORARY REINFORCED SILT FENCE | LF |  | x |  | = | \$ | - |
| 071325 | Temporary Fence (Type ESA) | LS | 1 |  | 25,000.00 | = | \$ | 25,000 |

## 5B - LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION

| Item code | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 200001 Highway Planting | LS |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 20XXXX XXX" (Insert Type) Conduit (Use for | LF |  | X |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 20XXXX Extend XXX" (Insert Type) Conduit | LF |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 201700 Imported Topsoil | CY |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 2030XX Erosion Control (Type __) | SQYD | 83,100 | x | 2.50 | = \$ | 207,750 |
| 203021 Fiber Rolls | LF |  | X |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 203026 Move In/ Move Out (Erosion Control) | EA |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 204099 Plant Establishment Work | LS |  | x |  | = \$ |  |
| 204101 Extend Plant Establishment (X Years) | LS |  | x |  | $=\$$ |  |
| 208000 Irrigation System | LS |  | $x$ |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 208304 Water Meter | EA |  | X |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 209801 Maintenance Vehicle Pullout | EA |  | X |  | $=\$$ | - |
| XXXXXX Some Item |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$\$ \quad 207,750$

## 5C - NPDES

| Item code |  | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 074016 | Construction Site Management | LS | 1 | x | 100,000.00 | $=\$$ | 100,000 |
| 074017 | Prepare WPCP | LS |  | x |  | = \$ | - |
| 074019 | Prepare SWPPP | LS | 1 | x | 20,000.00 | = \$ | 20,000 |
| 074023 | Temporary Erosion Control | SQYD |  | X |  | = \$ |  |
| 074027 | Temporary Erosion Control Blanket | SQYD |  | X |  | = \$ | - |
| 074028 | Temporary Fiber Roll | LF |  | X |  | = \$ |  |
| 074032 | Temporary Concrete Washout Facility | EA |  | x |  | = \$ |  |
| 074033 | Temporary Construction Entrance | EA |  | x |  | $=\$$ |  |
| 074035 | Temporary Check Dam | LF |  | X |  | = \$ |  |
| 074037 | Move In/ Move Out (Temporary Erosion Con | EA |  | x |  | = \$ |  |
| 074038 | Temp. Drainage Inlet Protection | EA |  | X |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 074041 | Street Sweeping | LS |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 074042 | Temporary Concrete Washout (Portable) | LS |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| XXXXXX | Water Pollution Control | LS | 1 |  | 750,000.00 | $=\$$ | 750,000 |

## Supplemental Work for NPDES

(These costs are not accounted in total here but under Supplemental Work on sheet 7 of 11).

| 066595 | Water Pollution Control Maintenance Sharinç | LS | 1 | $x$ | $50,000.00$ | $=$ | $\$$ | 50,000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 066596 | Additional Water Pollution Control** | LS | 1 | $x$ | $10,000.00$ | $=$ | 10,000 |  |
| 066597 | Storm Water Sampling and Analysis*** | LS | 1 | $x$ | $10,000.00$ | $=\$$ | 10,000 |  |


| XXXXXX Some Item |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |

Subtotal NPDES (Without Supplemental Work) \$ 870,000

[^28]TOTAL ENVIRONMENTAL $\$ \quad 1,102,800$

## SECTION 6: TRAFFIC ITEMS

## 6A - Traffic Electrical

| Item code |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 150760 | Remove Sign Structure |
| 151581 | Reconstruct Sign Structure |
| 152641 | Modify Sign Structure |
| 5602XX | Furnish and Install Sign Structure |
| 56XXXX | XXX" CIDHC Pile (Sign Foundation) |
| 860090 |  |
| 860810 | Inductive Loop Detectors |
| 86055X | Lighting \& Sign Illumination |
| 8607XX | Interconnection Facilities |
| 8609XX | Traffic Monitoring Stations |
| 860XXX | Signals \& Lighting |
| 8611XX | Ramp Metering System (Location X) |
| 8611XX | Ramp Metering System (Location X) |
| 86XXXX | Fiber Optic Conduit System |
|  | CCTVs |


| Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EA | 10 | x | 6,000.00 | $=$ | \$ | 60,000 |
| EA |  | x |  | = | \$ | - |
| EA |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| EA | 12 | x | 100,000.00 | $=$ | \$ | 1,200,000 |
| LF | 300 | x | 1,600.00 | $=$ | \$ | 480,000 |
| LS |  | X |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| EA |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LS |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LS |  | X |  | = | \$ | - |
| LS |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LS | 1 | x | 250,000.00 | $=$ | \$ | 250,000 |
| EA | 6 | x | 50,000.00 | $=$ | \$ | 300,000 |
| LS |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LS |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| EA | 3 | x | 1,000.00 | $=$ | \$ | 3,000 |

6B - Traffic Signing and Striping

| Item code | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 120090 Construction Area Signs | LS | 1 | X | 20,000.00 | = | \$ | 20,000 |
| 150701 Remove Yellow Painted Traffic Stripe | LF |  | x |  | = | \$ | - |
| 150710 Remove Traffic Stripe | LF |  | x |  | = | \$ | - |
| 150713 Remove Pavement Marking | SQFT |  | x |  | = | \$ |  |
| 150742 Remove Roadside Sign | EA |  | X |  | = | \$ |  |
| 152320 Reset Roadside Sign | EA |  | X |  | = | \$ | - |
| 152390 Relocate Roadside Sign | EA |  | X |  | = | \$ | - |
| 566011 Roadside Sign (One Post) | EA |  | X |  | = | \$ |  |
| 566012 Roadside Sign (Two Post) | EA |  | X |  | = | \$ | - |
| 560XXX Furnish Sign Panels | SQFT |  | x |  | = | \$ | - |
| 560XXX Install Sign Panels | SQFT |  | X |  | = | \$ | - |
| 82010X Delineator (Class X) | EA |  | X |  | = | \$ | - |
| 84XXXX Permanent Signing and Pavement Delineation | LS | 1 | x | 300,000.00 | = | \$ | 300,000 |

Subtotal Traffic Signing and Striping
$\$ \quad 320,000$

## 6C - Stage Construction and Traffic Handling

| Item code | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 120100 Traffic Control System | LS | 1 | x | 2,000,000 | $=$ | \$ | 2,000,000 |
| 120120 Type III Barricade | EA |  | x |  | = | \$ | - |
| 120143 Temporary Pavement Delineation | LF |  | X |  | = | \$ |  |
| 12016X Channelizer | EA |  | X |  | = | \$ | - |
| 128650 Portable Changeable Message Signs | EA | 16 | X | 5,000.00 |  | \$ | 80,000 |
| 129000 Temporary Railing (Type K) | LF | 62,100 | x | 10.00 | = | \$ | 621,000 |
| 129100 Temp. Crash Cushion Module | EA | 10 | X | 500.00 | = | \$ | 5,000 |
| 129099A Traffic Plastic Drum | EA |  | x |  | = | \$ | - |
| 839603A Temporary Crash Cushion (ADIEM) | EA |  | X |  | = | \$ | - |
| XXXXXX Some Item |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## SECTION 7: DETOURS

Include constructing, maintaining, and removal


| TOTAL DETOURS | $\$$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | ---: |
| SUBTOTAL SECTIONS 1-7 | $\$ \quad 29,768,200$ |  |

SECTION 8: MINOR ITEMS

| 8A - Americans with Disabilities Act Items |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ADA Items |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  | \$ | - |  |  |
| 8B - Bike Path Items |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bike Path Items |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  | \$ | - |  |  |
| 8C - Other Minor Items |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Minor Items |  |  |  | 10.0\% |  | \$ 2,976,820 |  |  |  |
| Total of Section 1-7 | \$ | 29,768,200 | X | 10.0\% | $=$ | \$ | 2,976,820 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | TOTAL | NOR | R IT | TEMS | \$ | 2,976,900 |

## SECTIONS 9: MOBILIZATION

```
Item
999990 Total Section 1-8
```

\$ $32,745,100 \times 10 \%=\$ 3,274,510$

TOTAL MOBILIZATION \$ 3,274,600

## SECTION 10: SUPPLEMENTAL WORK



SECTION 11: STATE FURNISHED MATERIALS AND EXPENSES


TOTAL STATE FURNISHED

SECTION 12: TIME-RELATED OVERHEAD

Estimated Time-Related Overhead (TRO) Percentage (0\% to 10\%) = $5 \%$

| Item code | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price (\$) | Cost |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 070018 Time-Related Overhead | WD | 600 | $\times 2900.83333=\$ 1,740,500$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | TOTAL TIME-RELATED OVERHEAD | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 7 4 0 , 5 0 0}$ |  |

SECTION 13: CONTINGENCY
(Pre-PSR 30\%-50\%, PSR 25\%, Draft PR 20\%, PR 15\%, after PR approval 10\%, Final PS\&E 5\%)

Total Section 1-11 \$ 41,182,000 x 20\% $=\$ 8,236,400$
TOTAL CONTINGENCY
\$8,236,400

## II. STRUCTURE ITEMS

## Bridge 1

DATE OF ESTIMATE
Bridge Name
Bridge Number Structure Type Width (Feet) [out to out] Total Bridge Length (Feet)
Total Area (Square Feet) Structure Depth (Feet)
Footing Type (pile or spread)
Cost Per Square Foot

Bridge 2

03/01/17
Pleasant Grove Creek Br - Lt Widen (Lt) 19-0136 L
CIP Reinforced Concrete Slab

| 12.48 | LF |
| :---: | :---: |
| 128.20 | LF |
| 1600 | SQFT |
| 1.29 | FT |
|  | Pile |
|  | $\$ 237.26$ |

Bridge 3

03/01/17
Pleasant Grove Creek Br - Lt Widen (Rt) 19-0136 L
CIP Reinforced Concrete Slab
16.48 LF
128.20 LF

2112 SQFT
1.29 FT

Pile
\$261.72

| COST OF EACH <br> STRUCTURE | $\$ 458,000$ | $\$ 380,000$ | $\$ 553,000$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Bridge 4

DATE OF ESTIMATE
Bridge Name Bridge Number Structure Type Width (Feet) [out to out] Total Bridge Length (Feet) Total Area (Square Feet) Structure Depth (Feet) Footing Type (pile or spread) Cost Per Square Foot

03/01/17
Pleasant Grove Creek Br - Rt Widen (Lt) 19-0136 R
CIP Reinforced Concrete Slab

| 16.73 | LF |
| ---: | :---: |
| 140.00 | LF |
| 2342 | SQFT |
| 1.33 | FT |

Pile \$286.94

00/00/00
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx 57-XXX
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

$$
0.00 \quad \mathrm{LF}
$$

0.00 LF
0.00 SQFT
0.00 LF
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx $\$ 0.00$

00/00/00 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx 57-XXX
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

$$
0.00 \quad \text { LF }
$$

0.00 LF
0.0 SQFT
0.00 LF
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
$\$ 0.00$

| COST OF EACH <br> STRUCTURE | $\$ 672,000$ | $\$ 0.00$ | $\$ 0.00$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| TOTAL COST OF BRIDGES | $\$ 2,063,000.00$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL COST OF BUILDINGS | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Estimate Prepared By

$\qquad$
${ }^{1}$ Structure's Estimate includes Overhead and Mobilization.
Add more sheets if needed. Call them 9a, 9b, 9c, ..., etc

## III. RIGHT OF WAY

Fill in all of the available information from the Right of Way data sheet.


## Project ID: 03-1F1700

| Type of Estimate : | Draft Project Report |
| :---: | :---: |
| Program Code : |  |
| Project Limits : | PLA-65-PM 6.5/12.8 |
| Description: | Widen SR 65 from north of Galleria Blvd Interchange to Lincoln Blvd in Placer County |
|  | This alternative would add a general purpose lane in southbound direction of SR 65 from the Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange to the Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road interchange. For added capacity on southbound SR 65, as recommended by the VA study, this alternative also includes an additional general purpose lane from the |
| Scope : | Blue Oaks Boulevard slip on-ramp to the Pleasant Grove Boulevard loop on-ramp. On northbound SR 65, a 12-foot general purpose lane would be added through the Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange. Additional improvements include intermittent auxiliary lanes, ramp reconfiguration and metering as applicable between the Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road interchange and the Twelve Bridge Drive interchange. |

Alternative :
Alternative 2 - General Purpose Lane


## I. ROADWAY ITEMS SUMMARY

| Section |  | Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Earthwork | \$ | 5,895,000 |
| 2 | Pavement Structural Section | \$ | 14,435,100 |
| 3 | Drainage | \$ | 767,800 |
| 4 | Specialty Items | \$ | 1,523,600 |
| 5 | Environmental | \$ | 1,102,800 |
| 6 | Traffic Items | \$ | 5,319,000 |
| 7 | Detours | \$ | - |
| 8 | Minor Items | \$ | 2,904,400 |
| 9 | Roadway Mobilization | \$ | 3,194,800 |
| 10 | Supplemental Work | \$ | 1,766,600 |
| 11 | State Furnished | \$ | 1,597,400 |
| 12 | Contingencies | \$ | 8,041,500 |
| 13 | Overhead | \$ | 1,700,600 |

## TOTAL ROADWAY ITEMS

\$ 48,248,600

Estimate Prepared By


Estimate Reviewed By

| Leo Heuston, P.E. | 10/28/2015 | 916-208-1814 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Name and Title | Date | Phone |

By signing this estimate you are attesting that you have discussed your project with all functional units and have incorporated all their comments or have discussed with them why they will not be incorporated.

## SECTION 1: EARTHWORK

| Item code |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 160101 | Clearing \& Grubbing |
| 170101 | Develop Water Supply |
| 190101 | Roadway Excavation |
| 190103 | Roadway Excavation (Type Y) ADL |
| 190105 | Roadway Excavation (Type Z-2) ADL |
| 192037 | Structure Excavation (Retaining Wall) |
| 193013 | Structure Backfill (Retaining Wall) |
| 193031 | Pervious Backfill Material (Retaining Wall) |
| 194001 | Ditch Excavation |
| 198001 | Impored Borrow |
| 198007 | Imported Material (Shoulder Backing) |


| Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LS | 1 | x | 100,000.00 | $=\$$ | 100,000 |
| LS | 1 | x | 20,000.00 | $=\$$ | 20,000 |
| CY | 231,000 | x | 25.00 | = \$ | 5,775,000 |
| CY |  | x |  | = \$ |  |
| CY |  | x |  | = \$ |  |
| CY |  | x |  | $=\$$ |  |
| CY |  | X |  | $=\$$ |  |
| CY |  | x |  | = \$ |  |
| CY |  | x |  | = \$ |  |
| CY |  | x |  | $=\$$ |  |
| TON |  | x |  | $=\$$ |  |

## SECTION 2: PAVEMENT STRUCTURAL SECTION

| Item code |  | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 150771 | Remove Asphalt Concrete Dike | LF |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 150860 | Remove Base and Surfacing | CY |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 153103 | Cold Plane Asphalt Concrete Pavement | SQYD |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 1532XX | Remove Concrete (type) | CY |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 250401 | Class 4 Aggregate Subbase | CY |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 260201 | Class 2 Aggregate Base | CY | 113,800 | x | 40.00 | \$ | 4,552,000 |
| 290201 | Asphalt Treated Permeable Base | CY |  | x |  | = \$ | - |
| 365001 | Sand Cover | TON |  | x |  | = \$ | - |
| 374002 | Asphaltic Emulsion (Fog Seal Coat) | TON |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 374492 | Asphaltic Emulsion (Polymer Modified) | TON |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 3750XX | Screenings (Type XX) | TON |  | x |  | $=\$$ |  |
| 377501 | Slurry Seal | TON |  | x |  | $=\$$ |  |
| 390095 | Replace Asphalt Concrete Surfacing | CY |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 390132 | Hot Mix Asphalt (Type A) | TON | 84,400 | x | 100.00 | $=\$$ | 8,440,000 |
| 390401 | Hot Mix Asphalt (OGFC) | TON | 12,500 | x | 100.00 | $=\$$ | 1,250,000 |
| 390136 | Minor Hot Mix Asphalt | TON |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 390137 | Rubberized Hot Mix Asphalt (Gap Graded) | TON |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 393003 | Geosynthetic Pavement Interlayer | SQYD |  | x |  | $=\$$ |  |
| 39405X | Shoulder Rumber Strip (HMA, Type XX Inden | STA |  | x |  | = \$ | - |
| 394071 | Place Hot Mix Asphalt Dike | LF |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 394090 | Place Hot Mix Asphalt (Misc. Area) | SQYD |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 397005 | Tack Coat | TON |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 401000 | Concrete Pavement | CY |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 401108 | Replace Concrete Pavement (Rapid Strength | CY |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 404092 | Seal Pavement Joint | LF |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 404094 | Seal Longitudinal Isolation Joint | LF |  | x |  | = \$ | - |
| 413112A | Repair Spalled Joints (Polyester Grout) | SQYD |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 413115 | Seal Existing Concrete Pavement Joint | LF |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 420102 | Groove Existing Concrete Pavement | SQYD |  | x |  | = \$ | - |
| 420201 | Grind Existing Concrete Pavement | SQYD |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 731502 | Minor Concrete (Misc. Const) | CY |  | x |  | \$ | - |
| 731530 | Minor Concrete (Textured Paving) | SQFT | 15,500 | x | 10.00 | $=\$$ | 155,000 |
| XXXXXX | Remove Pavement | SQFT | 7,605 | x | 5.00 | $=\$$ | 38,025 |

## SECTION 3: DRAINAGE

Item code
150206 Abandon Culvert
150805 Remove Culvert
150820 Modify Inlet
152430 Adjust Inlet
155003 Cap Inlet
193114 Sand Backfill
510502 Minor Concrete (Minor Structure - headwall \& wingwall)
510512 Minor Concrete (Box Culvert)
$62 X X X X$ XXX" APC Pipe
$64 X X X X ~ X X X " ~ P l a s t i c ~ P i p e ~$
$65 X X X X ~ 72 " ~ R C P ~ P i p e ~$
$66 X X X X ~ X X X " ~ C S P ~ P i p e ~$
$68 X X X X ~ E d g e ~ D r a i n ~$
$69 X X X X ~ X X X " ~ P i p e ~ D o w n d r a i n ~$
$70 X X X X ~ X X X " ~ P i p e ~ I n l e t ~$
$70 X X X X ~ X X X " ~ P i p e ~ R i s e r ~$
$70 X X X X ~ X X X " ~ F l a r e d ~ E n d ~ S e c t i o n ~$
703233 Grated Line Drain
$72 X X X X$ Rock Slope Protection (Type and Method)
721420 Concrete (Ditch Lining)
721430 Concrete (Channel Lining)
729010 Rock Slope Protection Fabric
750001 Miscellaneous Iron and Steel
XXXXXX Onsite Drainage Systems
XXXXXX Some Item

| Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LF |  | X |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LF |  | X |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| EA |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LF |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| EA |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| CY |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| CY | 80 | x | 2,000.00 | $=$ | \$ | 160,000 |
| CY | 130 | x | 2,000.00 | = | \$ | 260,000 |
| LF |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LF |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LF | 65 | x | 350.00 | $=$ | \$ | 22,750 |
| LF |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LF |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LF |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LF |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LF |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| EA |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LF |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| CY |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| CY |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| CY |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| SQYD |  | X |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LB |  | X |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LS | 1 | x | 325,000.00 | $=$ | \$ | 325,000 |
|  |  | x |  |  | \$ | - |

TOTAL DRAINAGE ITEMS \$ 767,800

## SECTION 4: SPECIALTY ITEMS

Item code
070012 Progress Schedule (Critical Path Method)
150662
Remove Metal Beam Guard Railing
150668 Remove Terminal Systems

| Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LS | 1 | x | 20,000.00 | $=$ | \$ | 20,000 |
| LF | 1,130 | x | 10.00 | $=$ | \$ | 11,300 |
| EA | 14 | x | 550.00 | $=$ | \$ | 7,700 |
| LF | 8,630 | x | 25.00 | $=$ | \$ | 215,750 |
| SQFT |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LS |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LF |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| SQFT | 1,502 | x | 205.00 | $=$ | \$ | 307,910 |
| SQFT | 1,382 | x | 224.00 | $=$ | \$ | 309,568 |
| CY |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| CY |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| SQFT |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| SQFT |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ |  |
| SQFT |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| SQFT |  | X |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LB |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LF |  | X |  | = | \$ | - |
| LF | 1,340 | X | 40.00 | $=$ | \$ | 53,600 |
| LF |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LF |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| EA | 4 | X | 4,500.00 | = | \$ | 18,000 |
| EA |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| EA | 19 | x | 3,000.00 | $=$ | \$ | 57,000 |
| EA |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| EA |  | X |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| EA |  | x |  | = | \$ | - |
| LF | 8,630 | X | 50.00 | $=$ | \$ | 431,500 |
| LF | 270 | X | 150.00 | = | \$ | 40,500 |
| LF | 390 | x | 130.00 | $=$ | \$ | 50,700 |

## SECTION 5: ENVIRONMENTAL

## 5A - ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION

| Item code |  | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Biological Mitigation | LS |  | X |  | $=$ | \$ |  |
| 071325 | TEMPORARY REINFORCED SILT FENCE | LF |  | x |  | = | \$ | - |
| 071325 | Temporary Fence (Type ESA) | LS | 1 |  | 25,000.00 | = | \$ | 25,000 |

## 5B - LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION

| Item code | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 200001 Highway Planting | LS |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 20XXXX XXX" (Insert Type) Conduit (Use for | LF |  | X |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 20XXXX Extend XXX" (Insert Type) Conduit | LF |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 201700 Imported Topsoil | CY |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 2030XX Erosion Control (Type __) | SQYD | 83,100 | x | 2.50 | = \$ | 207,750 |
| 203021 Fiber Rolls | LF |  | X |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 203026 Move In/ Move Out (Erosion Control) | EA |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 204099 Plant Establishment Work | LS |  | x |  | = \$ |  |
| 204101 Extend Plant Establishment (X Years) | LS |  | x |  | $=\$$ |  |
| 208000 Irrigation System | LS |  | $x$ |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 208304 Water Meter | EA |  | X |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 209801 Maintenance Vehicle Pullout | EA |  | X |  | $=\$$ | - |
| XXXXXX Some Item |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$\$ \quad 207,750$

## 5C - NPDES

| Item code |  | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 074016 | Construction Site Management | LS | 1 | x | 100,000.00 | $=\$$ | 100,000 |
| 074017 | Prepare WPCP | LS |  | x |  | = \$ | - |
| 074019 | Prepare SWPPP | LS | 1 | x | 20,000.00 | = \$ | 20,000 |
| 074023 | Temporary Erosion Control | SQYD |  | X |  | = \$ |  |
| 074027 | Temporary Erosion Control Blanket | SQYD |  | X |  | = \$ | - |
| 074028 | Temporary Fiber Roll | LF |  | X |  | = \$ |  |
| 074032 | Temporary Concrete Washout Facility | EA |  | x |  | = \$ |  |
| 074033 | Temporary Construction Entrance | EA |  | x |  | $=\$$ |  |
| 074035 | Temporary Check Dam | LF |  | X |  | = \$ |  |
| 074037 | Move In/ Move Out (Temporary Erosion Con | EA |  | x |  | = \$ |  |
| 074038 | Temp. Drainage Inlet Protection | EA |  | X |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 074041 | Street Sweeping | LS |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| 074042 | Temporary Concrete Washout (Portable) | LS |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |
| XXXXXX | Water Pollution Control | LS | 1 |  | 750,000.00 | $=\$$ | 750,000 |

## Supplemental Work for NPDES

(These costs are not accounted in total here but under Supplemental Work on sheet 7 of 11).

| 066595 | Water Pollution Control Maintenance Sharinç | LS | 1 | $x$ | $50,000.00$ | $=$ | $\$$ | 50,000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 066596 | Additional Water Pollution Control** | LS | 1 | $x$ | $10,000.00$ | $=$ | 10,000 |  |
| 066597 | Storm Water Sampling and Analysis*** | LS | 1 | $x$ | $10,000.00$ | $=\$$ | 10,000 |  |


| XXXXXX Some Item |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |

Subtotal NPDES (Without Supplemental Work) \$ 870,000

[^29]TOTAL ENVIRONMENTAL $\$ \quad 1,102,800$

## SECTION 6: TRAFFIC ITEMS

## 6A - Traffic Electrical

Item code
150760 Remove Sign Structure
151581 Reconstruct Sign Structure
152641 Modify Sign Structure
5602XX Furnish and Install Sign Structure
56XXXX XXX" CIDHC Pile (Sign Foundation)
860090 Maintain Existing Traffic Management System
860810 Inductive Loop Detectors
86055X Lighting \& Sign Illumination
8607XX Interconnection Facilities
8609XX Traffic Monitoring Stations
860XXX Signals \& Lighting
8611XX Ramp Metering System (Location X)
8611XX Ramp Metering System (Location X)
86XXXX Fiber Optic Conduit System
86XXXX CCTVs

| Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EA | 10 | x | 6,000.00 | $=$ | \$ | 60,000 |
| EA |  | x |  | = | \$ | - |
| EA |  | X |  | = | \$ | - |
| EA | 12 | x | 100,000.00 | = | \$ | 1,200,000 |
| LF | 300 | x | 1,600.00 | = | \$ | 480,000 |
| LS |  | x |  | = | \$ | - |
| EA |  | x |  | = | \$ | - |
| LS |  | x |  | = | \$ | - |
| LS |  | x |  | = | \$ | - |
| LS |  | x |  | = | \$ | - |
| LS | 1 | x | 250,000.00 | = | \$ | 250,000 |
| EA | 6 | x | 50,000.00 | = | \$ | 300,000 |
| LS |  | x |  | = | \$ | - |
| LS |  | x |  | = | \$ | - |
| EA | 3 | x | 1,000.00 | $=$ | \$ | 3,000 |

$\qquad$ $\$ \quad 2,293,000$

## 6B - Traffic Signing and Striping

| Item code | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  | Cost |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 120090 Construction Area Signs | LS | 1 | x | 20,000.00 | $=\$$ | 20,000 |  |  |
| 150701 Remove Yellow Painted Traffic Stripe | LF |  | x |  | = \$ | - |  |  |
| 150710 Remove Traffic Stripe | LF |  | x |  | = \$ | - |  |  |
| 150713 Remove Pavement Marking | SQFT |  | x |  | = \$ | - |  |  |
| 150742 Remove Roadside Sign | EA |  | x |  | = \$ | - |  |  |
| 152320 Reset Roadside Sign | EA |  | x |  | = \$ | - |  |  |
| 152390 Relocate Roadside Sign | EA |  | x |  | = \$ | - |  |  |
| 566011 Roadside Sign (One Post) | EA |  | x |  | = \$ | - |  |  |
| 566012 Roadside Sign (Two Post) | EA |  | x |  | = \$ | - |  |  |
| 560XXX Furnish Sign Panels | SQFT |  | X |  | = \$ | - |  |  |
| 560XXX Install Sign Panels | SQFT |  | x |  | = \$ | - |  |  |
| 82010X Delineator (Class X) | EA |  | x |  | $=\$$ | - |  |  |
| 84XXXX Permanent Signing and Pavement Delineation | LS | 1 | x | 300,000.00 | $=$ \$ | 300,000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | btotal Traffic Si | ning a | d Striping | \$ | 320,000 |

## 6C - Stage Construction and Traffic Handling

 Item code120100 Traffic Control System
120120 Type III Barricade
120143 Temporary Pavement Delineation
12016 X Channelizer
128650 Portable Changeable Message Signs
129000 Temporary Railing (Type K)
129100 Temp. Crash Cushion Module
129099A Traffic Plastic Drum
839603A Temporary Crash Cushion (ADIEM)
XXXXXX Some Item

| Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LS | 1 | x | 2,000,000 | $=$ | \$ | 2,000,000 |
| EA |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LF |  | X |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| EA |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| EA | 16 | x | 5,000.00 | = | \$ | 80,000 |
| LF | 62,100 | x | 10.00 | $=$ | \$ | 621,000 |
| EA | 10 | x | 500.00 | $=$ | \$ | 5,000 |
| EA |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| EA |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |

Subtotal Stage Construction and Traffic Handling \$ 2,706,000

TOTAL TRAFFIC ITEMS \$ 5,319,000

## SECTION 7: DETOURS

Include constructing, maintaining, and removal


## SECTION 8: MINOR ITEMS



## SECTIONS 9: MOBILIZATION

## Item <br> cnde

$999990 \quad$ Total Section 1-8
$\$ 31,947,700 \times 10 \%=\$ 3,194,770$
TOTAL MOBILIZATION $\$ 3,194,800$
SECTION 10: SUPPLEMENTAL WORK
Item code
066015 Federal Trainee Program
066063 Traffic Management Plan - Public Information
066090 Maintain Traffic
066094 Value Analysis
066204 Remove Rock \& Debris
066222 Locate Existing Cross-Over
066670 Payment Adjustments For Price Index Fluctuations
066700 Partnering
066866 Operation of Existing Traffic Management System Elements During Constructi
066920 Dispute Review Board
XXXXXX Some Item

| Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) |  |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LS |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LS | 1 | X | 500,000.00 | = | \$ | 500,000 |
| LS | 1 | X | 500,000.00 | = | \$ | 500,000 |
| LS |  | X |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LS |  | X |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LS |  | X |  | = | \$ | - |
| LS | 1 | X | 57,600.00 | = | \$ | 57,600 |
| LS |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LS |  | X |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
| LS |  | X |  | $=$ | \$ | - |
|  |  | x |  | $=$ | \$ | - |

SECTION 11: STATE FURNISHED MATERIALS AND EXPENSES

| Item code | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price (\$) | Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 066063 Public Information | LS |  | x | $=$ | \$0 |  |
| 066105 RE Office | LS |  | X | = | \$0 |  |
| 066803 Padlocks | LS |  | x | = | \$0 |  |
| 066838 Reflective Numbers and Edge Sealer | LS |  | x | = | \$0 |  |
| 066901 Water Expenses | LS |  | x | = | \$0 |  |
| 066062A COZEEP Expenses | LS |  | X | = | \$0 |  |
| 06684X Ramp Meter Controller Assembly | LS |  | x | = | \$0 |  |
| 06684X TMS Controller Assembly | LS |  | x | = | \$0 |  |
| 06684X Traffic Signal Controller Assembly | LS |  | x | $=$ | \$0 |  |
| XXXXXX Some Item |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Section 1-8 | \$ | 31,947,700 | $5 \%=\$ 1,597,385$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | TOTAL STATE FURNISHED |  |  | \$1,597,400 |

SECTION 12: TIME-RELATED OVERHEAD

Estimated Time-Related Overhead (TRO) Percentage (0\% to 10\%) = $5 \%$

| Item code | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price (\$) |  |  | Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 070018 Time-Related Overhead | WD | 600 | X | 2834.33 | $=$ | \$1,700,600 |  |
|  |  |  | TOTAL TIME-RELATED OVERHEAD |  |  |  | \$1,700,600 |

SECTION 13: CONTINGENCY
(Pre-PSR 30\%-50\%, PSR 25\%, Draft PR 20\%, PR 15\%, after PR approval 10\%, Final PS\&E 5\%)

## II. STRUCTURE ITEMS

## Bridge 1

DATE OF ESTIMATE
Bridge Name
Bridge Number Structure Type Width (Feet) [out to out] Total Bridge Length (Feet)
Total Area (Square Feet) Structure Depth (Feet)
Footing Type (pile or spread)
Cost Per Square Foot

Bridge 2

03/01/17
Pleasant Grove Creek Br. - Lt Widen (Left) 19-0136 L
CIP Reinforced Concrete Slab

| 12.48 | LF |
| ---: | :---: |
| 128.20 | LF |
| 1600 | SQFT |
| 1.29 | FT |
|  | Pile |
|  | $\$ 237.26$ |

Bridge 3

03/01/17
Pleasant Grove Creek Br. - Lt Widen (Rt)
19-0136 L
CIP Reinforced Concrete Slab
16.48 LF
128.20 LF

2112 SQFT
1.29 FT

Pile
\$261.72

| COST OF EACH <br> STRUCTURE | $\$ 458,000$ | $\$ 380,000$ | $\$ 553,000$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Bridge 4

| DATE OF ESTIMATE | 03/01/17 <br> Pleasant Grove Creek Br. - Rt Widen (Lt) 19-0136 R <br> CIP Reinforced Concrete Slab |  | 00/00/00 <br> xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx 57-XXX <br> xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx | 00/00/00 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx 57-XXX <br> xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bridge Name |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bridge Number |  |  |  |  |  |
| Structure Type |  |  |  |  |  |
| Width (Feet) [out to out] | 16.73 | LF | 0.00 LF | 0.00 | LF |
| Total Bridge Length (Feet) | 140.00 | LF | 0.00 LF | 0.00 | LF |
| Total Area (Square Feet) | 2342 | SQFT | 0.00 SQFT | 0.0 | SQFT |
| Structure Depth (Feet) | 1.33 | FT | 0.00 LF | 0.00 | LF |
| Footing Type (pile or spread) |  | Pile | xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx | xxx | xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx |
| Cost Per Square Foot |  | \$286.94 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 |


| COST OF EACH <br> STRUCTURE | $\$ 672,000$ | $\$ 0.00$ | $\$ 0.00$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| TOTAL COST OF BRIDGES | $\$ 2,063,000.00$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL COST OF BUILDINGS | $\$ 0.00$ |

[^30]$\overline{X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X ~------~ D i v i s i o n ~ o f ~ S t r u c t u r e s ~}$
${ }^{1}$ Structure's Estimate includes Overhead and Mobilization.
Add more sheets if needed. Call them 9a, 9b, 9c, ..., etc

## III. RIGHT OF WAY

Fill in all of the available information from the Right of Way data sheet.


## Attachment H <br> Exceptions to Design Standards (DRAFT)

## Fact Sheet Exceptions to Caltrans Design Standards

Prepared by:

REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER


Submitted by:

## Scott Mann

DATE
TELEPHONE OVERSIGHT ENGINEER

Recommended for Approval by:

District Approval by:

Laurie Lammert P.E.
DATE
TELEPHONE
CHIEF, Office of Design South

HQ DOD Exceptions Approved by:

### 1.0 PROPOSED PROJECT

## A. Project Description:

| Project Type: |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Proposed Facility: | Freeway | Route: | SR 65 |
| County: | Placer | End PM: | 12.8 |
| Begin PM: | 6.2 | Design Period: | 20 Years |
| Design Vehicle: | (TA) STAA |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), in cooperation with the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA), Placer County, and the Cities of Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln, proposes to widen State Route 65 (SR 65) from north of Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road to Lincoln Boulevard (from post miles 6.2 to 12.8).

This project has been assigned the Project Development Processing Category 4A for widening the existing freeway without requiring a revised freeway agreement. The project is subject to federal as well as state environmental review requirements. Caltrans is the lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The posted speed for this segment of SR 65 is 65 miles per hour (mph), and the design speed is 70 mph .

There are three (3) alternatives that were considered for this report; a No Build alternative and two (2) Build alternatives. The alternatives assessment was based on 2040 design year conditions. Both build alternatives will allow inside widening as future projects along SR 65 from north of the Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange to Lincoln Boulevard.

## No-Build Alternative:

Both build alternatives described below would allow for inside highway widening as future projects along SR 65 from north of the Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange to Lincoln Boulevard and would accommodate the I-80/SR 65 project and take into consideration the carpool/HOV lane restrictions and weaving volumes from the carpool/HOV lanes proposed by the I-80/SR 65 project.

## Carpool Lane Alternative:

This alternative adds a 12 -foot carpool/HOV lane in the southbound direction of SR 65 in the median from the Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange to north of Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road interchange. The carpool/HOV lane would connect to the carpool/HOV lanes proposed as part of the I-80/SR 65 interchange project.

The separate I-80/SR 65 interchange Improvements project will add a third lane in each direction of SR 65 from I-80 to Pleasant Grove Boulevard. This SR 65 Widening project alternative would also add one 12 -foot general purpose lane through the Pleasant Grove Boulevard Interchange, to create a third lane on SR 65 in both directions from I-80 to Blue Oaks Boulevard. This alternative would also add an auxiliary lane in each direction of SR 65 from the Galleria Boulevard interchange to the Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange, from the Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange to the Sunset Boulevard interchange, and from the Whitney Ranch Parkway interchange to the Twelve Bridges Drive interchange.

Following the recommendation from the Value Analysis (VA) study, this alternative would also include ramp metering modifications for the slip on-ramps to a $2+1$ configuration ( 2 metered lanes plus 1 carpool preferential lane) and a $1+1$ ( 1 metered lane plus 1 carpool preferential lane) for the loop on-ramps along SR 65 from the Galleria Boulevard interchange to Lincoln Boulevard. The southbound Pleasant Grove Boulevard slip and loop on-ramps, Blue Oaks Boulevard slip and loop on-ramps, and Lincoln Boulevard slip on-ramp would be modified to include these ramp metering changes.

## General Purpose Lane Alternative:

This alternative would add a 12-foot general purpose lane in southbound direction of SR 65 from the Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange to the Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road off-ramp. The separate I-80/SR 65 interchange Improvements project will add a third lane in each direction of SR 65 from I-80 to Pleasant Grove Boulevard. For added capacity on southbound SR 65, as recommended by the VA study, this alternative also includes an additional general purpose lane from the Blue Oaks Boulevard slip on-ramp to the Pleasant Grove Boulevard loop on-ramp. On northbound SR 65, a 12-foot general purpose lane would be added through the Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange. These improvements would result in a third lane in both directions of SR 65 from I-80 to Blue Oaks Boulevard.

This alternative would also add an auxiliary lane on northbound SR 65 from the Galleria Boulevard interchange to the Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange; and in both directions of SR 65 from the Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange to the Sunset Boulevard interchange, and from Whitney Ranch Parkway interchange to the Twelve Bridges Drive interchange. Following the recommendation from the Value Analysis (VA) study, this alternative would also include ramp metering modifications for the slip on-ramps to a $2+1$ configuration ( 2 metered lanes plus 1 carpool preferential lane) and a $1+1$ ( 1 metered lane plus 1 carpool preferential lane) for the loop-on ramps along SR 65 from the Galleria Boulevard interchange to Lincoln Boulevard. The southbound Pleasant Grove Boulevard slip and loop-on ramps, Blue Oaks Boulevard slip and loop on-ramps, and Lincoln Boulevard slip on-ramp would be modified to include these ramp metering changes.

This is a freeway capacity and operational improvement project and there are no pedestrian facilities proposed in this project. The existing pedestrian facilities closest to the project include the sidewalk and crosswalks at the intersections of SB off-ramp and SB loop on-ramp at Pleasant Grove Boulevard and at intersection of SB loop on-ramp at Blue Oaks Boulevard. No records of previous design exceptions on the ADA standards for Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Blue Oaks Boulevard are found. The design team reviewed the existing features and found them to meet ADA standards. The existing sidewalks along WB Pleasant Gove Boulevard and WB Blue Oaks Boulevard are 6 feet wide with maximum cross slopes of $2 \%$. The existing crosswalks all have $2 \%$ cross slopes with longitudinal profile varying from $3 \%$ to $4 \%$.

## B. Existing Highway:

SR 65 Mainline

| Existing Facility: | Highway | Design Speed: | $\mathbf{8 0} \mathbf{~ m p h}$ |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Truck Route Network: | Terminal Access (STAA) | Climate Region: | Inland Valley |
| Number of Lanes: | $\mathbf{4}$ | Posted Speed: | $\mathbf{6 5} \mathbf{~ m p h}$ |
| Lane Width: | 12 ft. | Sidewalk Width: | N/A |
| Shoulder Width: | $\mathbf{1 0} \mathbf{~ f t ~ o u t s i d e ~ a n d ~ 5 ~ f t ~}$ <br> inside | Median Width: | Vary 22 ft to 78 <br> ft |
| Concept Facility: | F/6 and F/4 | Ultimate Facility: | F/8 and F/6 |

SR 65 begins at the I-80 junction and is an important interregional route that serves both local and regional traffic. SR 65 generally runs north/south and serves as a major connector for both automobile and truck traffic originating from the I-80 corridor in the Roseville/Rocklin area to the SR 70/99 corridor in the Marysville/Yuba City area. SR 65 is a vital economic link from residential areas to shopping and employment centers in southern Placer County. It is also an important route for transporting aggregate, lumber, and other commodities. SR 65 is characterized by a significant growth of industrial, commercial, and residential development. The southern Placer County region is one of the fastest growing areas in California, both in terms of housing and economic development.

SR 65 was constructed as a two-lane expressway in 1971. The I-80/SR 65 Roseville Bypass to Blue Oaks Boulevard was constructed in 1985. SR 65 from Blue Oaks Boulevard to Twelve Bridges Drive was widened to a 4-lane facility in 1999. In 2009, Caltrans Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP) for SR-65 identified major mobility challenges including highway and roadway traffic congestion, lack of roadway capacity, and inadequate transit funding. A Supplemental Traffic Report was completed in June 2012 by Caltrans District 3 Office of Freeway Operations. The report indicated that the segment of SR 65 from Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road to Lincoln Boulevard was experiencing operational problems caused by high peak period traffic volumes, vehicles hours of delay, average speeds, travel time, and other traffic performance measures that were
deteriorating by the increasing growth in the surrounding areas. In 2013, a Project Study Report-Project Development Support (PSR-PDS) for Capital Support of adding one vehicle lane in each direction in the median of SR 65 from 0.5 miles north of Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road to Lincoln Boulevard was approved.

## C. Safety Improvements:

The project will improve traffic operations and safety in this segment of the highway. The added new lanes will add capacity to reduce congestion related accidents and the added auxiliary lanes will reduce weaving maneuvers between vehicles entering freeway and exiting to local roads.

## D. Total Project Cost:

The estimated project cost for the interchange project is summarized below:

| Item | Carpool Lane <br> Alternative | GP Lane <br> Alternative |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Roadway | $\$ 44,948,300$ | $\$ 43,777,600$ |
| Structure | $\$ 651,884$ | $\$ 644,215$ |
| Right-of-Way \& Utilities | $\$ 250,000$ | $\$ 250,000$ |
| Total Capital Cost | $\$ 45,851,000$ | $\$ 44,672,000$ |

### 2.0 FEATURES REQUIRING AN EXCEPTION

Approval of the following design exceptions are in accordance with the Design Stewardship Agreement dated January 20, 2015.

### 2.1 FEATURES REQUIRING AN ADVISORY EXCEPTION

## A. Advisory Design Exception Feature \#1: Superelevation Runoff Length

To document nonstandard features for each ramp being proposed for ramp metering modification, the design team has reviewed the existing superelevation runoff length of each ramp, from the ramp intersection to the gore, and found them to meet design standards. The ramps with non-standard superelevation runoff lengths are summarized below:

| Ramp | Superelevat <br> ion <br> Transition | Curve <br> Number/ <br> Location | Standard <br> Runoff <br> Length | Proposed <br> Runoff <br> Length | Existing <br> Runoff <br> Length | Transition <br> Rate <br> (Maximu <br> m 0.06) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Blue Oaks NB <br> Loop On-Ramp <br> ("B1") | $10 \%$ | C 24 | 240 ft | 167 ft | 162 ft | 0.060 |
| Pleasant Grove <br> SB Off-Ramp <br> ("P3") | $12 \%$ | C 11 | 300 ft | 223 ft | 220 ft | 0.054 |
| Pleasant Grove <br> SB Off-Ramp <br> ("P3") | $10 \%$ | C 12 | 210 ft | 186 ft | 180 ft | 0.054 |

## Non-Standard Feature:

Three (3) non-standard superelevation runoff lengths are proposed: one on the Blue Oaks Boulevard northbound loop on-ramp ("B1") and the other two on the Pleasant Grove Boulevard southbound off-ramp ("P3"), see Figure 1 in Attachment D for exhibits.

The alignment of SR65 NB loop on-ramp from EB Blue Oaks Boulevard "B1" starts the superelevation at $0.5 \%$ to match overcrossing profile and transition into $10 \%$ cross slope in a non-standard runoff length of 167 ft .

The alignment of SR65 SB off-ramp at Pleasant Grove Boulevard "P3" starts the superelevation at $12 \%$ superelevation for curve C11 and transition into $10 \%$ superelevation of curve C12 with n non-standard runoff lengths of 223 ft and 186 ft.

## Standard For Which Exception Is Requested:

Topic 202 - Superelevation, Index 202.5(1): "A superelevation transition should be designed in accordance with the diagram and tabular data shown in Figure 202.5A to satisfy the requirements of safety, comfort and pleasing appearance. The length of superelevation transition should be based upon the combination of superelevation rate and width of rotated plane in accordance with the tabulated superelevation runoff lengths on the bottom of Figure 202.5A."

## Reasons For Requesting Exceptions:

An exception to the superelevation transition standards is requested for the Blue Oaks Boulevard northbound loop on-ramp ("B1"), and the Pleasant Grove Boulevard southbound off-ramp ("P3").

The proposed project includes retrofitting the existing NB loop on-ramp for ramp metering as a result of the VA Study. The ramp needs to be realigned to accommodate an added mixed flow lane while holding the exiting configuration at the ramp intersection and at the gore area. The non-standard superelevation transition is located along the tangent section at the ramp entrance conforming to the Blue Oaks Boulevard roadway profile. Vehicle speeds are expected to be low ( 30 mph or less) in this area.

Similarly, for the southbound off-ramp ("P3"), the non-standard superelevation transition is located along the existing tangent section, between the curves C11 and C12, near the ramp terminal exit and is needed to conform to the roadway profile of Pleasant Grove Boulevard. Vehicle speeds are expected to be low ( 35 mph or less) in this area.

All proposed transition rates are less than or equal to $6 \%$ per 100 feet ( 0.06 ), the maximum superelevation transition rate required per HDM Section 202.5(3) under restrictive situations.

## Added Cost to Make Standard:

The ramp geometry of the Blue Oaks northbound ramps restricts the standard superelevation rate of change. To make it standard, substantial reconstruction of the ramp intersection including both the ramp structures and the northbound exit lanes is needed. The reconstruction cost of ramp realignment for both Blue Oaks Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Boulevard will be in excess of 10 million in structure, roadway, and electrical items.

## B. Advisory Design Exception Feature \#2: Side Slope

## Non-Standard Feature:

The following locations have proposed embankment slopes steeper than $4: 1(\mathrm{H}: \mathrm{V})$ :

- Galleria Boulevard SB Off-Ramp from Station 164+00 to 171+50 (750 LF)
- SR 65 SB direction from Station 191+00 to 202+00 (1100 LF)
- SR 65 NB direction from Station 191+00 to 200+00 (900 LF)
- SR 65 SB direction from Station $241+50$ to $248+00$ ( 650 LF )

See Figure 2 in the Attachment D for exhibits.

## Standard For Which Exception Is Requested:

Topic 304 - Side Slopes, Index 304.1 "Slopes should be designed as flat as is reasonable. For new construction, widening, or where slopes are otherwise being modified, embankment (fill) slopes should be 4:1 or flatter."

## Reasons For Requesting Exceptions:

No right-of-way (ROW) acquisition was included in this project to avoid direct and indirect impact to the vernal pool and wetlands next to the right of way. Segments of existing slope were already substandard with variable slopes that range from 2:1 to 3:1 for the same environmental concerns.

## Added Cost to Make Standard:

In order to achieve the standard embankment slope of $4: 1(\mathrm{H}: \mathrm{V})$, mitigation to the impacted wetland, vernal pools, and open space set aside for permitting requirements alone will be millions of dollars plus the project delay for the review and approval of permitting agencies. Option to install retaining walls has been considered. The construction costs for the retaining wall are in excess of $\$ 800,000$, but the construction of retaining walls would not be able to avoid the indirect impact to the adjacent environmental sensitive areas due to their larger footprint to the disturbed soils.

## FEATURES REQUIRING A HEADQUARTERS APPROVED MANDATORY EXCEPTION

## A. HQ Mandatory Design Exception Feature \#1: Shoulder Standards

## Non-Standard Feature:

The following locations have proposed shoulder of less than 10 feet where proposed concrete barrier type 60 will be placed to protect the existing columns at the overcrossing structures:

- SR-65 SB direction Pleasant Grove OC from Station 218+50 to 219+50
- SR-65 SB direction Blue Oaks Boulevard. OC at Station 269+30 to 270+30
- SR-65 SB direction Blue Oaks Boulevard. Off-Ramp OC at Station 273+90 to $274+40$

See Attachment C for exhibits.

## Standard For Which Exception Is Requested:

Topic 302 - Highway Shoulder Standards: Index 302.1 Width, "The shoulder widths given in Table 302.1 shall be the minimum continuous usable width of paved shoulder on highways." Table 302.1, Mandatory Standards for Paved Shoulder Widths on Highways, shows the paved left shoulder on Freeways with six or more lanes is 10 feet.

## Reasons For Requesting Exceptions:

For southbound SR 65 at Pleasant Grove Boulevard. from station 218+50 to 219+50, Blue Oaks Boulevard. from station 269+30 to 270+30 and Blue Oaks Boulevard. off-ramp from station 273+90 to 274+40, the inside shoulder width would be less than 10 feet next to a concrete barrier at the column, it will be a short transition before it goes back to standard width of 10 feet.

To provide the standard 10 ft inside shoulder, the SB SR 65 widening will be shifting toward west and impacting the configuration of the SB on ramps and overcrossing bridge abutments at Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Blue Oak Boulevard.

## Added Cost to Make Standard:

The estimated costs to reconstruct ramps and ground anchor walls to avoid the bridge abutments will be approximately $\$ 8.0$ million.

## B. HQ Mandatory Design Exception Feature \#2: Superelevation Rate

To document nonstandard features for each ramp being proposed for ramp metering modification, the design team has reviewed the existing superelevation rate of each ramp, from the ramp intersection to the gore, and found them to meet design standards. The ramps with non-standard superelevation rate have been documented below for design exception.

## Non-Standard Feature:

The proposed Blue Oaks Boulevard NB loop on-ramp ("B1" Line) with curve C24 radius of 159 ft has a non-standard superelevation rate of $10 \%$ instead of $12 \%$. See Attachment C for exhibits.

## Standard For Which Exception Is Requested:

Topic 202.2(1) Highways: "Based on an emax selected by the designer for one of the conditions, superelevation rates from Table 202.2 shall be used within the given range of curve radii. If less than standard superelevation rates are approved (see Index 82.1), Figure 202.2 shall be used to determine superelevation based on the curve radius and maximum comfortable speed."

## Reasons For Requesting Exceptions:

The exiting loop on-ramp was designed with non-standard superelevation rate of $10 \%$ and to provide standard rate of $12 \%$, the ramp alignment needs to be reconfigured including lengthening the curve and tangent on each side of curve

C24 to develop standard runoff transition. The free right onto the on-ramp from EB Blue Oaks will be eliminated for having nonstandard algebraic difference in cross slope with adjacent lanes on EB Blue Oaks Boulevard. The ramp intersection will be reconstructed including signal modification and the reconstruction of the bridge structure. Lacking the existing NB slip on-ramp at Blue Oaks Boulevard, the intersection of this ramp intersection will impact the operation and safety of the freeway and the interchange.

Based on Figure 202.2, a comfortable speed of approximately 25 miles per hour can be provided using the $10 \%$ superelevation rate on 159 ft radius curve. This comfortable speed exceeds the posted speed of 20 miles per hour at the existing loop on-ramp. Accident records at the existing loop on-ramp from TASAS are low and do not provide justification for high construction cost for ramp and intersection reconstruction.

## Added Cost to Make Standard:

The reconstruction of the loop on-ramp and bridge structure at the ramp intersection is estimated to be approximately $\$ 10.0$ million.

### 3.0 TRAFFIC DATA

A Final Transportation Analysis Report was prepared by Fehr \& Peers (September 2015) to document the traffic forecasts and operations analysis. Existing traffic volumes and design year projections are summarized in the table below and are documented in the "State Route 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements Transportation Analysis Report" dated September 2015. The base year is 2012, construction year is 2020 and design year is 2040.

| TABLE 1: AVERAGE ANNUAL DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Segment | Existing Conditions ${ }^{1}$ |  | Design Year Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Alternative 1 (Carpool Lane) |  | Alternative 2 (GP Lane) |  | Alternative 3 (No Build) |  |
|  | Total | Trucks | Total | Trucks | Total | Trucks | Total | Trucks |
| I-80 to Galleria Boulevard | 106,100 | 3,500 | 168,100 | 6,300 | 169,000 | 6,400 | 158,000 | 6,200 |
| Stanford Ranch Rd/ Galleria Boulevard to Pleasant Grove Boulevard | 104,400 | 3,500 | 169,200 | 6,600 | 170,900 | 6,700 | 152,400 | 6,300 |
| Pleasant Grove <br> Boulevard to Blue <br> Oaks Boulevard | 83,400 | 3,100 | 159,800 | 6,300 | 162,300 | 6,400 | 140,800 | 6,000 |
| Blue Oaks Boulevard to Sunset Boulevard | 65,300 | 2,400 | 134,600 | 4,900 | 135,700 | 4,900 | 112,100 | 4,600 |


| Sunset Boulevard to Whitney Ranch Pkwy/ Placer Pkwy |  |  | 114,000 | 3,700 | 114,600 | 3,700 | 96,900 | 3,300 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Whitney Ranch Pkwy/Placer Pkwy to Twelve Bridges Dr |  |  | 126,500 | 3,500 | 127,000 | 3,500 | 112,700 | 3,400 |
| Twelve Bridges Dr to Lincoln Boulevard ${ }^{2}$ | 48,800 | 1,900 | 104,300 | 3,200 | 104,500 | 3,200 | 93,600 | 3,000 |
| Lincoln Boulevard to Ferrari Ranch Rd | - | - | 61,100 | 2,700 | 61,400 | 2,700 | 56,300 | 2,600 |
| Notes: $\quad{ }^{1}$ The existing conditions total volume data is from 2009 as reported in the PeMS database. The existing truck volumes are estimated from the base year SACMET model. <br> ${ }^{2}$ The existing condition total volume data from Twelve Bridges Dr to Lincoln Boulevard is estimated based on 2009 PeMS data at Sunset Boulevard and the base year SACMET model. <br> Source: Fehr \& Peers, 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### 4.0 COLLISION ANALYSIS

Table 2 summarizes traffic collision data on SR-65 near the project. The data was obtained from the TASAS-TSN database maintained by Caltrans. The data shown is for the three-year period between beginning October 1, 2010 and ending September 30, 2013.

| Table 2 -State Route 65 Accident Data Summary October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | Number of Accidents |  |  |  | Accident Rates (Acc/MVM)* |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Actual |  |  | Statewide Average |  |  |
|  | Fatal | Injury | F\&I** | Total | Fatal | F\&I | Total | Fatal | F\&I** | Total |
| SR 65 NB Galleria <br> Boulevard./ Stanford Ranch Rd.(PM 5.5) to Lincoln Boulevard. (PM 12.9) | 1 | 39 | 40 | 122 | 0.003 | 0.14 | 0.43 | 0.007 | 0.24 | 0.72 |
| SR 65 SB Galleria Boulevard./ Stanford Ranch Rd.(PM 5.5) to Lincoln Boulevard. (PM 12.9) | 2 | 57 | 59 | 151 | 0.007 | 0.21 | 0.53 | 0.007 | 0.24 | 0.72 |

[^31]The table above shows that the actual accident rate on the SR-65 mainline is less than the average rate for similar freeway facilities. During the three year period, 122 accidents occurred on the northbound segment of SR-65 resulting 1 fatality and 39 injuries, and 151 accidents occurred on the southbound segment of SR-65 resulting 2 fatalities and 57 injuries.

In reviewing the individual accident records, the majority of these types of accidents along SR 65 occurred during the peak commute periods, which could be indicative of the traffic congestion observed along the corridor. The proposed improvements will reduce current and projected traffic congestion along the corridor.

### 5.0 INCREMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS

There are no practical incremental improvements that would eliminate the need for the proposed design exceptions.

### 6.0 FUTURE CONSTRUCTION

As mentioned in the proposed project above, a future MTP update will program the extension of the new lane in the northbound direction of SR 65 from north of Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road interchange to Lincoln Boulevard, and in the southbound direction from Lincoln Boulevard to Blue Oaks Boulevard.

### 7.0 PROJECT REVIEWS, CONCURRENCE

The exception included in this fact sheet is being submitted for review.

### 8.0 FEDERAL ACTION

This project is not part of the Interstate System or the National Highway System and there is no federal administration action related to approval of this fact sheet. The project will use federal-aid funding and a federal environmental determination/document will be approved specifically for this project.

### 9.0 ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A:Location Map
Attachment B: Project Geometric Approval Drawing (GAD)
Attachment C: Mandatory Design Exception Exhibit
Attachment D: Advisory Design Exception Exhibit

"B1" LINE SUPERELEVATION DIAGRAM
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## INTRODUCTION

Blackburn Consulting (BCI) prepared this aerially deposited lead (ADL) assessment for the State Route 65 (SR65) Capacity and Operational Improvements Project located in Placer County. The purpose of the investigation is to assess the presence of ADL in surface and shallow subsurface soil throughout the project corridor within areas anticipated to be disturbed by the planned improvements. The Assessment evaluates whether impacts due to ADL will require mitigation recommendations for construction and/or additional testing.

## Project Description and Location

The project proposes capacity and operational improvements on SR65 from north of Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road to Lincoln Boulevard (Post mile R6.5 to R12.9) and includes roadway widening, bridge work and widening, grinding off the existing pavement, overlay of new pavement, equipment staging areas, drainage/culvert work and stream channel work. No additional right-of-way is required and all work (with the exception of eight parcels identified for temporary construction easement) will be within existing Caltrans right-of-way. The project area is shown on the "Vicinity Map" attached as Figure 1. The project limits and ADL sample locations are depicted on the "ADL Sample Location Map" attached as Figures 2a through 2e.

## Potential for Aerially Deposited Lead

Soil testing by Caltrans and others along roads heavily traveled prior to 1987, indicates that ADL may be present in the surface soil of the unpaved shoulders. The lead is generally attributed to emissions from vehicles powered by internal-combustion, leaded-gasoline engines. Along roads where the shoulder subgrade has not been disturbed, the presence of ADL is generally limited to the upper twenty-four inches. Lead concentrations typically drop rapidly with increasing depth below the ground surface.

Historically, SR65 from Lincoln Boulevard to Blue Oaks Boulevard was a two lane highway until 1998, when it was expanded to a four lane divided highway. The northbound lanes were added and the two existing lanes became the southbound lanes. Consequently, it's reasonable to conclude that if ADL is present it will be associated with the older (current southbound) lanes. The extension of SR65 from Blue Oaks Boulevard to the Galleria Boulevard/SR65 Interchange began in 1985 and was completed in 1987. There were no roads in this segment of the project corridor prior to 1987, therefore the likelihood of encountering significant ADL concentrations is low.

## Prior Environmental Reports

BCI prepared an "Aerially Deposited Lead Screening Evaluation - Placer Parkway Interchange" report in June 2013 (Appendix A). This report concludes that ADL is present in the surface and shallow subsurface soil along the shoulder and median of the southbound lanes in relatively low concentrations at the proposed Placer Parkway Interchange. All detectable levels of "total lead" were at or below $100 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$, well below the total Threshold Limit Concentration (TTLC) of $1,000 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ that defines the lower limit for hazardous waste. The surface and shallow
subsurface soil within the shoulder along the northbound lanes had no detectable concentrations of total lead.

BCI prepared an "Aerially Deposited Lead Screening Evaluation - Pleasant Grove Interchange" report in October 2007 (Appendix B). This report concludes that low levels of ADL are present in the surface and shallow subsurface soil at the Pleasant Grove Boulevard/SR65 Interchange. All detectable levels of "total lead" were at or below $5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$, well below the total TTLC of $1,000 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ that defines the lower limit for hazardous waste. The report also concludes that the likelihood of encountering significant ADL concentrations in the improvement area was low as this interchange was part of the SR65 realignment constructed between 1985 and 1987 and not part of the original SR65 alignment.

## SCOPE OF WORK

BCI completed an ADL assessment for the project corridor modeled after historical roadway use including a near surface ADL assessment for the northbound lanes and a more typical ADL assessment incorporating more sample locations and additional soil profile (to a depth of $\pm 2$ feet below ground surface) for the southbound lanes and median. The intent of this limited surface soil screening is to assess soil expected to represent the highest ADL concentrations within the project corridor.

To perform this assessment, BCI completed the following tasks:

- Prepared an ADL Sampling Plan
- Reviewed prior environmental reports for the project area
- Prepared a map of the proposed sample locations based on the project limits depicted on plans provided by MTCo (Figures 2a through 2e, attached)
- Obtained Caltrans encroachment/traffic management permits
- Collected sixty-six (66) soil samples from fifty (50) locations within the project limits
- Submitted sixty-six (66) soil samples for laboratory analysis of total lead, soluble lead and/or pH
- Reviewed analytical results
- Performed statistical analysis of the analytical data set
- Prepared this report


## SAMPLING SUMMARY

BCI obtained samples from fifty (50) hand auger borings spaced approximately 1500 feet apart along both the southbound and northbound lanes of SR65 from north of Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road to Lincoln Boulevard (Post mile R6.5 to R12.9). We summarize below sample collection, subsurface soil conditions, and laboratory analysis.

## Sample Collection

BCI collected and prepared samples for analysis as follows:

- Collected two discrete samples zero to four inches (0-4") below ground surface (bgs) and twelve to eighteen inches (12-18") bgs within sixteen (16) hand auger borings located primarily along southbound SR65 with limited samples obtained in the median.
- Collected one discrete sample zero to four inches (0-4") bgs within thirty-four (34) hand auger borings located along northbound and southbound SR65.
- Transferred samples into glass jars, labeled with the sample time, date, location, depth, and the sampler's initials.
- Cleaned sampling equipment between each sample location by washing with an Alconox solution followed by rinsing with potable water and a second rinse using deionized water.
- Placed sample containers in a cooled ice chest, and delivered to SunStar Laboratories, a California certified analytical laboratory, under continuous chain-of-custody documentation.
- Backfilled borings with excess cuttings and discharged wash and rinse water to the ground surface at the boring locations.


## Soil Description

The soil profile varied over the project alignment according to the cut or fill sections along the highway, particularly on the southbound side. The soil consisted primarily of strong brown to light yellowish brown silty clay for the more shallow specimens, and dense, light yellowish brown breccia and gravel for the deeper specimens.

## Sample Analysis

BCI submitted sixty-six (66) soil samples to SunStar Laboratories for total lead analysis, using EPA Test Method 6010B. Six (6) samples exhibited total lead concentrations exceeding 50 milligrams per kilograms ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ ) and were therefore further tested for soluble lead using the Waste Extraction Test (WET) methodology. The $50 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ threshold indicates a sample has the potential to exceed the Soluble Threshold Limit Concentration (STLC) of 5 milligrams per liter ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ ), which is one criteria used for defining hazardous waste in California.

In addition to total lead testing, analytical testing also included pH testing of five (5) randomly selected samples using EPA Method 9045.

The laboratory performed Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) procedures for each method of analysis. Laboratory QA/QC procedures include: 1) Method Blanks, 2) Duplicate Samples, and 3) Spiked Samples. We include a copy of the laboratory reports and chain-ofcustody documents in Appendix C.

## ANALYTICAL RESULTS

The analytical test results indicate the following:

- Total lead concentrations range from below the detection limit of $3.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ to $160 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$.
- No samples exceed the Total Threshold Limit Concentration (TTLC) for lead of $1,000 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$.
- Six samples exhibited total lead in excess of $50 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ (i.e. ten times higher than the STLC of $5.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ ) and were further tested for soluble lead by the WET method.
- Soluble lead test results range from $3.8 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ to $15 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$, with three of the six samples analyzed exhibiting soluble lead levels which exceed the STLC for lead of $5.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$.
- The pH test results range from 6.3 to 7.8 with an average value of 6.84 .

Appendix D presents a table which summarizes the analytical results.

## STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

BCI performed statistical analysis of the ADL sample data using ProUCL 5.0 software to calculate the sample mean (average) as well as the 95\% Upper Confidence Limit (UCL) on the mean. UCLs were calculated using standard bootstrap methodology for normal and nonparametric data distribution (as appropriate).

## Total Lead

We analyzed groups of data based on location (northbound and southbound) and sample depth. Table 1 summarizes the total lead results for each sample depth interval, as well as combined intervals (0-4"), (12-18") and (0-18").

| TABLE 1: TOTAL LEAD STATISTICAL SUMMARY BY DEPTH INTERVAL |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location and <br> Depth Interval <br> (inches bgs) | Data Points <br> (\#) | Range <br> (mg/kg) | Mean <br> (mg/kg) | $\mathbf{9 5 \%}$ UCL <br> (mg/kg) |
| Southbound/Median <br> $0-4$ | 29 | ND to 160 | 24.95 | 72.4 |
| Southbound/Median <br> $12-18$ | 16 | ND to 110 | 22.47 | 37.74 |
| Southbound/Median <br> Combined Depths <br> $0-18$ | 45 | ND to 160 | 34.6 | 47.6 |
| Northbound <br> $0-4$ | 21 | ND to 34 | 7.3 | 13.18 |

Based on the mean and 95\% UCL values shown in Table 1, the total lead concentrations in all intervals are below the $1,000 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ Total Threshold Limit Concentration (TTLC) for lead based on the individual analytical test results.

## Soluble Lead

Six samples exhibit total lead in excess of $50 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ (i.e. ten times higher than the STLC of $5.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ ) and were further tested for soluble lead by the WET method. Soluble lead results range from $3.8 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ to $15 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$, however, only three of the six samples analyzed exhibit soluble lead levels exceeding the individual STLC for lead of $5.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$. Of these three samples, two were obtained from one sample location, ADL-39. The soil samples obtained from surrounding sample locations, including ADL-36, -37 , and -41 exhibit total lead levels below the $50 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ criteria.
As solubility testing was limited to the six samples with the highest total lead concentrations, this tends to introduce an upward bias in solubility results. We therefore performed a regression analysis to predict the $95 \%$ UCL on the mean for WET solubility of unbiased sample populations, as presented below.

## Predicted Lead Solubility

We used Excel Regression Analysis software to perform the regression calculations by comparing the total lead and corresponding WET data. A correlation coefficient (r) greater than 0.86 was calculated for the data set, which indicates an acceptable correlation between the total and soluble lead data for use in the regression analysis.

The regression equation is calculated to be:

$$
\mathrm{y}=0.042(\mathrm{x})
$$

Where:
$\mathrm{y}=$ Soluble (WET) lead concentrations in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$
$\mathrm{x}=$ Total Lead concentrations in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$
Note: The $95 \%$ UCL value for total lead was used in the regression formula.

|  | TABLE 2: PREDICTED LEAD SOLUBILITY |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Depth Interval <br> (inches) | Total Lead Mean <br> (mg/kg) | Total Lead 95\% <br> UCL <br> $(\mathbf{m g} / \mathbf{k g})$ | Predicted WET <br> Solubility 95\% UCL <br> $(\mathbf{m g} / \mathbf{l})$ |
| $0-4$ | 24.95 | 72 | 3.024 |
| $0-18$ | 34.6 | 47.6 | 1.99 |

The results presented in Table 2 indicate that the predicted WET 95\% UCL for soluble lead by WET method testing for both intervals have predicted soluble lead levels below the $5.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ regulatory threshold.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The near-surface soil within the project corridor exhibit low levels of ADL. The results indicate total lead concentrations at or below $160 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$, with the higher concentrations associated with the southbound lanes adjacent to the historical alignment of SR65. These concentrations are well below the total Threshold Limit Concentrations (TTLC) of $1,000 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ that defines the lower limit for hazardous waste. Based on the mean and 95\% UCL values shown in Table 1, the total lead concentrations in all intervals are below the $1,000 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ TTLC for lead based on the individual analytical test results.

Soluble lead results range from $3.8 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ to $15 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$; however, only three of the six samples analyzed exhibit soluble lead levels exceeding the individual Soluble Threshold Limit Concentration (STLC) for lead of $5.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$. Of these three samples, two were obtained from one sample location, ADL-39. The soil samples obtained from surrounding sample locations, including ADL-36, -37 , and -41 exhibited total lead levels below the $50 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ criteria. It is our opinion that ADL-39 is not representative of the project soil profile. In addition, the regression analysis to predict soluble lead levels (WET) of unbiased sample populations indicates the 95\% UCL for soluble lead levels is below the STLC of $5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$.

Because this assessment focuses on the near surface soil (0-18"), it is biased toward identifying "elevated" ADL concentrations. If the investigation were expanded to model a deeper soil section (i.e. 0 to 3 ft . bgs), where ADL concentrations drop sharply within the upper 3 feet of the soil profile, the average total and soluble concentrations would be significantly lower than the values presented in this screening. Proposed project improvements include soil disturbance along roadway shoulders to a depth of 4-10 feet bgs. Correlating a decrease in ADL concentrations with sample depth, the overall soil conditions for the project area would have significantly lower ADL concentrations than within the upper eighteen (18) inches. Therefore, based on the concentrations of both total and soluble lead detected, and depth of the proposed improvements, it is our opinion that specialized soil management is not warranted.

The project soil pH averages 6.84 (close to neutral). The pH conditions do not impose any special soil management requirements.

## Waste Disposal/Soil Reuse

Regulatory criteria to classify a waste as "California Hazardous" for handling and disposal purposes are contained in the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22, Division 4.5, Chapter 11, Article 3, subsection 66261.24. Federal criteria to classify a waste as "Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Hazardous Waste" are contained in Chapter 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR), Section 261. For a waste containing lead, the waste is classified as California Hazardous when:

- Total lead content exceeds the TTLC ( $1,000 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ ); and
- Soluble lead content exceeds the STLC ( $5.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ ) based on the standard Waste Extraction Test (WET).

Based on our review and analysis of the lead testing data, and the results of the statistical analyses, we conclude that the tested soil in the project area will not be classified as California Hazardous waste.

## Risk to Human Health

It is appropriate to compare the total lead values to the California Human Health Screening Levels (CHHSL) limits for lead in soil. The CHHSL is $320 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ for an industrial exposure scenario. All of the ADL samples exhibited total lead below the industrial CHHSL for lead. Based on the results of our ADL assessment we conclude that lead impacted soil within the project limits do not pose a significant health risk to site workers.

## Health and Safety Requirements

We recommend that the contractor conduct all grading operations with the awareness that lead impacted soil is present on the site and conduct all operations in accordance with applicable CalOSHA requirements including a project specific worker Health \& Safety Plan (HASP) and Lead Compliance Plan.

## LIMITATIONS

BCI performed these services in accordance with generally accepted environmental engineering principles and practices currently used in Northern California. We do not warranty our services.

Our scope does not include evaluation of other hazardous materials or a determination of their potential presence on the site.

The report is not a comprehensive site characterization and shall not be so construed. The findings presented in this report are predicated on the results of limited sampling and laboratory analyses. In addition, the obtained information is not intended to address potential impacts related to sources other than those specified herein. Therefore, we deem the report conclusive only with respect to the information presented.
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2014 Approximate Sampling Location
PP-ADL-X 2013 Sampling Location and Results ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ \& mg/L)
PG-ADL-X 2007 Sampling Location and Results (mg/kg at 0-4" / 8-18")

SOURCE: Preliminary plans by Mark Thomas \& Comapny, Inc., received May 2014.

| blackburn consulting |  | ADL SAMPLE LOCATION MAP <br> SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements Project Placer County, California | File No. 2602.x |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | January 2015 |
|  |  |  | Figure 2d |
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Mr. Matt Brogan
Mark Thomas \& Co.
7300 Folsom Blvd., Suite 203
Sacramento, CA 95826

Subject: Aerially Deposited Lead Screening
Placer Parkway/SR65 Interchange
Placer County, California
Dear Mr. Brogan,
Blackburn Consulting (BCI) completed an aerially deposited lead (ADL) screening for near surface soil along the shoulders and median of State Route 65 in the vicinity of the future Placer Parkway interchange.

This report includes a brief description of the project, the scope of our ADL investigation, analytical findings, and conclusions and recommendations regarding the occurrence of ADL within the project area.

Sincerely,

## BLACKBURN CONSULTING



David Buck, P.G., C.E.G.
Senior Project Manager


Jeff Patton, PE
Principal Engineer

# AERIALLY DEPOSITED LEAD SCREENING 

Placer Parkway/SR65 Interchange Placer County, California

TABLE OF CONTENTS
INTRODUCTION ..... 1
Project Location and Description ..... 1
BACKGROUND ..... 1
Prior Environmental Report ..... 1
Potential Lead in Soil Impacts ..... 1
SCOPE OF WORK ..... 2
SAMPLING SUMMARY ..... 2
Sample Locations ..... 2
Sample Collection ..... 2
Soil Description ..... 2
Sample Analysis ..... 2
Analytical Results ..... 3
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 3
LIMITATIONS ..... 4

## FIGURES

Figure 1 - Vicinity Map
Figures 2- ADL Sample Location Map

## APPENDIX

Laboratory Test Results
Chain of Custody

## INTRODUCTION

Blackburn Consulting (BCI) is pleased to provide this screening report for aerially deposited lead (ADL) at the planned Placer Parkway/State Route 65 (SR65) interchange in Placer County, California.

This ADL screening assesses the presence of ADL in near surface soil throughout the project corridor. By focusing on near surface soil, where the highest ADL concentrations are expected, the finding of this assessment are used determine if a more extensive ADL study is recommended. We commonly use this approach in areas where it's not clear if historic (pre1987) traffic volumes were high enough to produce significant ADL concentrations.

This report is for Mark Thomas and Company (MTCo) and the County to use during planning and construction. Do not rely on this report for different locations or improvements without the written consent of BCI.

## Project Location and Description

This ADL assessment is limited to the shoulders and median of SR65 in the vicinity of the proposed Whitney Boulevard interchange. Based on plans prepared by MTCo, road improvements will consist of on/off ramps and extended merge lanes. We performed this ADL investigation within the proposed improvement areas. The project area is shown on the "Vicinity Map" attached as Figure 1. The project limits and the individual sample locations are depicted on the "ADL Sample Location Map" attached as Figure 2.

## BACKGROUND

## Prior Environmental Report

BCI prepared the "Draft ISA, Whitney Blvd. and SR65 Interchange" in 2009. The ISA recommends evaluation for ADL within the project boundaries within the SR65 corridor.

## Potential Lead in Soil

Soil testing by Caltrans and others along heavily traveled roads (i.e. heavily traveled prior to 1987) indicates that ADL may be present in the surface soil of the unpaved the shoulders. The lead is generally attributed to emissions from vehicles powered by internal-combustion, leadedgasoline engines. Along roads where the shoulder subgrade has not been disturbed, the presence of ADL is generally limited to the upper 24 inches. Lead concentrations typically drop rapidly with increasing depth below the ground surface. A portion of the SR65 alignment assessed for this investigation was constructed sometime between 1967 and 1975; therefore, the potential for ADL exists.

Compared to this limited near surface assessment, typical full scale ADL assessments include more samples more sample locations, and they assess the soil profile to a depth of $\pm 3$ feet below ground surface (bgs). However, results of these investigations predictably detect the highest ADL concentrations in the near surface soil ( 0 to 6 inches below ground surface). Consequently, the intent of this limited surface soil screening is to assess soil expected to represent the highest ADL concentrations within the project area.

## SCOPE OF WORK

To prepare this report, BCI :

- Discussed the project with MTCo
- Prepared a map of the proposed sample locations based on the project limits depicted on plans provided by MTCo
- Obtained a County encroachment permit
- Collected surface soil samples (0-4 inches below ground surface) at ten locations along the project alignment
- Submitted ten soil samples for laboratory analysis of total lead
- Submitted the two samples with the highest total lead concentrations for soluble lead analysis
- Reviewed the laboratory test results and prepared this report of ADL Screening


## SAMPLING SUMMARY

## Sample Locations

Throughout the project corridor, BCI selected ten sample locations along north and south bound shoulders and median of SR65. All sample locations are within eight feet of the existing pavement edge. Each location is in an area where we anticipate the existing soil will be disturbed by the planned interchange construction. Aerially deposited lead concentrations are typically highest at the ground surface and decrease with increasing depth. Therefore, because this is a focused screening, intended to represent the highest ADL concentrations in the project corridor, our sampling targeted surface soils: all ten samples were collected from the zone zero to four inches below ground surface. We show sample locations on the attached "ADL Sample Location Map", Figure 2.

## Sample Collection

We collected soil samples using a hand trowel and placed the collected soil in self-sealing plastic bags. We cleaned the sampling equipment between sample locations by washing in an Alconox solution and double rinsing with de-ionized water. Rinse water was disposed at the sample locations. After collection, we labeled the samples with the BCI Project number, sample time, date, location, depth, and the sampler's initials. We delivered all samples under continuous chain-of-custody (COC) to Sunstar Laboratory for testing.

## Soil Description

Soils encountered are generally loose silty sand with gravel.

## Sample Analysis

We submitted 10 soil samples to Sunstar Labs for total lead analysis using EPA Test Method 6010B. The two samples with highest total lead concentrations (samples ADL-5 and ADL-10) were further tested for soluble lead using the Waste Extraction Test (WET) methodology. The laboratory performed Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) procedures including method blanks, and spiked samples. We include a copy of the laboratory reports and chain-of-custody documents in the Appendix.

## Analytical Results

Total lead concentrations range from below the detection limit of 3.0 milligram per kilogram $(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg})$ to $100 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$. WET test results are $3.4 \mathrm{mg} / 1$ and $4.6 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ for samples ADL-5 and ADL10 respectively. Table 1 summarizes the test results.

TABLE 1:
Total \& Soluble Lead Test Results (EPA Method 6010B)

| Sample Number | Location | Depth <br> (inches bgs) | Total <br> lead <br> $(\mathbf{m g} / \mathbf{k g})$ | WET <br> lead <br> $(\mathbf{m g / l})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ADL-1 | NB Shoulder | $0-4$ | ND | -- |
| ADL-2 | NB Shoulder | $0-4$ | ND | -- |
| ADL-3 | NB Median | $0-4$ | ND | -- |
| ADL-4 | NB Shoulder | $0-4$ | ND | -- |
| ADL-5 | SB Median | $0-4$ | 100 | 3.4 |
| ADL-6 | NB Median | $0-4$ | ND | -- |
| ADL-7 | NB Shoulder | $0-4$ | ND | -- |
| ADL-8 | SB Shoulder | $0-4$ | 52 | -- |
| ADL-9 | SB Shoulder | $0-4$ | 55 | -- |
| ADL-10 | SB Shoulder | $0-4$ | 78 | 4.6 |

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the distribution of "total lead", it appears that ADL is present along the shoulder and median of the southbound lanes. No detectable concentrations of "total lead" were detected along the northbound lanes. These findings are consistent with the historic roadway configuration. Specifically, historic SR65 was a two lane highway. In 1998, when it was expanded to a four lane divided highway, the northbound lanes were added and the two existing lanes became the southbound lanes. Consequently, it's reasonable to conclude that if ADL is present it will be associated with the older (current southbound) lanes.
"Total lead" concentrations adjacent to the southbound lanes are relatively low (all concentrations at or below $100 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ ). This is well below the total Threshold Limit Concentration (TTLC) of $1,000 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ that defines the lower limit for hazardous waste. However, all four samples from the southbound lanes did exceed the $50 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ threshold (equal to ten times the Soluble Threshold Limit Concentration (STLC) for lead of $5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ ). Commonly when total lead concentrations exceed $50 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ additional testing is done to establish relative soluble lead concentrations.

Soluble lead testing is done using the Waste Extraction Test (WET). Based on the findings of this investigation, specifically, that four of ten samples have "total lead" concentrations greater than $50 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$, the two samples with the highest "total lead" concentrations were selected for
soluble lead testing. Soluble lead (WET) test results range from 3.4 to $4.6 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$, which correspond to "total lead" concentrations of 100 and $78 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$, respectively. These soluble lead results are below the STLC hazardous waste threshold of $5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$.

Consequently, because this assessment focuses on the near surface soil, it is biased toward identifying "elevated" ADL concentrations. If the investigation were expanded to model a deeper soil section (i.e. 0 to 3 ft . bgs ), where ADL concentrations drop sharply within the upper 3 feet of the soil profile, the average total and soluble concentrations would be significantly lower than the values presented in this screening. Therefore, based on the concentrations of both total and soluble lead detected, it is our opinion that additional testing including the deeper soil horizons is not warranted.

Caltrans should review these screening results to determine if they concur with the findings.
The contractor should provide a lead compliance plan as part of worker health and safety plans.

## LIMITATIONS

BCI performed these services in accordance with generally accepted environmental engineering principles and practices currently used in Northern California. We do not warranty our services.

Our scope does not include evaluation of other hazardous materials or a determination of their potential presence on the site.

This report is not a comprehensive site characterization. We base the findings presented in this report on limited soil sampling and laboratory analyses. This report is not intended to address potential impacts related to sources other than those specified herein.

## Figures

Figure 1 - Vicinity Map Figure 2 - ADL Sample Location Map



## APPENDIX A

# Laboratory Test Results <br> Chain of Custody 

Geotechnical • Geo-Environmental • Construction Services . Forensics


Providing Quality Analytical Services Nationwide

21 March 2013

Dave Buck
Blackburn Consulting
11521 Blocker Dr \#110
Auburn, CA 95603
RE: Place Parkway / SR65

Enclosed are the results of analyses for samples received by the laboratory on 03/15/13 09:50. If you have any questions concerning this report, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,


Wendy Hsiao For Daniel Chavez
Project Manager

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: Place Parkway / SR65 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: $2150 . X$ | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Dave Buck | $03 / 21 / 1313: 26$ |

ANALYTICAL REPORT FOR SAMPLES

| Sample ID | Laboratory ID | Matrix | Date Sampled | Date Received |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ADL-1 | T130605-01 | Soil | $03 / 14 / 1309: 40$ | $03 / 15 / 1309: 50$ |
| ADL-2 | T130605-02 | Soil | $03 / 14 / 1309: 50$ | $03 / 15 / 13$ 09:50 |
| ADL-3 | T130605-03 | Soil | $03 / 14 / 1309: 55$ | $03 / 15 / 1309: 50$ |
| ADL-4 | T130605-04 | Soil | $03 / 14 / 1310: 00$ | $03 / 15 / 1309: 50$ |
| ADL-5 | T130605-05 | Soil | $03 / 14 / 1310: 10$ | $03 / 15 / 1309: 50$ |
| ADL-6 | T130605-06 | Soil | $03 / 14 / 1310: 15$ | $03 / 15 / 1309: 50$ |
| ADL-7 | T130605-07 | Soil | $03 / 14 / 1310: 20$ | $03 / 15 / 1309: 50$ |
| ADL-8 | T130605-08 | Soil | $03 / 14 / 1310: 40$ | $03 / 15 / 1309: 50$ |
| ADL-9 | T130605-09 | Soil | $03 / 14 / 1310: 50$ | $03 / 15 / 1309: 50$ |
| ADL-10 | T130605-10 | Soil | $03 / 14 / 13 ~ 11: 00$ | $03 / 15 / 1309: 50$ |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc. custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630
949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: Place Parkway / SR65 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2150.X | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Dave Buck | $03 / 21 / 1313: 26$ |

ADL-1
T130605-01 (Soil)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Analyte | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | ND | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 3031530 | $03 / 15 / 13$ | $03 / 18 / 13$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc. custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: Place Parkway / SR65 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2150.X | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Dave Buck | $03 / 21 / 1313: 26$ |

## ADL-2

T130605-02 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B | ND | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 3031530 | $03 / 15 / 13$ | $03 / 18 / 13$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc. custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: Place Parkway / SR65 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2150.X | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Dave Buck | $03 / 21 / 1313: 26$ |

## ADL-3

T130605-03 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B | ND | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 3031530 | $03 / 15 / 13$ | $03 / 18 / 13$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc. custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: Place Parkway / SR65 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2150.X | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Dave Buck | $03 / 21 / 1313: 26$ |

## ADL-4

T130605-04 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B | ND | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 3031530 | $03 / 15 / 13$ | $03 / 18 / 13$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc. custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: Place Parkway / SR65 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2150.X | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Dave Buck | $03 / 21 / 1313: 26$ |

## ADL-5

T130605-05 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 3031530 | $03 / 15 / 13$ | $03 / 18 / 13$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: Place Parkway / SR65 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2150.X | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Dave Buck | $03 / 21 / 1313: 26$ |

## ADL-6

T130605-06 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B | ND | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 3031530 | $03 / 15 / 13$ | $03 / 18 / 13$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc. custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: Place Parkway / SR65 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2150.X | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Dave Buck | $03 / 21 / 1313: 26$ |

## ADL-7

T130605-07 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B | ND | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 3031530 | $03 / 15 / 13$ | $03 / 18 / 13$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc. custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: Place Parkway / SR65 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2150.X | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Dave Buck | $03 / 21 / 1313: 26$ |

## ADL-8

T130605-08 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B | $\mathbf{5 2}$ | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 3031530 | $03 / 15 / 13$ | $03 / 18 / 13$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: Place Parkway / SR65 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2150.X | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Dave Buck | $03 / 21 / 1313: 26$ |

## ADL-9

T130605-09 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B | $\mathbf{5 5}$ | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 3031530 | $03 / 15 / 13$ | $03 / 18 / 13$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: Place Parkway / SR65 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2150.X | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Dave Buck | $03 / 21 / 1313: 26$ |

ADL-10
T130605-10 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B | $\mathbf{7 8}$ | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 3031530 | $03 / 15 / 13$ | $03 / 18 / 13$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630
949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: Place Parkway / SR65 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: $2150 . X$ | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Dave Buck | $03 / 21 / 1313: 26$ |

## Metals by EPA 6010B - Quality Control <br> SunStar Laboratories, Inc.



## Batch 3031530 - EPA 3051



SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting |
| :--- |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 |
| Auburn CA, 95603 |


| Project: Place Parkway / SR65 |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Project Number: $2150 . X$ | Reported: |
| Project Manager: Dave Buck | $03 / 21 / 1313: 26$ |

## Notes and Definitions

| DET | Analyte DETECTED |
| :--- | :--- |
| ND | Analyte NOT DETECTED at or above the reporting limit |
| NR | Not Reported |
| dry | Sample results reported on a dry weight basis |
| RPD | Relative Percent Difference |




 oul 'seuoteroqe7 delsuns

## SAMPLE RECEIVING REVIEW SHEET

BATCH \# $\qquad$

Client Name: $\qquad$ Project: PARE PARKWAY / SRG5 Date/Time Received: $\qquad$
Received by: $\qquad$ Samey Delivered by: $\square$ Client $\square$ SunStar Courier $⿴$ GS $\square$ FedEx $\square$ Other $\qquad$

Total number of coolers received $\qquad$ 1 Temp criteria $=6^{\circ} \mathrm{C}>\mathbf{0}^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (no frozen containers)

Temperature: cooler \#1 $5.5 \quad{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}+/$ the $\mathrm{CF}\left(-0.2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)=5,3^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ corrected temperature cooler \#2 $\qquad$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}+/$ the $\mathrm{CF}\left(-0.2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)=$ $\qquad$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ corrected temperature cooler \#3 $\qquad$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}+/$ - the $\mathrm{CF}\left(-0.2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)=$ $\qquad$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ corrected temperature

Samples outside temp. but received on ice, whin 6 hours of final sampling. $\square \mathrm{Yes} \square \mathrm{No}^{*} \square \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$
Custody Seals Intact on Cooler/Sample
$\square$ Yes $\square \mathrm{No}^{*} \square \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$
Sample Containers Intact
$\boxed{\square Y e s} \square \mathrm{No}^{*}$
Sample labels match COC ID's


Total number of containers received match COC
Proper containers received for analyses requested on COC
$\triangle$ Yes $\square \mathrm{No}^{*}$
Proper preservative indicated on $\mathrm{COC} /$ containers for analyses requested

Complete shipment received in good condition with correct temperatures, containers, labels, volumes preservatives and within method specified holding times. $\triangle$ Yes $\square \mathbf{N o}^{*}$

* Complete Non-Conformance Receiving Sheet if checked

Cooler/Sample Review - Initials and date $\qquad$ $823 \cdot 1513$ Comments:


Providing Quality Analytical Services Nationwide

22 April 2013

Dave Buck
Blackburn Consulting
11521 Blocker Dr \#110
Auburn, CA 95603
RE: Place Parkway / SR65

Enclosed are the results of analyses for samples received by the laboratory on 03/15/13 09:50. If you have any questions concerning this report, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,


Wendy Hsiao For Daniel Chavez
Project Manager

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630
949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: Place Parkway / SR65 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr\#110 | Project Number: $2150 . \mathrm{X}$ | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Dave Buck | $04 / 22 / 1317: 01$ |

ANALYTICAL REPORT FOR SAMPLES

| Sample ID | Laboratory ID | Matrix | Date Sampled | Date Received |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ADL-5 | T130605-05 | Soil | $03 / 14 / 13 ~ 10: 10$ | $03 / 15 / 13$ |
| ADL-10 09:50 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | T130605-10 | Soil | $03 / 14 / 1311: 00$ |

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630
949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: Place Parkway / SR65 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2150.X | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Dave Buck | $04 / 22 / 1317: 01$ |

## ADL-5 <br> T130605-05 (Soil)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Analyte | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

STLC Metals by 6000/7000 Series Methods

| Lead | $\mathbf{3 . 4}$ | 0.10 | $\mathrm{mg} / 1$ | 1 | 3041729 | $04 / 17 / 13$ | $04 / 22 / 13$ | STLC EPA |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc. custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: Place Parkway / SR65 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2150.X | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Dave Buck | $04 / 22 / 1317: 01$ |

ADL-10
T130605-10 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## STLC Metals by $6000 / 7000$ Series Methods

| Lead | $\mathbf{4 . 6}$ | 0.10 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 1 | 3041729 | $04 / 17 / 13$ | $04 / 22 / 13$ | STLC EPA |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc. custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630
949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: Place Parkway / SR65 |
| :--- | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: $2150 . \mathrm{X}$ |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Dave Buck |
|  | STLC Metals by $\mathbf{6 0 0 0 / 7 0 0 0}$ Series Methods - Quality Control |
| SunStar Laboratories, Inc. |  |


|  | Reporting |  |  | Spike | Source |  | \%REC |  | RPD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Level | Result | \%REC | Limits | RPD | Limit | Notes |

## Batch 3041729 - STLC Metals

| Blank (3041729-BLK1) | Prepared: 04/17/13 Analyzed: 04/22/13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lead | ND $\quad 0.10 \quad \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ |  |  | Prepared: 04/17/13 Analyzed: 04/22/13 |  |  |  |  |  |
| LCS (3041729-BS1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead | 9.94 | 0.10 | $\mathrm{mg} / 1$ | 10.0 |  | 99.4 | 75-125 |  |  |
| Matrix Spike (3041729-MS1) | Source: T130605-05 |  |  | Prepared: 04/17/13 |  | Analyzed: 04/22/13 |  |  |  |
| Lead | 13.5 | 0.10 | $\mathrm{mg} / 1$ | 10.0 | 3.39 | 101 | 75-125 |  |  |
| Matrix Spike Dup (3041729-MSD1) | Source: T130605-05 |  |  | Prepared: 04/17/13 |  | Analyzed: 04/22/13 |  |  |  |
| Lead | 13.0 | 0.10 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 10.0 | 3.39 | 96.0 | 75-125 | 3.51 | 30 |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting |
| :--- |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 |
| Auburn CA, 95603 |


| Project: |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Place Parkway / SR65 | Reported: |
| Project Number: | $2150 . X$ |
| $04 / 22 / 1317: 01$ |  |

## Notes and Definitions

| DET | Analyte DETECTED |
| :--- | :--- |
| ND | Analyte NOT DETECTED at or above the reporting limit |
| NR | Not Reported |
| dry | Sample results reported on a dry weight basis |
| RPD | Relative Percent Difference |

## Wendy Hsiao

From: Dave Buck [daveb@blackburnconsulting.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2013 9:39 AM
To: 'Wendy Hsiao'
Subject: RE: final report and invoice for SR65 (T130605)

Hi Wendy - I need to have two of the samples run for WET lead:
ADL-5
ADL-10
I'm not sure what the minimum time is for extraction but If possible I would like to get the results by next Monday

Thanks

## Dave Buck

From: Wendy Hsiao [mailto:wendy@sunstarlabs.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 21, 2013 1:36 PM
To: 'Dave Buck'
Cc: 'Bill Hannell'; accounting@sunstarlabs.com; 'Rene Erickson'; accounting@sunstarlabs.com
Subject: final report and invoice for SR65 (T130605)

Hi Dave,
Here is the final report and invoice for the project referenced in the subject line.
Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need any further STLC/TCLP tests run.

Thank you,

[^32]
## APPENDIX B

## BCI Aerially Deposited Lead Screening Evaluation Pleasant Grove Interchange, October 2007

 consulting
# AERIALLY DEPOSITED LEAD SCREENING INVESTIGATION <br> State Route 65 / Pleasant Grove Boulevard Interchange Roseville, California 

Prepared by:<br>Blackburn Consulting<br>11521 Blocker Drive, Suite 110<br>Auburn, CA 95603

October 2007

Prepared for:
Mark Thomas \& Company, Inc.

BCI File No. 1081.2
October 3, 2007

Mr. Matt Brogan
Mark Thomas \& Company
7300 Folsom Blvd., Suite 203
Sacramento, CA 95826

## Subject: Aerially Deposited Lead Screening Investigation SR65/Pleasant Grove Boulevard Interchange Roseville, California

Dear Mr. Brogan:
Blackburn Consulting ( BCI ) has completed aerially deposited lead (ADL) testing of soil in select areas of the proposed road improvements for the SR65/Pleasant Grove Boulevard Interchange project.

In summary, all collected and tested soil samples have detectable lead concentrations less than 10 parts per million (ppm) lead. Our report includes a description of the project, a summary of findings, and a map of the sample locations.

Sincerely,

## BLACKBURN CONSULTING



Alfred P/Worcester, P.G., C.E.G.
Senior Project Manager


# Aerially Deposited Lead Screening Investigation SR65/Pleasant Grove Boulevard Interchange Roseville, California 
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## INTRODUCTION

Blackburn Consulting $(\mathrm{BCI})$ is pleased to provide this letter report of a limited screening investigation for aerially deposited lead (ADL) for the City of Roseville's SR65/Pleasant Grove Boulevard Interchange project. We show the project site on a "Vicinity Map" attached as Figure 1.

Typically, Caltrans requires an ADL investigation for improvements along State owned roads, particularly roads constructed prior to 1987, which is the date of effective removal of lead from automobile fuels. There were no roads in the project area prior to 1987 and the subject roads (i.e. State Route 65 and Pleasant Grove Boulevard) were not extended into the project area until 1992. Therefore, the likelihood of encountering significant ADL concentrations in the improvement area was low, but it couldn't be rationally discounted without any supporting documentation. Consequently, the City decided to perform this limited ADL screening in the project area.

If this limited investigation had detected evidence of elevated ADL this report would have recommended additional sampling and testing. However, since the detected concentrations are low, there is no apparent need for additional sampling and testing.

## Project Description

The current SR65/Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange was opened in 2000. The overcrossing allows 4 lanes of Pleasant Grove Boulevard to cross over 6 lanes of SR65.

Based on information provided by Mark Thomas \& Company (MTCo), the proposed improvements consist of the following:

- Widen the Pleasant Grove Boulevard overcrossing structure on the northwest side.
- Add southbound travel lanes along the west side of Pleasant Grove Boulevard from Fairway Drive to the overcrossing structure.
- Provide a fourth travel lane along the east side of Pleasant Grove Boulevard between Roseville Parkway and the southbound SR65 ramp terminal.
- Provide three travel lanes in each direction along Pleasant Grove Boulevard between Highland Park Drive and Fairway Drive.
- Construct a southbound SR65 loop on-ramp from southbound Pleasant Grove Boulevard.
- Provide an additional lane at the southbound and northbound exit ramp terminals from SR65.
- Add auxiliary lanes along northbound and southbound SR65, between Pleasant Grove Boulevard and the Galleria Boulevard / Stanford Ranch Road Interchanges. The auxiliary lanes are planned as a separate, later phase of the project.


## BACKGROUND

## Hazardous Materials Determination Criteria

Regulatory criteria to classify a waste as "California Hazardous" for handling and disposal purposes are contained in the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22, Division 4.5, Chapter 11, Article 3, subsection 66261.24. Federal criteria to classify a waste as "Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Hazardous Waste" are contained in Chapter 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations ( 40 CFR), Section 261.

For a waste containing metals, it is classified as Califomia Hazardous when: 1) the total metal content exceeds the respective Total Threshold Limit Concentration (TTLC) of $1000 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ (California); or 2) the soluble metal content exceeds the respective Soluble Threshold Limit Concentration (STLC) of 5 milligrams/liter ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ ). For California waste, the soluble level is determined using the Waste Extraction Test (WET) with de-ionized water. For Federal RCRA waste the soluble value is determined using the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Potential (TCLP) test.

A lead-containing soil has the potential of exceeding the $5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ soluble concentration (Federal criteria to classify as waste as hazardous) when the soil has a total lead content greater than or equal to ten times the respective STLC regulatory level (i.e. $50 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ ). Hence, when test results detect total lead in excess of 10 times the STLC, soluble metal analysis is typically recommended.

## SCOPE

BCI completed the following tasks to prepare this report.

- Hand-augured seven (7) sample locations, and collected soil samples from 0 to 4 inches below ground surface (bgs) and between about 8 to 18 inches bgs. We obtained soil samples from the unpaved, exterior shoulders of proposed widening areas, from the proposed exit ramp widening areas, and at the foundation area where the overcrossing will be widened. All samples are located within 10 to 15 feet of the paved, travel lanes. Our original scope included six (6) sample locations but we collected an additional sample to determine potential lead impacts in the SR65 median adjacent to the existing bent.
- Conducted laboratory analysis of 13 samples for total lead.
- Reviewed the lab test results and prepared this report of findings for the City and Caltrans to review.


## SAMPLING SUMMARY

## Sample Locations

BCI selected seven (7) ADL test locations within the project limits. Each location represents an area where the existing soil may be disturbed by planned new construction.

Plans provided by MTCo define the project limits. ADL sample locations are shown on the "ADL Sampling Map", Figure 2.

## Sampling Collection

We collected soil samples using a combination of hand augering and a slide-hammer to drive a 1.0 -inch diameter, slotted-spoon, soil sampler to the desired sample interval. After driving to the appropriate depth, we manually retrieved a soil sample from the slotted spoon. We sealed the collected soil samples in sterile glass jars provided by the analytical lab. After collection, we labeled the samples with the BCI Project number, sample time, date, location, depth, and the sampler's initials. We maintained all samples under continuous chain-ofcustody (COC) until transport to the ExcelChem laboratory for testing.

At each sample interval, we cleaned the slotted-spoon by washing in an Alconox solution, rinsing with tap water, and final rinse with deionized water. Rinse water was disposed at the sample locations.

## Soil Description

Consistent with our previous geotechnical investigation of the site, surface soils consist of predominately dense to very dense, dry to slightly moist, silty sand with gravel and cobbles.

## Sample Analysis

We submitted thirteen (13) soil samples to ExcelChem for total lead analysis using EPA Test Method 6010B.

Copies of the laboratory reports and chain-of-custody documents are attached to the report.

## Analytical Results

The tests show low lead concentrations in all samples. The lowest is 3.0 ppm at ADL-5 ( 0 to 4 inches). The highest is $8.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ at ADL-7 (0 to 4 inches bgs).

We present analytical test results on Table 1.
TABLE 1:
TTLC Analytical Test Results

| Boring | Total lead (mg/kg) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 to 4 inches | 8 to $\mathbf{1 8}$ inches |
| ADL-1 | 3.2 | 3.2 |
| ADL-2 | 4.4 | 5.0 |
| ADL-3 | 3.7 | 3.1 |
| ADL-4 | 4.6 | 4.0 |
| ADL-5 | 3.0 | 4.1 |
| ADL-6 | 4.1 | 4.5 |
| ADL-7 | 8.0 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## Statistical Evaluation

Following the hazardous waste characterization guidelines published in California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22, Section 66694, we used appropriate statistical analysis to assess the total lead findings.

From all lead test results, the total lead concentration average is $4.2 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$, the standard deviation is $1.3 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$, the 90 percent upper confidence interval (UCI) is $4.7 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$, and the 95 percent UCI is $4.9 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$.

## Recommendations

We do not recommend additional analysis and field sampling, based on the following:

- Low overall total lead concentrations.
- Low average total lead (significantly less than $50 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ ).
- A 95 percent UCI that is an order of magnitude below the California action level (350 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ ) and the California Preliminary Remediation Goal (PRG) for industrial areas ( $400 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ ).


## Risk to Human Health

Based on the current and proposed land use for the project and surrounding areas, it is appropriate to compare the highest reported total lead values to the EPA Region 9 Preliminary Remediation Goal (PRG) for lead in both industrial and residential soil.

The highest reported total lead concentration from all tests conducted for this project is 8.0 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$. The $95 \%$ UCI for total lead in soil located within 18 inches of the ground surface is less than $5.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$. This value is significantly less than the California-modified $150 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ PRG in residential application.

## Waste Disposal/Soil Reuse

Based on our review and analysis of the lead testing data, we conclude that the Contractor may reuse, without restrictions related to ADL, all soil excavated within the project boundaries. However, this does not relieve the contractor of his independent responsibility to confirm the actual conditions. Soil should not be moved outside the project boundaries without prior written approval from the City.

## LIMITATIONS

BCI performed these services in accordance with generally accepted environmental engineering principles and practices currently used in Northern California. We do not warranty our services.

We intend this report for MTCo and the City of Roseville to use during advanced planning and construction. Do not rely on this report for different locations or improvements. Others shall not rely upon this report without the written consent of BCI.

Our scope does not include evaluation of other hazardous materials or a determination of their potential presence on the site.

The scope of services performed to prepare this report are not intended to be a comprehensive site characterization. The findings presented in this report are based on the results of limited sampling and laboratory analyses. This scope of services is only intended to look for indications that elevated ADL concentrations may be encountered within the project area.



# EXCELCHEM Environmental Labs 

1135 W Sunset Boulevard
Suite A
Rocklin, CA 95765
Phone\# 916-543-4445
Fax\# 916-543-4449 ELAP Certificate No. : 2119

10 September 2007
Alfred P. Worcester
Blackburn
11521 Blocker Dr, Suite 110
Auburn, CA 95603
RE: Pleasant Grove
Workorder number:0708147

Enclosed are the results of analyses for samples received by the laboratory on 08/31/07 13:52. All Quality Control results are within acceptable limits except where noted as a case narrative. If you have any questions concerning this report, please feel free to contact the laboratory.

Sincerely,

[^33]Excelchem Environmental Labs

| Blackburn | Project: | Pleasant Grove |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11521 Blocker Dr, Suite 110 | Project Number: | 1081.2 |
| Auburn, CA 95603 | Project Manager: | Alfred P. Worcester |

ANALYTICAL REPORT FOR SAMPLES

| Sample ID | Laboratory ID | Matrix | Date Sampled | Date Received |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ADL-6 0-4 | 0708147-01 | Soil | 08/31/07 10:30 | 08/31/07 13:52 |
| ADL-6 12-18 | 0708147-02 | Soil | 08/31/07 10:55 | 08/31/07 13:52 |
| ADL-1 0-4 | 0708147-03 | Soil | 08/31/07 11:05 | 08/31/0713:52 |
| ADL-1 10-12 | 0708147-04 | Soil | 08/31/0711:10 | 08/31/07 13:52 |
| ADL-2 0-4 | 0708147-05 | Soil | 08/31/0712:30 | 08/31/0713:52 |
| ADL-2 12-18 | 0708147-06 | Soil | 08/31/07 12:30 | 08/31/0713:52 |
| ADL-3 0.4 | 0708147-07 | Soil | 08/31/0711:15 | 08/31/07 13:52 |
| ADL-3 10-12 | 0708147-08 | Soil | 08/31/07 11:20 | 08/31/07 13:52 |
| ADL-4 04 | 0708147-09 | Soil | 08/31/07 11:52 | 08/31/07 13:52 |
| ADL-4 8-10 | 0708147-10 | Soil | 08/31/07 11:59 | 08/31/07 13:52 |
| ADL-5 0-4 | 0708147-11 | Soil | 08/31/07 12:05 | 08/31/07 13:52 |
| ADL-5 12-18 | 0708147-12 | Soil | 08/31/07 12:18 | 08/31/07 13:52 |
| ADL-70-4 | 0708147-13 | Soil | 08/31/07 12:50 | 08/31/07 13:52 |

Excelchem Environmental Lab.



Excelchem Environmental Labs

| Blackburn | Project: | Pleasant Grove |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11521 Blocker Dr, Suite 110 | Project Number: | 1081.2 | Date Reported: |
| Auburn, CA 95603 | Project Manager: | Alfred P. Worcester | $09 / 10 / 0716: 12$ |

ADL-6 0-4
0708147-01 (Soil)

|  |  | Reporting |  |  | Date Prepared | Date Analyzed |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |

## METALS BY 6000/7000 SERIES

Lead
$4.1 \quad 1$
$.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ AQl0055

09/08/0
09/10/07
EPA 6010 B


## Excelchem Environmental Labs

| Blackburn | Project: | Pleasant Grove |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11521 Blocker Dr, Suite 110 | Project Number: | 1081.2 |
| Auburn, CA 95603 | Project Manager: | Alfred P. Worcester |

ADL-6 12-18
0708147-02 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Batch | Date Prepared | Date Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

METALS BY 6000/7000 SERIES

| Lead | 4.5 | 1.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | AQ10055 | $09 / 08 / 07$ | $09 / 10 / 07$ | EPA 6010 B |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



Excelchem Environmental Labs

| Blackburn | Project: | Pleasant Grove |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11521 Blocker Dr, Suite 110 | Project Number: | 1081.2 |
| Auburn, CA 95603 | Project Manager: | Alfred P. Worcester |

ADL-1 0-4
0708147-03 (Soil)

|  | Reporting |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {Date }}$ | Date |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |

METALS BY 6000/7000 SERIES

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lead | 3.2 | 1.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | AQ10055 | $09 / 08 / 07$ | $09 / 10 / 07$ | EPA 6010B |

## Excelchem Environmental Labs

| Blackburn | Project: | Pleasant Grove |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11521 Blocker Dr, Suite 110 | Project Number: | 1081.2 |
| Auburn, CA 95603 | Project Manager: | Alfred P. Worcester |

ADL-1 10-12
0708147-04 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting |  |  | Dimit | Units | Batch |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Prepared | Analyzed | Method |  |  |  |  |  |

METALS BY 6000/7000 SERIES



## Excelchem Environmental Labs

| Blackburn | Project: | Pleasant Grove |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11521 Blocker Dr, Suite 110 | Project Number: | 1081.2 |
| Auburn, CA 95603 | Project Manager: | Alfred P. Worcester |

ADL-2 0-4
0708147-05 (Soil)

|  |  | Reporting |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Date } \\ \text { Prepared } \end{gathered}$ | Date Analyzed |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |

METALS BY 6000/7000 SERIES

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Excelchem Environmental Labs

| Blackburn | Project: | Pleasant Grove |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11521 Blocker Dr, Suite 110 | Project Number: | 1081.2 |
| Auburn, CA 95603 | Project Manager: | Alfred P. Worcester |

## ADL-2 12-18

## 0708147-06 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting <br> Limit | Units | Batch | Date <br> Prepared | Date <br> Analyzed | Method |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## METALS BY 6000/7000 SERIES

| Lead | 5.0 | 1.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | AQ10055 | 09/08/07 | 09/10/07 | EPA 6010B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Excelchem Environmental Lab.
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analyical report musi be reproduced in its entirety.


## Excelchem Environmental Labs

| Blackburn | Project: | Pleasant Grove |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11521 Blocker Dr, Suite 110 | Project Number: | 1081.2 |
| Auburn, CA 95603 | Project Manager: | Alfred P. Worcester |

## ADL-3 0-4

0708147-07 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting <br> Limit | Units | Batch | Date <br> Prepared | Date <br> Analyzed | Method |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## METALS BY 6000/7000 SERIES



Excelchem Environmental Lab.


## Excelchem Environmental Labs

| Blackburn | Project: | Pleasant Grove |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11521 Blocker Dr, Suite 110 | Project Number: | 1081.2 |
| Auburn, CA 95603 | Project Manager: | Alfred P. Worcester |

## ADL-3 10-12 <br> 0708147-08 (Soil)



## METALS BY 6000/7000 SERIES

| Lead | 3.1 | 1.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | AQ10055 | $09 / 08 / 07$ | $09 / 10 / 07$ | EPA 6010 B |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Excelchem Environmental Lab.


## Excelchem Environmental Labs

| Blackburn | Project: | Pleasant Grove |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11521 Blocker Dr, Suite 110 | Project Number: | 1081.2 |
| Auburn, CA 95603 | Project Manager: | Alfred P. Worcester |

## ADL-4 04

0708147-09 (Soil)

|  |  | Reporting Limit |  |  | Date Prepared | Date Analyzed |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |

## METALS BY 6000/7000 SERIES

| Lead | 4.6 | 1.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | AQ 10055 | $09 / 08 / 07$ | $09 / 10 / 07$ | EPA 6010 B |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Excelchem Environmental Lab.
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

## Excelchem Environmental Labs

| Blackburn | Project: | Pleasant Grove |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11521 Blocker Dr, Suite 110 | Project Number: | 1081.2 |
| Auburn, CA 95603 | Project Manager: | Alfred P. Worcester |

> ADL-4 8-10
> $0708147-10$ (Soil)


METALS BY 6000/7000 SERIES



## Excelchem Environmental Labs

| Blackburn <br> 11521 Blocker Dr, Suite 110 <br> Auburn, CA 95603 |  | Project: <br> Project Nu <br> Project Ma | nber: <br> nager: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ple } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ $\mathrm{Al}$ | Grove <br> P. Worce |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { orted: } \\ & 6: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{ADL-5} \\ & 8147-11 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analyte | Result | Reporting $\qquad$ |  | Units | Batch | Date Prepared | Date Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| METALS BY 6000/7000 SERIES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead |  |  | 1.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | AQ10055 | 09/08/07 | 09/10/07 | EPA 601 |  |



Excelchem Environmental Labs

| Blackburn | Project: | Pleasant Grove |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11521 Blocker Dr, Suite 110 | Project Number: | 1081.2 |
| Auburn, CA 95603 | Project Manager: | Alfred P. Worcester |

ADL-5 12-18
0708147-12 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Batch | Date Prepared | Date Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

METALS BY 6000/7000 SERIES

| Lead | 4.1 | 1.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | AQ10055 | 09/08/07 | 09/10/07 | EPA 6010B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



## Excelchem Environmental Labs



Excelchem Environmental Lab.
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its emirety.


## Excelchem Environmental Labs

| Blackburn | Project: | Pleasant Grove |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11521 Blocker Dr, Suite 110 | Project Number: | 1081.2 |
| Auburn, CA 95603 | Project Manager: | Alfred P. Worcester |

METALS BY 6000/7000 SERIES - Quality Control

| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Spike <br> Level | Source Result | \%REC | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \%REC } \\ & \text { Limits } \end{aligned}$ | RPD | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RPD } \\ & \text { Limit } \end{aligned}$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Batch AQ10055-EPA 6010B

| Blank (AQ10055-BLK1) | Prepared: 09/08/07 Analyzed: 09/10/07 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lead | ND $\quad 1.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ |  |  |  |  |
| LCS (AQI0055-BS1) |  | Prepared: 09/08/07 | Analyzed: 09/10/07 |  |  |
| Lead | 97.6 1.0 mg/kg | 100 | 97.6 75-125 |  |  |
| LCS Dup (AQ10055-BSD1) |  | Prepared: 09/08/07 | Analyzed: 09/10/07 |  |  |
| Lead | 98.6 l $1.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 100 | 98.6 75-125 | 1.02 | 25 |
| Matrix Spike (AQ10055-MS1) | Source: 0708147-01 | Prepared: 09/08/07 | Analyzed: 09/10/07 |  |  |
| Lead | 98.4 ( $1.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | $100 \quad 4.1$ | $94.3 \quad 75-125$ |  |  |
| Matrix Spike Dup (AQ10055-MSD1) | Source: 0708147-01 | Prepared: 09/08/07 | Analyzed: 09/10/07 |  |  |
| Lead | 99.6 1.0 mg/kg | $100 \quad 4.1$ | 95.5 75-125 | 1.21 | 25 |




## Excelchem Environmental Labs

| Blackburn | Project: | Pleasant Grove |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11521 Blocker Dr, Suite 110 | Project Number: | 1081.2 |
| Auburn, CA 95603 | Project Manager: | Alfred P. Worcester |$\quad$ Date Reported: $\quad 09 / 10 / 0716: 120$

## Notes and Definitions

ND - Analyte not detected at reporting limit.
NR - Not reported

Excelchem Environmental Lab.


## Excelchem Environmental Labs

| Blackburn | Project: | Pleasant Grove |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11521 Blocker Dr, Suite 110 | Project Number: | 1081.2 |
| Auburn, CA 95603 | Project Manager: | Alfred P. Worcester |



## Excelchem Environmental Lab.

 custody doctment. This analyical report must be reproduced in its enirety.

Excelchem Environmental Labs


## APPENDIX C

## SunStar Laboratories Analytical Results and Chain-of-Custody

consulting
.

Providing Quality Analytical Services Nationwide

08 August 2014

Laura Long
Blackburn Consulting
11521 Blocker Dr \#110
Auburn, CA 95603
RE: SR 65 Capacity
Enclosed are the results of analyses for samples received by the laboratory on 08/01/14 08:40. If you have any questions concerning this report, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,


## Daniel Chavez

Project Manager

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

ANALYTICAL REPORT FOR SAMPLES


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive Lake Forest, California 92630
949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

ANALYTICAL REPORT FOR SAMPLES

| Sample ID | Laboratory ID | Matrix | Date Sampled | Date Received |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| S29-2 | T141513-27 | Soil | $07 / 29 / 1411: 45$ | $08 / 01 / 1408: 40$ |
| S29-15 | T141513-28 | Soil | $07 / 29 / 1411: 45$ | $08 / 01 / 1408: 40$ |
| S27-2 | T141513-29 | Soil | $07 / 29 / 1412: 15$ | $08 / 01 / 1408: 40$ |
| S27-15 | T141513-30 | Soil | $07 / 29 / 1412: 15$ | $08 / 01 / 1408: 40$ |
| S25-2 | T141513-31 | Soil | $07 / 29 / 1412: 45$ | $08 / 01 / 1408: 40$ |
| S25-15 | T141513-32 | Soil | $07 / 29 / 1412: 45$ | $08 / 01 / 1408: 40$ |
| S23-2 | T141513-33 | Soil | $07 / 29 / 1413: 15$ | $08 / 01 / 1408: 40$ |
| S23-15 | T141513-34 | Soil | $07 / 29 / 1413: 15$ | $08 / 01 / 1408: 40$ |
| S22-2 | T141513-35 | Soil | $07 / 29 / 1413: 45$ | $08 / 01 / 1408: 40$ |
| S22-15 | T141513-36 | Soil | $07 / 29 / 1413: 45$ | $08 / 01 / 1408: 40$ |

## DETECTIONS SUMMARY



No Results Detected

Sample ID: S48-2 Laboratory ID: T141513-03

## No Results Detected



The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |



No Results Detected
Sample ID: S41-2 Laboratory ID: T141513-08

No Results Detected

| Sample ID: | S41-15 | Laboratory ID: | T141513-09 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Reporting |  | Notes |  |  |
| Analyse |  | Result | Limit | Units | Method | EPA 6010B |

## No Results Detected

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr\#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

Sample ID: S47-2 $\quad$ Laboratory ID: T141513-11

No Results Detected


| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |




SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
 custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


| Sample ID: | S32-2 | Laboratory ID: |  | T141513-23 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyte <br> Lead |  | Result <br> 140 | orting Limit 3.0 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Units } \\ \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \end{gathered}$ | Method EPA 6010B | Notes |
| Sample ID: | S32-15 | Laboratory ID: |  | T141513-24 |  |  |
| Analyte <br> Lead |  | Result $20$ | orting Limit 3.0 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Units } \\ \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \end{gathered}$ | Method <br> EPA 6010B | Notes |
| Sample ID: | S31-2 | Laboratory ID: |  | T141513-25 |  |  |
| No Results | etected |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample ID: | S31-15 | Laboratory ID: |  | T141513-26 |  |  |
| Analyte <br> Lead |  | Result <br> 3.4 | orting <br> Limit <br> 3.0 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Units } \\ & \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \end{aligned}$ | Method EPA 6010B | Notes |
| Sample ID: | S29-2 | Laboratory ID: |  | T141513-27 |  |  |
| Analyte <br> Lead |  | Result <br> 4.4 | orting Limit 3.0 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Units } \\ & \text { mg/kg } \end{aligned}$ | Method <br> EPA 6010B | Notes |
| Sample ID: | S29-15 | Lab | y ID: | T141513-28 |  |  |

No Results Detected

Sample ID: S27-2
Laboratory ID: T141513-29

## No Results Detected

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of |
| :--- |
| custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety. |

Daniel Chavez, Project Manager
Page 6 of 47

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

Sample ID: S27-15
Laboratory ID: T141513-30

No Results Detected

| Sample ID: | S25-2 | Laboratory ID: | T141513-31 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Reporting |  |  | Notes |  |
| Analyse |  | Result | Limit | Units | Method |  |
| pH | 6.7 | 0.1 | pH Units | EPA 9045B |  |  |
| Sample ID: | S25-15 |  |  |  |  |  |

No Results Detected
Sample ID: S23-2 Laboratory ID: T141513-33

## No Results Detected

Sample ID: S23-15 $\quad$ Laboratory ID: T141513-34

No Results Detected


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive Lake Forest, California 92630

Proving Quality Analytical Services Nationwide

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 14$ 15:47 |

S49-2
T141513-01 (Soil)


## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lead | 4.8 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4080135 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 05 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity | Reported: |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long |  |

S49-15
T141513-02 (Soil)

| Analyse | Result | Reporting |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

Metals by EPA 6010B


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


## S48-2

T141513-03 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Limit | Units | Dilution Batch | Prepared Analyzed | Method |  |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

## S48-15

T141513-04 (Soil)

| Analyse | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Repealed | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared |  |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.



SunStar Laboratories, Inc.



S46-2
T141513-05 (Soil)


## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.



SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker $\operatorname{Dr} \# 110$ | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

S46-15
T141513-06 (Soil)

| Analyse | Reporting |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Result | Limit | Units | Dilution Batch | Prepared Analyzed | Method |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 5.3 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4080135 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 05 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

SunStar

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker $\operatorname{Dr} \# 110$ | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

## S44-2

T141513-07 (Soil)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyte | Reporting | Limit | Units | Dilution Batch | Prepared Analyzed | Method |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B | ND | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4080135 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 05 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## S41-2

T141513-08 (Soil)

| Analyse | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared Analyzed | Method |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
Metals by EPA 6010B


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


S41-15
T141513-09 (Soil)

| Analyse | Result | Reporting |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Limit | Units | Dilution Batch | Prepared Analyzed | Method |  |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B



SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


S50-2
T141513-10 (Soil)


## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B



SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


## S47-2

T141513-11 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B



SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

## S2-2

T141513-12 (Soil)


## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lead | 7.8 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4080135 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 05 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |

## Conventional Chemistry Parameters by APHA/EPA/ASTM Methods

| $\mathbf{p H}$ | 6.4 | 0.1 | pH Units | 1 | 4080127 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 01 / 14$ | EPA 9045B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

SunStar

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

S42-2
T141513-13 (Soil)

|  |  | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Analyte | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |  |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lead | 67 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4080135 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 05 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


S42-15
T141513-14 (Soil)

|  |  | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Analyse | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared Analyzed | Method |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B | 16 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4080135 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 05 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.
SunStar

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

## S39-2

T141513-15 (Soil)


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 160 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4080135 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 05 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


25712 Commercentre Drive
$\ldots-$ Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 14$ 15:47 |

S39-15
T141513-16 (Soil)

| Analyse | Reporting |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Result | Limit | Units | Dilution Batch | Prepared Analyzed | Method |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.



SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.
SunStar

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

S37-2
T141513-17 (Soil)


## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B



SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.
SunStar

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

S37-15
T141513-18 (Soil)


## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 19 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4080135 | $08 / 0 \mathrm{l} / 14$ | $08 / 05 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr\#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

## S36-2

T141513-19 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 44 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4080135 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 05 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Conventional Chemistry Parameters by APHA/EPA/ASTM Methods

| pH | 6.3 | 0.1 | pH Units | 1 | 4080127 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 01 / 14$ | EPA 9045B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

S36-15
T141513-20 (Soil)


## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lead | 3.2 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4080135 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 05 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

## S34-2

T141513-21 (Soil)

| Analyse | Result | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lead | $\mathbf{8 5}$ | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4080136 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 05 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity | Reported: |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long |  |

## S34-15

T141513-22 (Soil)


## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

Metals by EPA 6010B


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


25712 Commercentre Drive Lake Forest, California 92630

| Blackburn Consulting |
| :--- |
| 11521 Blocker $\mathrm{Dr} \# 110$ |
| Auburn CA, 95603 |


| Project: | SR65 Capacity |
| :--- | :---: |
| Project Number: | 2602.2 |
| Reported: |  |
| Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 14$ 15:47 |

S32-2
T141513-23 (Soil)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Analyse | Reporting | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared Analyzed |  |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B | 140 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4080136 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 05 / 14$ | EPA 6010 B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity | Reported: |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr\#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long |  |

S32-15
T141513-24 (Soil)


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B | 20 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4080136 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 05 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | ND | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4080136 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 05 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone
949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

S31-15
T141513-26 (Soil)


## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 3.4 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4080136 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 05 / 14$ | EPA 6010 B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity | Reported: |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | $08 / 08 / 14$ 15:47 |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long |  |

## S29-2

T141513-27 (Soil)


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

## SunStar

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

S29-15
T141513-28 (Soil)

| Analyse | Result | Reporting |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B | ND | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4080136 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 05 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 14$ 15:47 |

## S27-2

T141513-29 (Soil)


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B



SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


## SunStar

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

S27-15
T141513-30 (Soil)


## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B



SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity | Reported: |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long |  |

## S25-2

T141513-31 (Soil)

| Analyse | Reporting |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared Analyzed |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B | ND | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4080136 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 05 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Conventional Chemistry Parameters by APHA/EPA/ASTM Methods

| $\mathbf{p H}$ | 6.7 | 0.1 | pH Units | 1 | 4080127 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 01 / 14$ | EPA 9045B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

S25-15
T141513-32 (Soil)

| Analyse | Reporting |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Result | Limit | Units | Dilution Batch | Prepared Analyzed |  |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B | ND | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4080136 | $08 / 01 / 14$ | $08 / 05 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.



S23-2
T141513-33 (Soil)


## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.



SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 14$ 15:47 |

S23-15
T141513-34 (Soil)


## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B



SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

S22-2
T141513-35 (Soil)


| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr\#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

## S22-15

T141513-36 (Soil)

|  |  | Reporting |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Analyse | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared Analyzed Method |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 08 / 1415: 47$ |

## Metals by EPA 6010B - Quality Control

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


## Batch 4080135 - EPA 3051



Batch 4080136 - EPA 3051


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


## Conventional Chemistry Parameters by APHA/EPA/ASTM Methods - Quality Control

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


## Batch 4080127 - General Preparation

| Duplicate (4080127-DUP1) |  | Source: T141513-12 | Prepared \& Analyzed: 08/01/14 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| pH | 6.47 | 0.1 | pH Units | 6.36 | 1.71 | 20 |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


## Notes and Definitions

| QM-07 | The spike recovery and or RPD was outside acceptance limits for the MS and/or MSD. The batch was accepted based on acceptable |
| :--- | :--- |
| LCS recovery. |  |
| NET | Analyte DETECTED |
| ND | Analyte NOT DETECTED at or above the reporting limit |
| NR | Not Reported |
| dry | Sample results reported on a dry weight basis |
| RFD | Relative Percent Difference |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.




0Z09-26て-676 Lake Forest, CA 92630
 SunStar Laboratories, Inc.



client: Blackburn Consultiy
949-297-5020
Lake Forest, CA 92630
25712 Commercentre Dr
SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## SAMPLE RECEIVING REVIEW SHIEET

BATCH \# $\qquad$ T141513

Client Name: $\qquad$ Project: $\qquad$

Received by: $\qquad$ Date/Time Received:_8V1/4/ / 8:40
Delivered by: $\square$ Client $\square$ SunStar Courier $\quad \&$ GSO $\square$ FedEx $\square$ Other $\qquad$
Total number of coolers received $\qquad$ Temp criteria $=6^{\circ} \mathrm{C}>0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (no frozen containers)
Temperature: cooler \#1 $\qquad$ 1.2 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}+/-$ the CF $\left(-0.2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)=$ $\qquad$ . 0 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ corrected temperature cooler \#2 $\qquad$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}+/$ the $\mathrm{CF}\left(-0.2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)=$ $\qquad$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ corrected temperature cooler \#3 $\qquad$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}+/$ the $\mathrm{CF}\left(-0.2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)=$ $\qquad$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ corrected temperature

Samples outside temp. but received on ice, w/in 6 hours of final sampling. $\square \mathrm{Yes} \square \mathrm{No} \quad \square \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$

Custody Seals Intact on Cooler/Sample
Sample Containers Intact $\square \mathrm{Bl} \mathrm{Yes} \square \mathrm{No} \quad \square \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$

Sample labels match COC D's
Total number of containers received match COC
Proper containers received for analyses requested on COC
Proper preservative indicated on COC/containers for analyses requested
$\square$ Yes $\square \mathrm{No}^{*}$
$\square$ Yes $\square \mathrm{No}^{*}$
$\boxtimes$ Yes $\square \mathrm{No}^{*}$
$\square \mathrm{Yes} \quad \square \mathrm{No}^{*}$
$\square$ Yes $\square \mathrm{No}^{*} \square \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$

Complete shipment received in good condition with correct temperatures, containers, labels, volumes preservatives and within method specified holding times. $\triangle$ Yes $\square \mathrm{No}^{*}$

* Complete Non-Conformance Receiving Sheet if checked

Cooler/Sample Review - Initials and date $\qquad$
Comments:

# SunStar 

# Laboratories, Inc. 

Providing Quality Analytical Services Nationwide

15 August 2014

Laura Long
Blackburn Consulting
11521 Blocker Dr \#110
Auburn, CA 95603
RE: SR65 Capacity

Enclosed are the results of analyses for samples received by the laboratory on 08/08/14 08:50. If you have any questions concerning this report, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,


Daniel Chavez
Project Manager

25712 Commercentre Drive Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone
949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |

ANALYTICAL REPORT FOR SAMPLES


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of aramid y Gravy custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive Lake Forest, California 92630

## Blackburn Consulting

11521 Blocker Dr \#1 10
Auburn CA, 95603
Project: SR65 Capacity
Project Number: 2602 Reported:
Project Manager: Laura Long
08/15/14 12:12
ANALYTICAL REPORT FOR SAMPLES

| Sample ID | Laboratory ID | Matrix | Date Sampled | Date Received |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| S45-2 | T141580-27 | Soil | $08 / 07 / 1410: 10$ | $08 / 08 / 1408: 50$ |
| S20-2 | T141580-28 | Soil | $08 / 07 / 1410: 05$ | $08 / 08 / 1408: 50$ |
| S18-2 | T141580-29 | Soil | $08 / 07 / 1410: 36$ | $08 / 08 / 1408: 50$ |
| S40-2 | T141580-30 | Soil | $08 / 07 / 1409: 30$ | $08 / 08 / 1408: 50$ |

## DETECTIONS SUMMARY

Sample ID: S43-2
Laboratory ID: T141580-01

## No Results Detected



SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


No Results Detected

Sample ID: S21-2
Laboratory ID: T141580-08

## No Results Detected

Sample ID: S14-2 Laboratory ID: T141580-09


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.




## No Results Detected

Sample ID: S5-2
Laboratory ID: T141580-16


## No Results Detected

Sample ID: $\quad$ S24-2
Laboratory ID: T141580-18

## No Results Detected

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.




SunStar Laboratories, Inc.



SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |

S43-2
T141580-01 (Soil)


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | ND | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr\#110 | Project Number: 2602 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |

S33-2
T141580-02 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 5.6 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 4.4 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Conventional Chemistry Parameters by APHA/EPA/ASTM Methods

| $\mathbf{p H}$ | 6.7 | 0.1 | pH Units | 1 | 4081123 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 11 / 14$ | EPA 9045B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |

S38-2
T141580-04 (Soil)

|  |  | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Analyse | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |  |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 14 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010 B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr\#110 | Project Number: 2602 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |

S35-2
T141580-05 (Soil)


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 34 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |

S28-2
T141580-06 (Soil)

|  |  | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Analyse | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B | 12 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B

|  | ND | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone
949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting <br> 11521 Blocker Dr \#1 10 <br> Auburn CA, 95603 | Project: SR65 Capacity <br> Project Number: 2602 <br> Project Manager: Laura Long |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Reported: } \\ \text { 08/15/14 12:12 } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S21-2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| SunStar Laboratories, Inc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Metals by EPA 6010B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead | ND | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | 08/11/14 | 08/12/14 | EPA 6010 B |  |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |

S14-2
T141580-09 (Soil)

|  |  | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Analyse | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 4.8 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010 B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


| SunStar Laboratories, Inc. <br> Proviong Quality Anaiytical Stirvices Nationwide |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25712 Commercentre Drive Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Blackburn Consulting <br> 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 <br> Auburn CA, 95603 | Project: SR65 Capacity <br> Project Number: 2602 <br> Project Manager: Laura Long |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Reported: } \\ \text { 08/15/14 12:12 } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| S16-2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| SunStar Laboratories, Inc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Metals by EPA 6010B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead | 5.2 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | 08/11/14 | 08/12/14 | EPA 6010B |  |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |

S19-2
T141580-11 (Soil)


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

| Metals by EPA 6010B | 9.3 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 4.2 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |

## S8-2

T141580-13 (Soil)

|  |  | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Analyse | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 8.6 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |

S10-2
T141580-14 (Soil)


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | $\mathbf{5 . 5}$ | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr\#110 | Project Number: 2602 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $\mathbf{0 8 / 1 5 / 1 4 1 2 : 1 2}$ |

S13-2
T141580-15 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | ND | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010 B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 22 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.



SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | ND | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |

S24-2
T141580-18 (Soil)


## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | ND | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |

S1-2
T141580-19 (Soil)

|  |  | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Analyse | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 6.5 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 14 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr\#110 | Project Number: 2602 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |

S7-2
T141580-20 (Soil)


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 6.5 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081128 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 14 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


Daniel Chavez, Project Manager
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive
$\ldots$ Laboratories, Inc.
Lake Forest, California 92630
Providing Quaint Analytical Services Nationwide 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |

S6-2
T141580-21 (Soil)


## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 4.4 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081129 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity | Reported: |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602 | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long |  |

S15-2
T141580-22 (Soil)


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | $\mathbf{8 . 5}$ | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081129 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Conventional Chemistry Parameters by APHA/EPA/ASTM Methods

| pH | 6.7 | 0.1 | pH Units | 1 | 4081123 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 11 / 14$ | EPA 9045B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity | Reported: |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker $\operatorname{Dr} \# 110$ | Project Number: 2602 | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long |  |

## S12-2

T141580-23 (Soil)

|  |  | Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Analyse | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |  |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B



SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |

S9-2
T141580-24 (Soil)


## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | $\mathbf{5 . 8}$ | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081129 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.


## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 14 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081129 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr\#110 | Project Number: 2602 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |

S17-2
T141580-26 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Note |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | $\mathbf{5 . 0}$ | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081129 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 4.2 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081129 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.



## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 19 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081129 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.



## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 7.9 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081129 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010 B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
 custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

SunStar

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |

S40-2
T141580-30 (Soil)


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## Metals by EPA 6010B

| Lead | 13 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | 1 | 4081129 | $08 / 11 / 14$ | $08 / 12 / 14$ | EPA 6010B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.



## Batch 4081128 - EPA 3051



Batch 4081129 - EPA 3051


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 15 / 1412: 12$ |

Conventional Chemistry Parameters by APHA/EPA/ASTM Methods - Quality Control
SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

|  |  | Reporting |  | Spike | Source |  | \%REC |  | ReD |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyse | Result | Limit | Units | Level | Result | \%REC | Limits | RFD | Limit | Notes |

## Batch 4081123 - General Preparation

| Duplicate (4081123-DUP1) | Source: $\mathbf{T 1 4 1 5 8 0 - 0 3}$ | Prepared \& Analyzed: 08/11/14 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| pH | 6.99 | 0.1 | pH Units | 6.71 | 4.09 | 20 |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


Project: SR65 Capacity
Project Number: 2602
Reported:
Auburn CA, 95603

08/15/14 12:12

## Notes and Definitions

DET Analyte DETECTED

ND Analyte NOT DETECTED at or above the reporting limit
NR Not Reported
dry Sample results reported on a dry weight basis
RPD Relative Percent Difference

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.
Chain of Custody Record


SunStar Laboratories, Inc. 25712 Còmmercentre Dr Lake Forest, CA 92630 949-297-5020


(|əse!p) WGL08



 Relinguished by: (signature) Date / Time Date / Time
 Project Manager: Laura Cory Relinqusthed by: (signature) 650 8.8.M Relinquished by: (signature) Date / Time

## SAMIPLE RECEIVING REVIEW SHIEET

## BATCH \#

$\qquad$ T(4.580)

Client Name: Blackauen
Project: $\qquad$

Date/Time Received: $\qquad$ $8.8 .14 \quad 8.50$
Received by: $\qquad$

Delivered by: $\square$ Client $\square$ SunStar Courier $\boxtimes$ GSO $\square$ FedEx $\square$ Other $\qquad$
Total number of coolers received $\qquad$ Temp criteria $=6^{\circ} \mathrm{C}>0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (no frozen containers)

Temperature: cooler\#1 $1.2 \quad{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}+/$ the $\mathrm{CF}\left(-0.2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)=1.0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ corrected temperature cooler \#2 $\quad{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}+1$ - the CF $\left(-0.2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)=\ldots{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ corrected temperature cooler \#3 $\qquad$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}+/$ - the $\mathrm{CF}\left(-0.2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)=$ $\qquad$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ corrected temperature

Samples outside temp. but received on ice, w/in 6 hours of final sampling. ХYes $\square$ No* $\square$ N/A
Custody Seals Intact on Cooler/Sample
Sample Containers Intact
Sample labels match COC D's
$\square$ Yes $\square$ No* $\square$ N/A
$\square$ Yes. $\square \mathrm{No}^{*}$
$\square$ Yes $\square \mathrm{No}^{*}$
Total number of containers received match COC
$\triangle$ Yes $\square \mathrm{No}^{*}$
Proper containers received for analyses requested on COC
$\triangle$ Yes $\square \mathrm{No}^{*}$
Proper preservative indicated on COC/containers for analyses requested $\square$ Yes $\square \mathrm{No}^{*} \square \mathrm{X} / \mathrm{A}$

Complete shipment received in good condition with correct temperatures, containers, labels, volumes preservatives and within method specified holding times. $\Sigma$ Yes $\square$ No*

[^34]Comments:
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Providing Quality Analytical Services Nationwide

## 22 August 2014

Laura Long
Blackburn Consulting
11521 Blocker Dr \#110
Auburn, CA 95603
RE: SR65 Capacity

Enclosed are the results of analyses for samples received by the laboratory on 08/01/14 08:40. If you have any questions concerning this report, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,


Daniel Chavez
Project Manager

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630
949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 22 / 1414: 56$ |

## ANALYTICAL REPORT FOR SAMPLES

| Sample ID | Laboratory ID | Matrix | Date Sampled | Date Received |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| S42-2 | T141513-13 | Soil | $07 / 29 / 1410: 45$ | $08 / 01 / 1408: 40$ |
| S39-2 | T141513-15 | Soil | $07 / 29 / 1408: 50$ | $08 / 01 / 1408: 40$ |
| S39-15 | T141513-16 | Soil | $07 / 29 / 1408: 50$ | $08 / 01 / 1408: 40$ |
| S34-2 | T141513-21 | Soil | $07 / 29 / 1410: 30$ | $08 / 01 / 1408: 40$ |
| S34-15 | T141513-22 | Soil | $07 / 29 / 1410: 30$ | $08 / 01 / 1408: 40$ |
| S32-2 | T141513-23 | Soil | $07 / 29 / 1410: 45$ | $08 / 01 / 1408: 40$ |

## DETECTIONS SUMMARY



25712 Commercentre Drive Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 22 / 1414: 56$ |



SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

25712 Commercentre Drive Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 22 / 1414: 56$ |

S42-2
T141513-13 (Soil)


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## STLC Metals by 6000/7000 Series Methods

| Lead | 3.8 | 0.10 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 1 | 4081233 | $08 / 12 / 14$ | $08 / 18 / 14$ | STLC Waste <br> Extraction <br> Test |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630
949.297.5020 Phone
949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 22 / 1414: 56$ |

S39-2
T141513-15 (Soil)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Analyse | Result | Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |  |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
STLC Metals by 6000/7000 Series Methods


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630
949.297.5020 Phone
949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 22 / 1414: 56$ |

S39-15
T141513-16 (Soil)


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
STLC Metals by 6000/7000 Series Methods

| Lead | 6.2 | 0.10 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 1 | 4081233 | $08 / 12 / 14$ | $08 / 18 / 14$ | STLC Waste <br> Extraction <br> Test |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630
949.297.5020 Phone
949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 22 / 1414: 56$ |

S34-2
T141513-21 (Soil)


SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## STLC Metals by 6000/7000 Series Methods

Lead 4

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630
949.297.5020 Phone
949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr\#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 22 / 1414: 56$ |

S34-15
T141513-22 (Soil)

| Analyte | Result | Reporting Limit | Units | Dilution | Batch | Prepared | Analyzed | Method | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
STLC Metals by 6000/7000 Series Methods Lead 4.8
4.8
-

25712 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, California 92630
949.297.5020 Phone
949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | Reported: |
| Auburn CA, 95603 | Project Manager: Laura Long | $08 / 22 / 1414: 56$ |

S32-2
T141513-23 (Soil)


## SunStar Laboratories, Inc.

## STLC Metals by 6000/7000 Series Methods

| Lead | 7.5 | 0.10 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 1 | 4081233 | $08 / 12 / 14$ | $08 / 18 / 14$ | STLC Waste <br> Extraction <br> Test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.


## STLC Metals by 6000/7000 Series Methods - Quality Control SunStar Laboratories, Inc.



## Batch 4081233 - STLC Metals



SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

25712 Commercentre Drive Lake Forest, California 92630 949.297.5020 Phone 949.297.5027 Fax

| Blackburn Consulting | Project: SR65 Capacity | Reported: |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 11521 Blocker Dr \#110 | Project Number: 2602.2 | $08 / 22 / 1414: 56$ |

## Notes and Definitions

| LET | Analyse DETECTED |
| :--- | :--- |
| ND | Analyte NOT DETECTED at or above the reporting limit |
| NR | Not Reported |
| dry | Sample results reported on a dry weight basis |
| RFD | Relative Percent Difference |

SunStar Laboratories, Inc.
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## SAMPLE RECEIVING REVIEW SHEET

BATCH \# $\qquad$

Client Name: $\qquad$ Project: SR 65 CARPCITY

Received by: $\qquad$ Date/Time Received: $\qquad$
Delivered by: $\square$ Client $\square$ SunStar Courier $\quad$ 母GSO $\quad \square$ FedEx $\quad \square$ Other $\qquad$

Total number of coolers received $\qquad$ Temp criteria $=6^{\circ} \mathrm{C}>\mathbf{0}^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ( $\mathbf{n o}$ frozen containers)
Temperature: cooler \#1 $\qquad$ 1.2 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}+/-$ the $\mathrm{CF}\left(-0.2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)=$ $\qquad$ 1.0 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ corrected temperature cooler \#2 $\qquad$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}+/$ - the $\mathrm{CF}\left(-0.2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)=$ $\qquad$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ corrected temperature cooler \#3 $\qquad$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}+/-$ the $\mathrm{CF}\left(-0.2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)=$ $\qquad$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ corrected temperature

Samples outside temp. but received on ice, whin 6 hours of final sampling.
Custody Seals Intact on Cooler/Sample

| $\boxtimes \mathrm{Yes}$ | $\square \mathrm{No}^{*}$ | $\square \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\boxed{\mathrm{Yes}}$ | $\square \mathrm{No}^{*}$ | $\square \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $\boxtimes \mathrm{Yes}$ | $\square \mathrm{No}^{*}$ |  |
| $\nabla \mathrm{Yes}$ | $\square \mathrm{No}^{*}$ |  |
| $\boxed{\mathrm{Yes}}$ | $\square \mathrm{No}^{*}$ |  |
| $\boxed{\mathrm{Yes}}$ | $\square \mathrm{No}^{*}$ |  |
| $\square \mathrm{Yes}$ | $\square \mathrm{No}^{*}$ | $\boxed{\mathrm{~N}} / \mathrm{A}$ |

Proper preservative indicated on $\mathrm{COC} /$ containers for analyses requested
$\square$ Yes $\square \mathrm{No}^{*} \quad \mathrm{~B} / \mathrm{A}$

Complete shipment received in good condition with correct temperatures, containers, labels, volumes preservatives and within method specified holding times. $\boxed{X}$ Yes $\square \mathbf{N o}$ *

* Complete Non-Conformance Receiving Sheet if checked

Cooler/Sample Review - Initials and date $\qquad$ St $8 \cdot 14$ Comments:

## APPENDIX D

## Analytical Laboratory Results Summary and GPS Sample Locations

consulting

| Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample <br> Location | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Sample } \\ \text { ID } \end{array}$ | Average <br> Depth | Date Sampled | Total Lead (mg/kg) | pH | Soluble Lead (mg/l) | Coordinates |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Latitude | Longitude |
| ADL-2 | S2-2 | 2" | 7/29/2014 | 7.8 | 6.4 | --- | $38.77968^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.26982^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-4 | S4-2 | 2" | 8/4/2014 | 4.2 | --- | --- | $38.78220^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ | $-121.27486^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-8 | S8-2 | 2" | 8/4/2014 | 8.6 | --- | --- | $38.79059^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.29137^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-10 | S10-2 | 2" | 8/4/2014 | 5.5 | --- | --- | $38.79353^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.29447^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-13 | S13-2 | 2 " | 8/4/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | $38.79607^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.29724^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-14 | S14-2 | 2" | 8/4/2014 | 4.8 | --- | --- | $38.79763^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.29832^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-16 | S16-2 | 2" | 8/4/2014 | 5.2 | --- | --- | $38.80082^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.29969^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-19 | S19-2 | 2" | 8/4/2014 | 9.3 | --- | --- | $38.80468^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.29999^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-21 | S21-2 | 2" | 8/4/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | $38.80918^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.29987^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-24 | S24-2 | 2 " | 8/7/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | n/a | n/a |
| ADL-26 | S26-2 | 2 " | 8/4/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | $38.81820^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ | $121.29977^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-28 | S28-2 | $2 "$ | 8/4/2014 | 12 | --- | --- | $38.82288^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.29974^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-30 | S30-2 | 2" | 8/4/2014 | 4.4 | 6.7 | --- | $38.82712^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.29469^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-33 | S33-2 | 2" | 8/4/2014 | 5.6 | --- | -- | $38.82860^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ | $-121.29967^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-35 | S35-2 | 2 " | 8/4/2014 | 34 | --- | --- | $38.83029^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.29965^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-38 | S38-2 | 2 " | 8/4/2014 | 14 | --- | --- | $38.83475^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.29968^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-40 | S40-2 | 2 " | 8/7/2014 | 13 | --- | --- | n/a | n/a |
| ADL-43 | S43-2 | 2" | 8/7/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | n/a | n/a |
| ADL-45 | S45-2 | 2 " | 8/7/2014 | 4.2 | --- | --- | n/a | n/a |
| ADL-47 | S47-2 | 2" | 7/29/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | $38.86017^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.29951{ }^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-50 | S50-2 | $2 "$ | 7/29/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | $38.86400^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.29990^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |


| Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | To |  |  | Coor | dinates |
| Location | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Sample } \\ \text { ID } \end{array}$ | Depth | Sampled | $\begin{gathered} \text { Lead } \\ (\mathbf{m g} / \mathbf{k g}) \end{gathered}$ | pH | Lead (mg/l) | Latitude | Longitude |
| ADL-1 | S1-2 | 2" | 8/7/2014 | 6.5 | --- | --- | n/a | n/a |
| ADL-3 | S3-2 | 2 " | 8/7/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | n/a | n/a |
| ADL-5 | S5-2 | 2 " | 8/7/2014 | 22 | --- | --- | n/a | n/a |
| ADL-6 | S6-2 | 2" | 8/7/2014 | 4.4 | --- | --- | n/a | n/a |
| ADL-7 | S7-2 | 2" | 8/7/2014 | 6.5 | --- | --- | n/a | n/a |
| ADL-9 | S9-2 | 2" | 8/7/2014 | 5.8 | --- | --- | n/a | n/a |
| ADL-11 | S11-2 | 2" | 8/7/2014 | 14 | --- | --- | n/a | n/a |
| ADL-12 | S12-2 | 2 " | 8/7/2014 | 3.8 | --- | --- | n/a | n/a |
| ADL-15 | S15-2 | 2 " | 8/7/2014 | 8.5 | 6.7 | --- | n/a | n/a |
| ADL-17 | S17-2 | 2" | 8/7/2014 | 5 | --- | --- | n/a | n/a |
| ADL-18 | S18-2 | 2" | 8/7/2014 | 7.9 | --- | --- | n/a | n/a |
| ADL-20 | S20-2 | 2" | 8/7/2014 | 19 | --- | --- | n/a | n/a |
| ADL-22 | S22-2 | 2" | 7/30/2014 | 39 | --- | --- | $38.80920^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30056^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-22 | S22-15 | 12" | 7/30/2014 | 44 | --- | --- | $38.80920^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ | $-121.30056^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-23 | S23-2 | 2 " | 7/30/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | $38.81131^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30054^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-23 | S23-15 | 12" | 7/30/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | $38.81131^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30054^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-25 | S25-2 | 2" | 7/30/2014 | nrd | 6.7 | --- | $38.81632^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30050^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-25 | S25-15 | 12" | 7/30/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | $38.81632^{0} \mathrm{~N} \backslash$ | $-121.30050^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-27 | S27-2 | 2" | 7/30/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | $38.81838^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30052^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-27 | S27-15 | 12" | 7/30/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | $38.81838^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30052^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-29 | S29-2 | 2" | 7/30/2014 | 4.4 | --- | --- | $38.82234^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30045^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-29 | S29-15 | 12" | 7/30/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | $38.82234^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30045^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-31 | S31-2 | 2 " | 7/30/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | $38.82591{ }^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30038^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-31 | S31-15 | 12 | 7/30/2014 | 20 | --- | --- | $38.82591{ }^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30038^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-32 | S32-2 | 2" | 7/30/2014 | 140 | --- | 7.5 | $38.83050^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30027^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-32 | S32-15 | 12" | 7/30/2014 | 20 | --- | --- | $38.83050^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ | $-121.30027^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-34 | S34-2 | 2" | 7/30/2014 | 85 | --- | 4.7 | $38.83498{ }^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30024^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-34 | S34-15 | 12" | 7/30/2014 | 110 | --- | 4.8 | $38.83498{ }^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30024^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-36 | S36-2 | 2" | 7/30/2014 | 44 | 6.3 | --- | $38.83829^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30015^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-36 | S36-15 | 12" | 7/30/2014 | 3.2 | --- | --- | $38.83829^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ | $-121.30015^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-37 | S37-2 | 2" | 7/30/2014 | 49 | --- | --- | $38.48036^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30015^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-37 | S37-15 | 12" | 7/30/2014 | 19 | --- | --- | $38.48036^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ | $-121.30015^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-39 | S39-2 | 2" | 7/30/2014 | 160 | --- | 15 | $38.84428^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30022^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-39 | S39-15 | 12" | 7/30/2014 | 100 | --- | 6.2 | $38.84428^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30022^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-41 | S41-2 | 2" | 7/29/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | $38.85078^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30023^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-41 | S41-15 | 12 | 7/29/2014 | 4 | --- | --- | $38.85078{ }^{0} \mathrm{~N} \backslash$ | $-121.30023^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-42 | S42-2 | 2" | 7/29/2014 | 67 | --- | 3.8 | $38.85221^{0} \mathrm{~N} \backslash$ | $-121.30007^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-42 | S42-15 | 12" | 7/29/2014 | 16 | --- | --- | $38.85221^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30007^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-44* | S44-2* | 2 " | 7/29/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | $38.85531^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.29987^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-46 | S46-2 | 2" | 7/29/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | $38.85786^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30008^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |


| Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Tot |  |  | Coor | dinates |
| Location | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Sample } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Depth | Sampled | $\begin{gathered} \text { Lead } \\ (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}) \end{gathered}$ | pH | Lead (mg/l) | Latitude | Longitude |
| ADL-46 | S46-15 | 12" | 7/29/2014 | 5.3 | --- | --- | $38.85786^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $-121.30008^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-48 | S48-2 | 2" | 7/29/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | $38.860706^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $121.301359^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-48 | S48-15 | 12" | 7/29/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | $38.860706^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $121.301359^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-49 | S49-2 | 2" | 7/29/2014 | 4.8 | --- | --- | $38.848438^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $121.359003^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
| ADL-49 | S49-15 | 12" | 7/29/2014 | nrd | --- | --- | $38.848438^{0} \mathrm{~N}$ | $21.359003^{0} \mathrm{~W}$ |
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## INVESTIGATIVE SUMMARY

Blackburn Consulting (BCI) completed this Draft Initial Site Assessment (ISA) for the proposed State Route 65 (SR65) Capacity and Operational Improvements Project located in Placer County, California. The purpose of this assessment is to identify recognized environmental conditions (RECs) ${ }^{1}$ and/or potential RECs within and adjacent to the proposed improvement area which could affect the design, constructability, feasibility, and/or the cost of the proposed project. We prepared this report in general conformance with ASTM E1527-13 "Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process."

The project proposes capacity and operational improvements on SR65 from north of Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road to Lincoln Boulevard (Post mile R6.5 to R12.9) and includes roadway widening, bridge work and widening, grinding off the existing pavement, overlay of new pavement, equipment staging areas, drainage/culvert work and stream channel work. No additional right-of-way is required and all work (with the exception of eight parcels identified for temporary construction easement) will be within existing Caltrans right-of-way.

## Sites Within or Adjacent to the Project Corridor with Potential RECs

BCI did not identify any sites with known or potential hazardous materials issues within or adjacent to the project site that are likely to have a significant impact on the project.

## General Contamination/Hazardous Materials Issue

Our assessment identified the following general environmental conditions that should be considered for present and future planning for the proposed project.

## Aerially Deposited Lead (ADL)

BCI completed an ADL Assessment (September 2014) to evaluate the presence of ADL within the project area. Based on the lead testing data and the results of the statistical analyses, we conclude that additional ADL testing is not warranted and that soil excavated within the project limits is not classified as a hazardous material. We recommend that the contractor conduct all grading operations with the awareness that lead impacted soil is present on the site and conduct all operations in accordance with applicable Cal-OSHA requirements including a project specific worker Health \& Safety Plan (HASP) and Lead Compliance Plan.

[^35]
## Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM) and Lead Based Paint (LBP)

The design team requested an asbestos and lead survey of the Pleasant Grove Creek Bridges, which are included in the project area. BCI contracted Entek to perform this survey. The "Hazardous Materials Survey Report" dated August 7, 2014, prepared by Entek Consulting evaluated the presence of ACM and LBP at the Pleasant Grove Creek Bridges. The report concluded that ACM is not present in the concrete that comprises the bridge deck and supporting columns beneath the bridges. In addition, Entek did not observe existing paints or coatings associated with the bridges that would require sampling for LBP. The report further concluded that although asbestos was not found during the survey, written notification to the California Air Resources Board may be required. Attachment 1 contains a copy of the report.

## Yellow Traffic Stripes

Yellow traffic stripes may contain heavy metals such as lead and chromium at concentrations in excess of the hazardous waste thresholds established by the California Code of Regulations and may produce toxic fumes when heated. Consequently, removal or disturbance of any yellow traffic striping within the project area will require development of an appropriate Lead Compliance Plan.

## Metal Beam Guardrail (MBGR) Wood Post

If MBRG wood posts are removed as part of this project, the contractor shall prepare and submit a safety and health work practices plan for handling treated wood waste approved by an ABIH Certified Industrial Hygienist. Treated wood waste must be disposed of in an approved treated wood waste facility.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Blackburn Consulting (BCI) completed this Draft Initial Site Assessment (ISA) for the proposed State Route 65 (SR65) Capacity and Operational Improvements Project located in Placer County, California. The purpose of this assessment is to identify recognized environmental conditions (RECs) ${ }^{2}$ and/or potential RECs within and adjacent to the proposed improvement area which could affect the design, constructability, feasibility, and/or the cost of the proposed project. We prepared this report in general conformance with ASTM E1527-13 "Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process."

The project proposes capacity and operational improvements on SR65 from north of Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road to Lincoln Boulevard (Post mile R6.5 to R12.9) and includes roadway widening, bridge work and widening, grinding off the existing pavement, overlay of new pavement, equipment staging areas, drainage/culvert work and stream channel work. No additional right-of-way is required and all work (with the exception of eight sliver parcels for temporary construction easement) will be within existing Caltrans right-of-way. Figure 1 presents the Vicinity Map and Figure 2 presents the Site Plan.

To conduct this ISA, BCI:

- Conducted a limited site inspection to observe current land use and indications of potential contamination, as well as hazardous and potentially hazardous waste issues for the project area and immediately adjacent parcels.
- Reviewed historical aerial photographic coverage and topographic map coverage, and the City Directory for the project area and surrounding properties for indications of potential sources of contamination.
- Performed updated (July 18, 2014) federal, state, and county records review for indications of the use, misuse, or storage of hazardous and/or potentially hazardous materials on or near the project corridor. The federal, state, and county database search was provided by Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) of Shelton, Connecticut. A copy of the EDR report's Executive Summary is included in Appendix D. The complete EDR report in CD format is also included in Appendix D.
- Conducted reviews of state records available on GeoTracker and DTSC Envirostor websites.

[^36]- Reviewed existing environmental reports including:
o Placer 65 HOV Lane Hazardous Waste Evaluation for a Mini-Preliminary Environmental Analysis Report, Caltrans (2012)
o State Route 65/Whitney Boulevard Interchange Initial Site Assessment, BCI (2009)
o State Route 65/Pleasant Grove Interchange Initial Site Assessment, BCI (2007)
o I-80/State Route 65 Interchange Project Initial Site Assessment, BCI (2014)
o Aerially Deposited Lead Screening Evaluation - Pleasant Grove Interchange, BCI (2007)
o Aerially Deposited Lead Screening Evaluation - Placer Parkway Interchange, BCI (2013)
o Hazardous Materials Survey Final Report, Entek Consulting Group, Inc. (2014)


## 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

### 2.1 Description and Location

The project proposes capacity and operational improvements on SR65 from north of Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road to Lincoln Boulevard (Post mile R6.5 to R12.9) and includes roadway widening, bridge work and widening, grinding off the existing pavement, overlay of new pavement, equipment staging areas, drainage/culvert work and stream channel work. No additional right-of-way is anticipated and all work is proposed to be within existing Caltrans right-of-way. Figure 1 presents the Vicinity Map and Figure 2 presents the Site Plan.

According to a preliminary site plan dated July 2014, provided by the design team, MTCo indicates minor areas of eight parcels which may require temporary acquisition to accommodate planned construction. Assessor's parcel numbers (APN) for parcels in the temporary construction easement are identified on Figure 2 and listed below.

- APN 017-123-059
- APN 017-123-042
- APN 363-011-003
- APN 363-202-009
- APN 363-020-053
- APN 363-020-024
- APN 017-123-003
- APN 021-290-073


### 2.2 Regional Geology and Physical Setting

The topography of the area can be characterized as rolling hills with gentle slopes. The site elevation is approximately 150 feet above mean sea level (msl) based on the USGS 7.5 Minute

Roseville Quadrangle; the elevation across the site ranges from a high of approximately 150 ft msl to a low of approximately 135 ft msl .

The site lies within the Sacramento Valley portion of the Great Valley geomorphic province. The Cascade and Klamath Ranges border the Great Valley to the north, the Coast Ranges to the west and the Sierra Nevada to the east. The valley is characterized by a thick sequence of alluvial, lacustrine, and marine sediments. The thickness of the sediments varies from a thin veneer at the edges of the valley, to thousands of feet in the central portion.

Based on review of published geologic maps (Wagner et al, 1981; Loyd, 1995) and our review of site conditions, most of the site appears to be underlain by hard volcanic mudflow breccia and dense conglomerate of the Miocene age Mehrten Formation. The western portion of the site and lower elevations in the central portion appear to be underlain by what is expected to be a relatively thin layer of sediments of the Quaternary age Turlock Lake Formation. This formation is typically composed of semi-consolidated, medium dense to dense sand and stiff silts with gravels.

### 2.3 Surface Water, Groundwater, Wells

Drainage is generally to the west-southwest but construction of SR65 has modified the natural drainage courses. At SR65, drainage is directed through roadside ditches into culverts crossing beneath the highway.

The depth to groundwater beneath the site is expected to be variable considering the transition from relatively young sediments in the western portion to rock of the Mehrten Formation in central and eastern portions. We reviewed ground water level data made available by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) website and available groundwater elevation maps. DWR reports the regional ground water table in the project vicinity at a level of approximately 50 to 85 feet in depth (DWR, 2008). Groundwater flow is generally to the southwest.

No Federal Public Water Supply System or State Database wells are located within a ½ mile radius of the project area.

### 2.4 Current Land Use

The project site is developed with existing roads, highway fencing, and drainage culverts. Properties immediately surrounding the site are primarily undeveloped from Lincoln Boulevard to Sunset Boulevard with the exception of a large warehouse occupied by ACE Shipping and Receiving, Sundance Self Storage, AT\&T offices and Greenheck Corp. Properties immediately surrounding the site from Sunset Boulevard to Blue Oaks Boulevard include Stanford Ranch Business Center, Placer County Court House and Jail, Arizona Tile, storage warehouses, and Blue Oaks Town Center. Properties immediately surrounding the site from Blue Oaks Boulevard to Galleria Boulevard include a variety of restaurants, commercial and retail big box stores. A Solid Waste Management Landfill, Thunder Valley Casino, the prior Formica Corporation and
the Rio Bravo Biomass Power Plant are all located within a mile west of the project area and west of the railroad tracks.

### 2.5 Historic Land Use

### 2.5.1 Aerial Photograph Review

BCI reviewed aerial photos from 1947, 1952, 1961, 1984, 1993, 1998 and 2005, 2006, 2009, 2010, and 2012 as listed below:

1947 Photo by USGS, Scale 1"=655'
1952 Photo by Southwestern, Scale 1"=555'
1961 Photo by Cartwright, Scale 1"=555'
1984 Photo by USGS, Scale 1"=690’
1993 Photo by USGS, Scale 1"=666'
1998 Photo by USGS, Scale 1"=666'
2005 Photo by EDR, Scale 1"=484'
2006 Photo by EDR, Scale 1"=500'
2009 Photo by EDR, Scale 1"=500'
2010 Photo by EDR, Scale 1"=500'
2012 Photo by EDR, Scale 1"=500'
We reviewed historic aerial photography in an attempt to identify significant changes in site use that may indicate the potential for hazardous materials within or adjacent to the project corridors. Copies of aerial photographs are provided in Appendix A. The following is a summary of notable features observed within the overall project area.

1947, 1952 and 1961, 1966:

- The project area is undeveloped. SR65 has not yet been constructed.

1984:

- Industrial Boulevard and SR65 have been constructed and appear to be two-lane highways. Whitney Boulevard appears to be a dirt road and is in its current alignment.
- A warehouse/commercial structure and parking lot are developed west of the project area.

1993:

- The warehouse/commercial structure present in 1984 is identified by a rooftop sign as "Western Electric".
- Sunset Boulevard is present. Surrounding sites appear to be light industrial.
- Blue Oaks Boulevard is present. Surrounding sites have limited development.
- SR 65 extends to I-80.


## 1998:

- The large building between SR65 and Industrial Avenue has a railroad spur into the property ending at a small structure with two above ground tanks.
- Stanford Ranch Road/Galleria Boulevard is present.


## 2005:

- SR65 has been reconstructed as a 4 lane divided highway.
- Pleasant Grove Boulevard is present.
- Development surrounding the project corridor has increased.

2006, 2009, 2010, 2012:

- Development surrounding the project corridor has increased.


### 2.5.2 Topographic Map Review

BCI reviewed topographic maps for features that may indicate an impact to the site. Maps included a Sacramento 30-minute quad map from 1893, Lincoln 15-minute quad maps from 1953, Markham Ravine quad map from 1941, Roseville 7.5-minute quad maps from 1910, 1953, 1967, 1975, 1981, and 1992, and Rockling-adjoining quad maps from 1967 and 1975. Appendix B contains copies of the topographic maps. This summary includes noted changes within and adjacent to the project location as recorded on the maps:

1893 Historical Topographic Map, Sacramento, Scale 1:125000

- The C.P.R.R. railroad exists west of the project area.


## 1910 USGS Roseville Quad, Scale 1:31680

- The C.P.R.R. railroad is renamed Southern Pacific Rail Road.


## 1941 Markham Ravine Quad, Scale 1:62500

- A secondary highway (99), present day Industrial Avenue, is located immediately east of the railroad.

1953 USGS Lincoln Quad, Scale 1:62500 and Roseville Quad, Scale 1: 24000

- Two reservoirs exist, one southeast and one north, of the project area.


## 1967 USGS Roseville Quad, Scale 1:24000

- One large building and associated "water tanks" are identified west of the railroad.

1975 USGS Roseville Quad (Photo revised from 1967), Scale 1:24000

- One large building is present immediately west of the project area.
- SR65 is located in its present alignment.

1981 USGS Roseville Quad (Photo revised from 1967), Scale 1:24000

- An unimproved Whitney Boulevard exists.
- Improved roads extend from SR65 to the building immediately west of the project area.


## 1992 USGS Roseville Quad), Scale 1:24000

- SR65 is identified extending southeast to I80.


### 2.5.3 Sanborn ${ }^{\circledR}$ Map Review

Sanborn® Maps do not exist for the project area.

## 3 RECORDS REVIEW

### 3.1 County, State and Federal Records Review

BCI requested EDR, a commercial data base search firm, to perform a corridor study for the study area. The search includes a review of county, state, federal and EDR proprietary databases. Appendix C contains the list of searched databases. Appendix D presents the EDR Report Executive Summary in hardcopy and the entire report on a CD. The maximum search radius is 1 mile from the outline of the project study area. Sites with adequate address information are plotted on EDR's site plan "EDR Radius Map with Geocheck". EDR lists sites with inadequate address information as "orphan sites" and does not provide mapped locations. BCI reviewed the complete list of twenty "orphan sites" and determined there are no additional sites that appear to be located within the project location.

### 3.2 Summary of Records Search

To generate this summary, we reviewed the database records search for sites within or adjacent to the project site, or considered close enough to the project site to potentially impact the project.

Gap Inc, 695 Menlo Drive. This site is adjacent to the project limits and is listed in the following databases:

- UST
- PLACER Co. MS
- SWEEPS UST

One 9,500 gallon gasoline UST is listed for this site. The UST registration has been active since 1994. The site is also listed as a small quantity generator of hazardous waste. No violations or accidental releases are noted in the records. Site reconnaissance determined the tank location is
potentially at the southwest corner of the site approximately 130 feet from the project limits. There is no evidence in the records review to suggest hazardous material issues from this site will impact the planned roadway improvement.

Formica Corp, 3500 Cincinnati Avenue. This site is nearby the project limits and is listed in the following databases:

- HIST UST
- RCRA-TSDF
- RCRA-SQG
- CORRACTS
- FINDS
- CERC-NFRAP
- LUST
- EMI
- CHMIRS
- HIST CORTESE

The Formica Corporation is located more than 0.6 miles from the project site. There is no evidence in the records review to suggest hazardous material issues from this site will impact the planned roadway improvement. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board completed their review of the site on September 22, 2009 and granted site closure.

### 3.3 City Directory Review

BCI reviewed the historical city directory. The information contained in the directory supported information presented in other sections of this report.

### 3.4 Title Documents Review

BCI was not provided title documents for this assessment.

### 3.5 Prior Environmental Investigations

The review of the following reports did not identify any additional information that is not discussed in other areas of this report

- Placer 65 HOV Lane Hazardous Waste Evaluation for a Mini-Preliminary Environmental Analysis Report, Caltrans (2012)
- State route 65/Whitney Boulevard Interchange Initial Site Assessment, BCI (2009)
- State Route 65/Pleasant Grove Interchange Initial Site Assessment, BCI (2007)
- I-80/State Route 65 Interchange Project Initial Site Assessment, BCI (2013)
- Aerially Deposited Lead Screening Evaluation - Pleasant Grove Interchange, BCI (2007)
- Aerially Deposited Lead Screening Evaluation - Placer Parkway Interchange, BCI (2013)

We also reviewed the October 2001 "Initial Site Assessment and Geologic Conditions Report (Final), Whitney Boulevard/Route 65 Interchange" prepared by BCI. The information provided in the report support the findings of this ISA and included one additional site identified in the records search conducted in 2001. This site is discussed below.

Western Regional Landfill, 3195 Athens Road. This site was included on the following list:

- Solid Waste Landfill (SWLF)

This site is identified as a solid waste facility, including an operations and/or disposal site. The landfill is located more than 1 mile from the project site. There is no evidence to suggest any hazardous material issues from this site will impact the planned roadway improvement.

## 4 RECONNAISSANCE INFORMATION

### 4.1 Subject Property Reconnaissance

BCI completed a site reconnaissance on July 29, 2014. Observations were made from publicly accessible portions of the study area. Our observations generally support the descriptions and background data above. A fence line view of the Gap Inc property indicated the potential underground storage tank location to be at the southwest corner of the property.

## 5 FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The scope of this initial site assessment was directed at determining whether there may be hazardous materials at or near the study area at concentrations likely to warrant mitigation pursuant to regulations, and to identify sites with recognized environmental conditions (RECs) and/or potential RECs within and adjacent to the proposed improvement area which could affect the design, constructability, feasibility, and/or the cost of the proposed project.

### 5.1 Sites Within or Adjacent to the Project Corridor with Potential RECs

BCI identified the following site(s) with known or potential hazardous materials issues within or adjacent to the project corridor.

## Gap Inc, 695 Menlo Drive.

Findings: One 9,500 gallon gasoline UST is listed for this site. The UST registration has been active since 1994. The site is also listed as a small quantity generator of hazardous waste. No violations or accidental releases are noted in the records. Site reconnaissance determined the tank location is potentially at the southwest corner of the site approximately 130 feet from the project limits.

Recommendations: There is no evidence in the records review to suggest hazardous material issues from this site will impact the planned roadway improvement. It does not appear that ROW acquisition will occur at this property, however if partial or complete acquisition of this parcel occurs, further review and investigation of potential contamination impacts is recommended. The initial investigation should include an in depth records review, site inspection and interview with the property owner and the local environmental health department.

### 5.2 General Contamination/Hazardous Waste Issues

Our assessment identified the following general environmental conditions that should be considered for present and future planning for the proposed project.

## Yellow Traffic Stripes

Yellow traffic stripes are known to contain heavy metals such as lead and chromium at concentrations in excess of the hazardous waste thresholds established by the California Code of Regulations and may produce toxic fumes when heated. Consequently, any yellow traffic striping within the project area will require development of an appropriate Lead Compliance Plan.

## Aerially Deposited Lead (ADL)

BCI completed an ADL Assessment (September 2014) to evaluate the presence of ADL within the project area. Based on the lead testing data and the results of the statistical analyses, we conclude that additional ADL testing is not warranted and that soil excavated within the project limits is not classified as a hazardous material. We recommend that the contractor conduct all grading operations with the awareness that lead impacted soil is present on the site and conduct all operations in accordance with applicable Cal-OSHA requirements including a project specific worker Health \& Safety Plan (HASP) and Lead Compliance Plan.

## Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM) and Lead Based Paint (LBP)

The design team requested an asbestos and lead survey of the Pleasant Grove Creek Bridges, which are included in the project area. BCI contracted Entek to perform this survey. The "Hazardous Materials Survey Report" dated August 7, 2014, prepared by Entek Consulting evaluated the presence of ACM and LBP at the Pleasant Grove Creek Bridges. The report concluded that ACM is not present in the concrete that comprises the bridge deck and supporting columns beneath the bridges. In addition, Entek did not observe existing paints or coatings associated with the bridges that would require sampling for LBP. The report further concluded that although asbestos was not found during the survey, written notification to the California Air Resources Board may be required. Attachment 1 contains a copy of the report.

## Metal Beam Guardrail (MBGR) Wood Post

If MBRG wood posts are removed, the contractor shall prepare and submit a safety and health work practices plan for handling treated wood waste approved by an ABIH Certified Industrial Hygienist. Treated wood waste must be disposed of in an approved treated wood waste facility.

## 6 LIMITATIONS

The accompanying report summarizes the findings and opinions of Blackburn Consulting (BCI), with regard to the potential for hazardous materials to be present on the properties within and adjacent to the proposed improvement area at concentrations likely to warrant mitigation under current statutes and guidelines. Our findings and opinions are based on information obtained on given dates or provided by specified individuals, through records review, site review, and related activities. Conditions can change after we have made our observations. We cannot warrant or
guarantee that hazardous materials do not exist at the described site. To further reduce your risk, an extensive invasive exploration may be necessary.

This report was prepared for the specific use of our client and applies only to the subject area. We are not responsible for interpretations by others of data presented in this report. This report does not represent a legal opinion. No warranty is expressed or implied. We base our conclusions in this report on judgment and experience. We performed this work in accordance with generally accepted standards of practice existing in northern California at the time of the assessment.

The scope of our investigation did not include determining the presence of radon, lead-based paint, or asbestos-containing materials, except as described herein. Identifying endangered species, geologic hazards, archeological sites, or ecologically sensitive areas are also beyond the scope of this report.

The governmental records portion of this report is derived from public records and is updated on a continual basis. For this reason, we do not advise you to use this information to base a decision after 180 days of the issue date of this report. Also, conditions at the site can and will change over time. Please contact BCI to revise this report to reflect new information.

## FIGURES

Figure 1 - Vicinity Map
Figure 2 - Site Plan
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## APPENDIX A

## Aerial Photographs

## SR 65 HOV

SR 65 and Lincoln Boulevard
Lincoln, CA 95648

Inquiry Number: 3664215.5
August 06, 2013

The EDR Aerial Photo Decade Package

## EDR Aerial Photo Decade Package

Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) Aerial Photo Decade Package is a screening tool designed to assist environmental professionals in evaluating potential liability on a target property resulting from past activities. EDR's professional researchers provide digitally reproduced historical aerial photographs, and when available, provide one photo per decade.

When delivered electronically by EDR, the aerial photo images included with this report are for ONE TIME USE ONLY. Further reproduction of these aerial photo images is prohibited without permission from EDR. For more information contact your EDR Account Executive.

Thank you for your business.
Please contact EDR at 1-800-352-0050 with any questions or comments.

## Disclaimer - Copyright and Trademark Notice

This Report contains certain information obtained from a variety of public and other sources reasonably available to Environmental Data Resources, Inc. It cannot be concluded from this Report that coverage information for the target and surrounding properties does not exist from other sources. NO WARRANTY EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, IS MADE WHATSOEVER IN CONNECTION WITH THIS REPORT. ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. SPECIFICALLY DISCLAIMS THE MAKING OF ANY SUCH WARRANTIES, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR USE OR PURPOSE. ALL RISK IS ASSUMED BY THE USER. IN NO EVENT SHALL ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. BE LIABLE TO ANYONE, WHETHER ARISING OUT OF ERRORS OR OMISSIONS, NEGLIGENCE, ACCIDENT OR ANY OTHER CAUSE, FOR ANY LOSS OF DAMAGE, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, SPECIAL, INCIDENTAL, CONSEQUENTIAL, OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES. ANY LIABILITY ON THE PART OF ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. IS STRICTLY LIMITED TO A REFUND OF THE AMOUNT PAID FOR THIS REPORT. Purchaser accepts this Report AS IS. Any analyses, estimates, ratings, environmental risk levels or risk codes provided in this Report are provided for illustrative purposes only, and are not intended to provide, nor should they be interpreted as providing any facts regarding, or prediction or forecast of, any environmental risk for any property. Only a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment performed by an environmental professional can provide information regarding the environmental risk for any property. Additionally, the information provided in this Report is not to be construed as legal advice.

Copyright 2013 by Environmental Data Resources, Inc. All rights reserved. Reproduction in any media or format, in whole or in part, of any report or map of Environmental Data Resources, Inc., or its affiliates, is prohibited without prior written permission.

## Date EDR Searched Historical Sources:

Aerial PhotographyAugust 06, 2013

## Target Property:

SR 65 and Lincoln Boulevard
Lincoln, CA 95648

| Year | Scale | Details | Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1947 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 1947 | USGS |
| 1952 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 1952 | Southwestern |
| 1961 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 1961 | Cartwright |
| 1966 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 1966 <br> Best Copy Available from original source | USGS |
| 1984 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 1984 | USGS |
| 1993 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 1993 | USGS |
| 1998 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | /DOQQ - acquisition dates: 1998 | EDR |
| 1998 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | /DOQQ - acquisition dates: 1998 | EDR |
| 1998 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | /DOQQ - acquisition dates: 1998 | EDR |
| 1998 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | /DOQQ - acquisition dates: 1998 | EDR |
| 1998 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | /DOQQ - acquisition dates: 1998 | EDR |
| 1998 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | /DOQQ - acquisition dates: 1998 | EDR |
| 2005 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2005 | EDR |
| 2005 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2005 | EDR |
| 2005 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2005 | EDR |
| 2005 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2005 | EDR |
| 2005 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2005 | EDR |
| 2005 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2005 | EDR |
| 2006 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=50{ }^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2006 | EDR |


| Year | Scale | Details | Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2006 | EDR |
| 2006 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2006 | EDR |
| 2006 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2006 | EDR |
| 2006 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2006 | EDR |
| 2006 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2006 | EDR |
| 2009 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2009 | EDR |
| 2009 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500$ | Flight Year: 2009 | EDR |
| 2009 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2009 | EDR |
| 2009 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2009 | EDR |
| 2009 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2009 | EDR |
| 2009 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2009 | EDR |
| 2010 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2010 | EDR |
| 2010 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2010 | EDR |
| 2010 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2010 | EDR |
| 2010 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500$ | Flight Year: 2010 | EDR |
| 2010 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2010 | EDR |
| 2010 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2010 | EDR |
| 2012 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2012 | EDR |
| 2012 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2012 | EDR |
| 2012 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2012 | EDR |
| 2012 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2012 | EDR |
| 2012 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2012 | EDR |
| 2012 | Aerial Photograph. Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$ | Flight Year: 2012 | EDR |










INQUIRY \#: 3664215.5
YEAR: 1998




INQUIRY \#: 3664215.5
YEAR: 1998
$\square$



































## APPENDIX B

## Topographic Maps

consulting

## SR 65 HOV

SR 65 and Lincoln Boulevard
Lincoln, CA 95648

Inquiry Number: 3664215.4
July 15, 2013

## EDR Historical Topographic Map Report

## EDR Historical Topographic Map Report

Environmental Data Resources, Inc.s (EDR) Historical Topographic Map Report is designed to assist professionals in evaluating potential liability on a target property resulting from past activities. EDRs Historical Topographic Map Report includes a search of a collection of public and private color historical topographic maps, dating back to the early 1900s.

Thank you for your business.
Please contact EDR at 1-800-352-0050
with any questions or comments.

## Disclaimer - Copyright and Trademark Notice
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Historical Topographic Map



Historical Topographic Map


| $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{N} \\ & \text { A } \end{aligned}$ | TARGET QUAD | SITE NAME: | SR 65 HOV | CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAME: ROSEVILLE | ADDRESS: | SR 65 and Lincoln Boulevard | CONTACT: Laura Long |
|  | MAP YEAR: 1910 |  | Lincoln, CA 95648 | INQUIRY\#: 3664215.4 |
|  |  | LAT/LONG: | 38.8421 / -121.2996 | RESEARCH DATE: 07/15/2013 |
|  | SERIES: 7.5 <br> SCALE: $1: 31680$ |  |  |  |

Historical Topographic Map



Historical Topographic Map



Historical Topographic Map



Historical Topographic Map


|  | TARGET QUAD | SITE NAME: | SR 65 HOV | CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAME: ROSEVILLE | ADDRESS: | SR 65 and Lincoln Boulevard | CONTACT: Laura Long |
|  | MAP YEAR: 1967 |  | Lincoln, CA 95648 | INQUIRY\#: 3664215.4 |
|  |  | LAT/LONG: | 38.8421/-121.2996 | RESEARCH DATE: 07/15/2013 |
|  | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { SERIES: } & 7.5 \\ \text { SCALE: } & 1: 24000 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |

Historical Topographic Map



Historical Topographic Map


|  | TARGET QUAD | SITE NAME: | SR 65 HOV | CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | NAME: ROSEVILLE | ADDRESS: | SR 65 and Lincoln Boulevard | CONTACT: Laura Long |
| 个 | MAP YEAR: 1981 |  | Lincoln, CA 95648 | INQUIRY\#: 3664215.4 |
| $\bigcirc$ | PHOTOREVISED FROM :1967 | LAT/LONG: | 38.8421/-121.2996 | RESEARCH DATE: 07/15/2013 |
|  | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { SERIES: } & 7.5 \\ \text { SCAIE: } & 1.24000\end{array}$ |  |  |  |

## I-80/SR-65 Interchange

Interstate 80/State Route 65
Roseville, CA 95678

Inquiry Number: 3596071.4
May 03, 2013

## EDR Historical Topographic Map Report

## EDR Historical Topographic Map Report

Environmental Data Resources, Inc.s (EDR) Historical Topographic Map Report is designed to assist professionals in evaluating potential liability on a target property resulting from past activities. EDRs Historical Topographic Map Report includes a search of a collection of public and private color historical topographic maps, dating back to the early 1900s.
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Historical Topographic Map


|  | TARGET QUAD | SITE NAME: I-80/SR-65 Interchange <br> ADDRESS: Interstate 80/State Route 65 Roseville, CA 95678 <br> LAT/LONG: 38.7689 / -121.2523 |  | CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | NAME: SACRAMENTO |  |  | CONTACT: Laura Long |
| 个 | MAP YEAR: 1893 |  |  | INQUIRY\#: 3596071.4 |
| 1 | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { SERIES: } & 30 \\ \text { SCALE: } & 1: 125000 \end{array}$ |  |  | RESEARCH DATE: 05/03/2013 |

Historical Topographic Map


| N | TARGET QUAD | SITE NAME ADDRESS: LAT/LONG: | I-80/SR-65 Interchange | CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAME: ROSEVILLE |  | Interstate 80/State Route 65 | CONTACT: Laura Long |
|  | MAP YEAR: 1910 |  | Roseville, CA 95678 <br> 38.7689/-121.2523 | INQUIRY\#: 3596071.4 <br> RESEARCH DATE: 05/03/2013 |
|  | SERIES: 7.5 <br> SCALE: 1:31680 |  |  |  |

Historical Topographic Map


TARGET QUAD
N
A
$\uparrow$
MAP YEAR: 1941

SERIES: 15
SCALE: 1:62500

SITE NAME: I-80/SR-65 Interchange ADDRESS: Interstate 80/State Route 65 Roseville, CA 95678
LAT/LONG: 38.7689/-121.2523

CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting CONTACT: Laura Long
INQUIRY\#: 3596071.4
RESEARCH DATE: 05/03/2013

Historical Topographic Map


| $\begin{gathered} N \\ \uparrow \end{gathered}$ | TARGET QUAD | SITE NAME: ADDRESS: <br> LAT/LONG: | I-80/SR-65 Interchange | CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAME: ROSEVILLE |  | Interstate 80/State Route 65 | CONTACT: Laura Long |
|  | MAP YEAR: 1953 |  | Roseville, CA 95678 | INQUIRY\#: 3596071.4 |
|  | SERIES: 7.5 <br> SCALE: 1:24000 |  | 38.7689 / -121.2523 | RESEARCH DATE: 05/03/2013 |

Historical Topographic Map


|  | TARGET QUAD | SITE NAME: I-80/SR-65 Interchange <br> ADDRESS: Interstate 80/State Route 65 Roseville, CA 95678 <br> LAT/LONG: 38.7689 / -121.2523 |  | CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | NAME: LINCOLN |  |  | CONTACT: Laura Long |
| 个 | MAP YEAR: 1953 |  |  | INQUIRY\#: 3596071.4 |
| 1 | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { SERIES: } & 15 \\ \text { SCALE: } & 1: 62500 \end{array}$ |  |  | RESEARCH DATE: 05/03/2013 |

## Historical Topographic Map



| $\begin{gathered} N \\ \uparrow \end{gathered}$ | TARGET QUAD | SITE NAME: ADDRESS: <br> LAT/LONG: | I-80/SR-65 Interchange | CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAME: ROSEVILLE |  | Interstate 80/State Route 65 | CONTACT: Laura Long |
|  | MAP YEAR: 1967 |  | Roseville, CA 95678 | INQUIRY\#: 3596071.4 |
|  | SERIES: 7.5 <br> SCALE: 1:24000 |  | 38.7689 / -121.2523 | RESEARCH DATE: 05/03/2013 |

Historical Topographic Map


TARGET QUAD
N
个
MAP YEAR: 1975
PHOTOREVISED FROM :1967
SERIES: 7.5
SCALE: 1:24000

SITE NAME: I-80/SR-65 Interchange
ADDRESS: Interstate 80/State Route 65 Roseville, CA 95678
LAT/LONG: 38.7689 / -121.2523

CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting
CONTACT: Laura Long
INQUIRY\#: 3596071.4
RESEARCH DATE: 05/03/2013

## I-80/SR-65 Interchange

Interstate 80/State Route 65
Roseville, CA 95678

Inquiry Number: 3596071.4
May 03, 2013

## EDR Historical Topographic Map Report

## EDR Historical Topographic Map Report

Environmental Data Resources, Inc.s (EDR) Historical Topographic Map Report is designed to assist professionals in evaluating potential liability on a target property resulting from past activities. EDRs Historical Topographic Map Report includes a search of a collection of public and private color historical topographic maps, dating back to the early 1900s.

Thank you for your business.
Please contact EDR at 1-800-352-0050
with any questions or comments.

## Disclaimer - Copyright and Trademark Notice
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Historical Topographic Map


|  | TARGET QUAD | SITE NAME: I-80/SR-65 Interchange <br> ADDRESS: Interstate 80/State Route 65 Roseville, CA 95678 <br> LAT/LONG: 38.7689 / -121.2523 |  | CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | NAME: SACRAMENTO |  |  | CONTACT: Laura Long |
| 个 | MAP YEAR: 1893 |  |  | INQUIRY\#: 3596071.4 |
| 1 | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { SERIES: } & 30 \\ \text { SCALE: } & 1: 125000 \end{array}$ |  |  | RESEARCH DATE: 05/03/2013 |

Historical Topographic Map


| N | TARGET QUAD | SITE NAME ADDRESS: LAT/LONG: | I-80/SR-65 Interchange | CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAME: ROSEVILLE |  | Interstate 80/State Route 65 | CONTACT: Laura Long |
|  | MAP YEAR: 1910 |  | Roseville, CA 95678 <br> 38.7689/-121.2523 | INQUIRY\#: 3596071.4 <br> RESEARCH DATE: 05/03/2013 |
|  | SERIES: 7.5 <br> SCALE: 1:31680 |  |  |  |

Historical Topographic Map


TARGET QUAD
N
A
$\uparrow$
MAP YEAR: 1941

SERIES: 15
SCALE: 1:62500

SITE NAME: I-80/SR-65 Interchange ADDRESS: Interstate 80/State Route 65 Roseville, CA 95678
LAT/LONG: 38.7689/-121.2523

CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting CONTACT: Laura Long
INQUIRY\#: 3596071.4
RESEARCH DATE: 05/03/2013

Historical Topographic Map


| $\begin{gathered} N \\ \uparrow \end{gathered}$ | TARGET QUAD | SITE NAME: ADDRESS: <br> LAT/LONG: | I-80/SR-65 Interchange | CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAME: ROSEVILLE |  | Interstate 80/State Route 65 | CONTACT: Laura Long |
|  | MAP YEAR: 1953 |  | Roseville, CA 95678 | INQUIRY\#: 3596071.4 |
|  | SERIES: 7.5 <br> SCALE: 1:24000 |  | 38.7689 / -121.2523 | RESEARCH DATE: 05/03/2013 |

Historical Topographic Map


|  | TARGET QUAD | SITE NAME: I-80/SR-65 Interchange <br> ADDRESS: Interstate 80/State Route 65 Roseville, CA 95678 <br> LAT/LONG: 38.7689 / -121.2523 |  | CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | NAME: LINCOLN |  |  | CONTACT: Laura Long |
| 个 | MAP YEAR: 1953 |  |  | INQUIRY\#: 3596071.4 |
| 1 | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { SERIES: } & 15 \\ \text { SCALE: } & 1: 62500 \end{array}$ |  |  | RESEARCH DATE: 05/03/2013 |

## Historical Topographic Map



| $\begin{gathered} N \\ \uparrow \end{gathered}$ | TARGET QUAD | SITE NAME: ADDRESS: <br> LAT/LONG: | I-80/SR-65 Interchange | CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAME: ROSEVILLE |  | Interstate 80/State Route 65 | CONTACT: Laura Long |
|  | MAP YEAR: 1967 |  | Roseville, CA 95678 | INQUIRY\#: 3596071.4 |
|  | SERIES: 7.5 <br> SCALE: 1:24000 |  | 38.7689 / -121.2523 | RESEARCH DATE: 05/03/2013 |

Historical Topographic Map


TARGET QUAD
N
个
MAP YEAR: 1975
PHOTOREVISED FROM :1967
SERIES: 7.5
SCALE: 1:24000

SITE NAME: I-80/SR-65 Interchange
ADDRESS: Interstate 80/State Route 65 Roseville, CA 95678
LAT/LONG: 38.7689 / -121.2523

CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting
CONTACT: Laura Long
INQUIRY\#: 3596071.4
RESEARCH DATE: 05/03/2013

Historical Topographic Map


| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} \\ & \text { A } \end{aligned}$ | TARGET QUAD | SITE NAME: SR 65 HOV <br> ADDRESS: SR 65 and Lincoln Boulevard Lincoln, CA 95648 <br> LAT/LONG: 38.8421/-121.2996 |  | CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting <br> CONTACT: Laura Long <br> INQUIRY\#: 3664215.4 <br> RESEARCH DATE: $07 / 15 / 2013$  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAME: ROSEVILLE <br> MAP YEAR: 1992 |  |  |  |
|  | SERIES: 7.5 <br> SCALE: $1: 24000$ |  |  |  |

Historical Topographic Map


|  | TARGET QUAD | SITE NAME: | I-80/SR-65 Interchange | CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | NAME: ROSEVILLE | ADDRESS: | Interstate 80/State Route 65 | CONTACT: Laura Long |
| 个 | MAP YEAR: 1981 |  | Roseville, CA 95678 | INQUIRY\#: 3596071.4 |
|  | PHOTOREVISED FROM :1967 | LAT/LONG: | 38.7689 /-121.2523 | RESEARCH DATE: 05/03/2013 |
|  | SERIES: 7.5 <br> SCALE: 1:24000 |  |  |  |

Historical Topographic Map


TARGET QUAD
$\stackrel{N}{N}$
NAME: ROSEVILLE
MAP YEAR: 1992

SERIES: 7.5
SCALE: 1:24000

SITE NAME: I-80/SR-65 Interchange ADDRESS: Interstate 80/State Route 65 Roseville, CA 95678 LAT/LONG: 38.7689 / -121.2523

CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting CONTACT: Laura Long
INQUIRY\#: 3596071.4
RESEARCH DATE: 05/03/2013

Historical Topographic Map


|  | ADJOINING QUAD |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| N | NAME: | AUBURN | SITE NAME: | I-80/SR-65 Interchange | CLIENT: | Blackburn Consulting |
| MAP YEAR: | 1947 | ADDRESS: | Interstate 80/State Route 65 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Roseville, CA 95678 | CONTACT: | Laura Long |  |
| SERIES: | 15 | LAT/LONG: | $38.7689 /-121.2523$ | INQUIRY\#: | 3596071.4 |  |
| SCALE: | $1: 62500$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Historical Topographic Map


|  | ADJOINING QUAD |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NAME: | AUBURN | SITE NAME: | I-80/SR-65 Interchange | CLIENT: | Blackburn Consulting |  |
| NAP YEAR: | 1954 | ADDRESS: | Interstate 80/State Route 65 | CONTACT: | Laura Long |  |
| $\boldsymbol{N}$ |  |  | Roseville, CA 95678 | INQUIRY\#: | 3596071.4 |  |
|  | SERIES: | 15 | LAT/LONG: | $38.7689 /-121.2523$ | RESEARCH DATE: 05/03/2013 |  |
| SCALE: | $1: 62500$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Historical Topographic Map


| $\stackrel{N}{N}$ | ADJOINING QUAD |  |  |  | CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting <br> CONTACT: Laura Long <br> INQUIRY\#: 3596071.4 <br> RESEARCH DATE: $05 / 03 / 2013$  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAME: ROCKLIN <br> MAP YEAR: 1954 |  | SITE NAME: I-80/SR-65 Interchange <br> ADDRESS: Interstate 80/State Route 65 <br> Roseville, CA 95678 <br> LAT/LONG: 38.7689/-121.2523 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | SERIES: <br> SCALE: | $\begin{aligned} & 7.5 \\ & 1: 24000 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |

Historical Topographic Map


| $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{N} \\ & \mathbf{N} \end{aligned}$ | ADJOINING QUAD | SITE NAME: ADDRESS: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAME: ROCKLIN |  | I-80/SR-65 Interchange | CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting |
|  | MAP YEAR: 1967 |  | Interstate 80/State Route 65 | CONTACT: Laura Long |
|  |  |  | Roseville, CA 95678 | INQUIRY\#: 3596071.4 |
|  | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { SERIES: } & 7.5 \\ \text { SCALE: } & 1: 24000 \end{array}$ | LAT/LONG: | 38.7689 / -121.2523 | RESEARCH DATE: 05/03/2013 |

Historical Topographic Map


| $\mathbf{N}$ | ADJOINING QUAD |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAME: ROCKLIN |  |  | CLIENT: Blackburn Consulting |
|  | MAP YEAR: 1981 |  |  | CONTACT: Laura Long |
|  | PHOTOREVISED FROM :1967 |  |  | INQUIRY\#: 3596071.4 |
|  | SERIES: 7.5 <br> SCALE: 1:24000 |  |  | RESEARCH DATE: 05/03/2013 |

## APPENDIX C

## EDR Report

## SR 65 HOV

SR 65 and Lincoln Boulevard Lincoln, CA 95648

Inquiry Number: 4009322.1s
July 18, 2014

## The EDR Radius Map ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Report with GeoCheck®
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A search of available environmental records was conducted by Environmental Data Resources, Inc (EDR). The report was designed to assist parties seeking to meet the search requirements of EPA's Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries (40 CFR Part 312), the ASTM Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments (E 1527-13) or custom requirements developed for the evaluation of environmental risk associated with a parcel of real estate.

## TARGET PROPERTY INFORMATION

## ADDRESS

SR 65 AND LINCOLN BOULEVARD LINCOLN, CA 95648

## COORDINATES

| Latitude (North): | $38.8421000-38^{\circ} 50^{\prime} 31.56^{\prime \prime}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Longitude (West): | $121.2996000-121^{\circ} 17 \prime 58.56^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Universal Tranverse Mercator: Zone 10 |  |
| UTM X (Meters): | 647575.8 |
| UTM Y (Meters): | 4300420.5 |
| Elevation: | 142 ft. above sea level |

## USGS TOPOGRAPHIC MAP ASSOCIATED WITH TARGET PROPERTY

| Target Property Map: | 38121-G3 ROSEVILLE, CA |
| :--- | :--- |
| Most Recent Revision: | 1992 |

## AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY IN THIS REPORT

Portions of Photo from: 20120706, 20120705
Source:
USDA

## TARGET PROPERTY SEARCH RESULTS

The target property was not listed in any of the databases searched by EDR.

## DATABASES WITH NO MAPPED SITES

No mapped sites were found in EDR's search of available ("reasonably ascertainable ") government records either on the target property or within the search radius around the target property for the following databases:

## STANDARD ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

Federal NPL site list
NPL
National Priority List

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Proposed NPL --- -------.-. . . Proposed National Priority List Sites <br> NPL LIENS Federal Superfund Liens

## Federal Delisted NPL site list

Delisted NPL $\qquad$ National Priority List Deletions

## Federal CERCLIS list

CERCLIS .-.................. Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System
FEDERAL FACILITY ........... Federal Facility Site Information listing

## Federal CERCLIS NFRAP site List

CERC-NFRAP
CERCLIS No Further Remedial Action Planned

## Federal RCRA non-CORRACTS TSD facilities list

RCRA-TSDF $\qquad$ RCRA - Treatment, Storage and Disposal

## Federal RCRA generators list

RCRA-LQG
RCRA - Large Quantity Generators
RCRA-CESQG $\qquad$ RCRA - Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator

## Federal institutional controls / engineering controls registries

US ENG CONTROLS .-.-...... Engineering Controls Sites List
US INST CONTROL . . .-...... . Sites with Institutional Controls
LUCIS - ----------------------. Land Use Control Information System

## Federal ERNS list

ERNS ------------------------ Emergency Response Notification System

## State- and tribal - equivalent NPL

RESPONSE $\qquad$ State Response Sites

State and tribal landfill and/or solid waste disposal site lists
SWF/LF
Solid Waste Information System

## State and tribal leaking storage tank lists

SLIC
Statewide SLIC Cases
INDIAN LUST
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land

## State and tribal registered storage tank lists

INDIAN UST.--------------... Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
FEMA UST Underground Storage Tank Listing

## State and tribal voluntary cleanup sites

INDIAN VCP $\qquad$ Voluntary Cleanup Priority Listing

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

VCP $\qquad$ Voluntary Cleanup Program Properties

## ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

## Local Brownfield lists

US BROWNFIELDS.-........-. A Listing of Brownfields Sites

## Local Lists of Landfill / Solid Waste Disposal Sites

DEBRIS REGION 9............ Torres Martinez Reservation Illegal Dump Site Locations
ODI_-.........................-. Open Dump Inventory
SWRCY ------------------ Recycler Database
HAULERS -------------------- Registered Waste Tire Haulers Listing
INDIAN ODI. .-................. Report on the Status of Open Dumps on Indian Lands
WMUDS/SWAT .-.-.-.-.-...... Waste Management Unit Database

## Local Lists of Hazardous waste / Contaminated Sites

US CDL
HIST Cal-Sites.................. Historical Calsites Database
SCH - .-........................... School Property Evaluation Program
Toxic Pits .-.-......-.-.-....... Toxic Pits Cleanup Act Sites
CDL .-........................-. Clandestine Drug Labs


## Local Lists of Registered Storage Tanks



## Local Land Records

LIENS 2.-..-....................- CERCLA Lien Information
LIENS
DEED...........................-. .- Deed Restriction Listing

## Records of Emergency Release Reports

| HMIRS | Hazardous Materials Information Reporting System |
| :---: | :---: |
| CHMIRS | California Hazardous Material Incident Report System |
| LDS | Land Disposal Sites Listing |
| MCS | Military Cleanup Sites Listing |
| SPILLS 90 | SPILLS 90 data from FirstSearch |
| Other Ascertainable |  |
| RCRA NonGen / NLR | RCRA - Non Generators / No Longer Regulated |
| DOT OPS | Incident and Accident Data |
| DOD. | Department of Defense Sites |
| FUDS | Formerly Used Defense Sites |
| CONSENT | Superfund (CERCLA) Consent Decrees |
| ROD | Records Of Decision |
| UMTRA | Uranium Mill Tailings Sites |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RGA LF $\qquad$ Recovered Government Archive Solid Waste Facilities List

## SURROUNDING SITES: SEARCH RESULTS

Surrounding sites were identified in the following databases.
Elevations have been determined from the USGS Digital Elevation Model and should be evaluated on a relative (not an absolute) basis. Relative elevation information between sites of close proximity should be field verified. Sites with an elevation equal to or higher than the target property have been differentiated below from sites with an elevation lower than the target property.
Page numbers and map identification numbers refer to the EDR Radius Map report where detailed data on individual sites can be reviewed.

Sites listed in bold italics are in multiple databases.
Unmappable (orphan) sites are not considered in the foregoing analysis.

## STANDARD ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

## Federal RCRA CORRACTS facilities list

CORRACTS: CORRACTS is a list of handlers with RCRA Corrective Action Activity. This report shows which nationally-defined corrective action core events have occurred for every handler that has had corrective action activity.

A review of the CORRACTS list, as provided by EDR, and dated $03 / 11 / 2014$ has revealed that there is 1 CORRACTS site within approximately 1 mile of the target property.

| Lower Elevation | Address | Direction / Distance | Map ID | Page |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FORMICA CORP | 3500 CINCINNATI AVE | SSW 1/2-1 (0.649 mi.) | F21 | 56 |

## Federal RCRA generators list

RCRA-SQG: RCRAInfo is EPA's comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. The database includes selective information on sites which generate, transport, store, treat and/or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Small quantity generators (SQGs) generate between 100 kg and $1,000 \mathrm{~kg}$ of hazardous waste per month.

A review of the RCRA-SQG list, as provided by EDR, and dated 03/11/2014 has revealed that there are 2 RCRA-SQG sites within approximately 0.25 miles of the target property.
Lower Elevation
HERMAN MILLER INC
MAINTENANCE WAREHOUSE
Address
333 SUNSET BLVD
1111 TINKER RD

| Direction / Distance | Map ID | Page |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S 0-1/8 (0.121 mi.) | C5 | 12 |
| S 1/8-1/4 (0.212 mi.) | D11 |  |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## State- and tribal - equivalent CERCLIS

ENVIROSTOR: The Department of Toxic Substances Control's (DTSC's) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program's (SMBRP's) EnviroStor database identifes sites that have known contamination or sites for which there may be reasons to investigate further. The database includes the following site types: Federal Superfund sites (National Priorities List (NPL)); State Response, including Military Facilities and State Superfund; Voluntary Cleanup; and School sites. EnviroStor provides similar information to the information that was available in CalSites, and provides additional site information, including, but not limited to, identification of formerly-contaminated properties that have been released for reuse, properties where environmental deed restrictions have been recorded to prevent inappropriate land uses, and risk characterization information that is used to assess potential impacts to public health and the environment at contaminated sites.

A review of the ENVIROSTOR list, as provided by EDR, and dated 06/05/2014 has revealed that there are 4 ENVIROSTOR sites within approximately 1 mile of the target property.

| Equal/Higher Elevation | Address | Direction / Distance | Map ID | Page |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CBS ROSEVILLE INDUSTRIAL IMPRO <br> Status: Certified O\&M - Land Use Restricir | 8250 INDUSTRIAL AVE ons Only | S 1/2-1 (0.733 mi.) | 22 | 73 |
| Lower Elevation | Address | Direction / Distance | Map ID | Page |
| HEWLETT PACKARD <br> Status: Refer: Other Agency | 3625 CINCINNATI AVE | SSW 1/2-1 (0.643 mi.) | 19 | 46 |
| FORMICA CORP <br> Status: Refer: RWQCB <br> Status: No Further Action | 3500 CINCINNATI AVE | SSW 1/2-1 (0.649 mi.) | F21 | 56 |
| FOOTHILLS SUBSTATION <br> Status: Inactive - Needs Evaluation | 8000 FOOTHILLS BLVD | SSW 1/2-1 (0.929 mi.) | 23 | 82 |

## State and tribal leaking storage tank lists

LUST: The Leaking Underground Storage Tank Incident Reports contain an inventory of reported leaking underground storage tank incidents. The data come from the State Water Resources Control Board Leaking Underground Storage Tank Information System.

A review of the LUST list, as provided by EDR, and dated 06/16/2014 has revealed that there is 1 LUST site within approximately 0.5 miles of the target property.

| Equal/Higher Elevation | Address | Direction / Distance | Map ID | Page |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TWELVE BRIDGES GOLF COURSE | TWELVE BRIDGES RD | NNE 1/4-1/2 (0.467 mi.) | 18 | 46 |

## State and tribal registered storage tank lists

UST: The Underground Storage Tank database contains registered USTs. USTs are regulated under Subtitle I of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). The data come from the State Water Resources Control Board's Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database.

A review of the UST list, as provided by EDR, and dated 06/16/2014 has revealed that there is 1 UST

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

site within approximately 0.25 miles of the target property.

| Lower Elevation | Address | Direction / Distance | Map ID | Page |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GAP, INC. (THE) | 695 MENLO DR | S 0-1/8 (0.089 mi.) | A1 | 8 |

AST: A listing of aboveground storage tank petroleum storage tank locations.
A review of the AST list, as provided by EDR, and dated 08/01/2009 has revealed that there is 1 AST site within approximately 0.25 miles of the target property.

| Lower Elevation | Address | Direction / Distance | Map ID | Page |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GAP INC. - ON LINE ORDERING AN | 3830 ATHERTON ROAD | S 1/8-1/4 (0.230 mi.) | E14 | 20 |

## ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

## Local Lists of Registered Storage Tanks

SWEEPS UST: Statewide Environmental Evaluation and Planning System. This underground storage tank listing was updated and maintained by a company contacted by the SWRCB in the early 1990's. The listing is no longer updated or maintained. The local agency is the contact for more information on a site on the SWEEPS list.

A review of the SWEEPS UST list, as provided by EDR, and dated 06/01/1994 has revealed that there is 1 SWEEPS UST site within approximately 0.25 miles of the target property.

| Lower Elevation | Address | Direction / Distance | Map ID | Page |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GAP, INC. (THE) | 695 MENLO DR | S 0-1/8 (0.089 mi.) | A1 | 8 |

## Other Ascertainable Records

Cortese: The sites for the list are designated by the State Water Resource Control Board (LUST), the Integrated Waste Board (SWF/LS), and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (Cal-Sites).

A review of the Cortese list, as provided by EDR, and dated 03/31/2014 has revealed that there is 1 Cortese site within approximately 0.5 miles of the target property.

| Lower Elevation | Address | Direction / Distance | Map ID | Page |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP | 1200 ATHENS AVENUE |  | WSW 1/4-1/2 (0.383 mi.) | 17 |

HIST CORTESE: The sites for the list are designated by the State Water Resource Control Board [LUST], the Integrated Waste Board [SWF/LS], and the Department of Toxic Substances Control [CALSITES]. This listing is no longer updated by the state agency.

A review of the HIST CORTESE list, as provided by EDR, and dated 04/01/2001 has revealed that there is 1 HIST CORTESE site within approximately 0.5 miles of the target property.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Equal/Higher Elevation <br> TWELVE BRIDGES GOLF COURSE

| $\frac{\text { Direction / Distance }}{\text { NNE 1/4-1/2 (0.467 mi.) }}$ |  | Map ID |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 46 |  |  |  |

CA PLACER CO. MS: Placer County Master List of Facilities includes Aboveground Hazardous Material tanks, Underground Storage tanks, Site Clean-up sites.

A review of the CA PLACER CO. MS list, as provided by EDR, and dated 06/09/2014 has revealed that there are 14 CA PLACER CO. MS sites within approximately 0.25 miles of the target property.

| Lower Elevation | Address | Direction / Distance | Map ID | Page |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GAP, INC. (THE) | 695 MENLO DR | S 0-1/8 (0.089 mi.) | A1 | 8 |
| GAP, INC | 3900 ATHERTON DR | S 0-1/8 (0.102 mi.) | B2 | 9 |
| MENLO ROCKLIN PROPERTIES, LLC | 655 MENLO DR 200 | S 0-1/8 (0.108 mi.) | A3 | 9 |
| WILLIAM JESSUP UNIVERSITY | 333 SUNSET AVE | S 0-1/8 (0.121 mi.) | C4 | 9 |
| 017-300-072-000 | 1091 TINKER WAY | S 1/8-1/4 (0.142 mi.) | D6 | 14 |
| AKTIS CORPORATION | 3845 ATHERTON RD 1 | S 1/8-1/4 (0.166 mi.) | E7 | 15 |
| PRECISION METAL FABRICATORS | 575 MENLO DR 1 | S 1/8-1/4 (0.184 mi.) | B8 | 15 |
| TRANSNATIONAL PRINTING SERVICE | 575 MENLO DR 4 | S 1/8-1/4 (0.184 mi.) | B9 | 15 |
| CANNON WATER TECHNOLOGY | 233 TECHNOLOGY WAY 9 | S 1/8-1/4 (0.203 mi.) | 10 | 16 |
| MAINTENANCE WAREHOUSE | 1111 TINKER RD | S 1/8-1/4 (0.212 mi.) | D11 | 16 |
| GOLDEN EAGLE DISTRIBUTING CORP | 1251 TINKER RD | S 1/8-1/4 (0.213 mi.) | D12 | 18 |
| GAP INC | 3830 ATHERTON DR | S 1/8-1/4 (0.230 mi.) | E13 | 18 |
| GEOCHEMICAL SERVICES, INC | 3805 ATHERTON RD 6 | S 1/8-1/4 (0.236 mi.) | E15 | 20 |
| CHRISTY MANUFACTURING CORPORAT | 3805 ATHERTON RD STE 10 | S 1/8-1/4 (0.236 mi.) | E16 | 20 |

HWP: Detailed information on permitted hazardous waste facilities and corrective action ("cleanups") tracked in EnviroStor.

A review of the HWP list, as provided by EDR, and dated 05/27/2014 has revealed that there is 1 HWP site within approximately 1 mile of the target property.

| Lower Elevation | Address | Direction / Distance | Map ID | Page |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FORMICA CORPORATION | 3500 CINCINNATI AVE | SSW 1/2-1 (0.649 mi.) | F20 | 47 |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Due to poor or inadequate address information, the following sites were not mapped. Count: 20 records.

Site Name
LINCOLN SMALL LOG SAWMILL GLADDING MCBEAN
THUNDER MOUNTAIN TRAIN WRECK SITE
VALLEY VIEW MINE
CAMP FAR WEST LAKE
LINCOLN SAWMILL AND PLANER
A \& A CONCRETE
KIEWIT PACIFIC
CAL TRANS WHITMORE
TRMT OF PETROLEUM CONTAM. SOIL
ALPHA EXPLOSIVES
LOWE'S OF LINCOLN \#2499
ENERGY 2001
CVS PHARMACY NO 9535
SAFEWAY STORE NO 1761
BOHEMIA, INC.
NICHOLAS TURKEY BREEDING FARM CLOS
FIBREWOOD CORPORATION
GLADDING MCBEAN \& CO
RMC PACIFIC MATERIALS

Database(s)
HIST UST,SWEEPS UST
TOXIC
CERCLIS
CERCLIS
AST
AST
AST
AST
AST
WMUDS/SWAT
WMUDS/SWAT
MS PLACER,HAZNET
FINDS,RCRA-SQG
RCRA-LQG
RCRA-NLR
BEP
MS PLACER
MS PLACER
MINES
MINES
overview MAP - 4009322.1s


- Sites at elevations higher than or equal to the target property
- Sites at elevations lower than the target property
- Manufactured Gas Plants
- Sensitive Receptors

National Priority List Sites
Dept. Defense Sites

This report includes Interactive Map Layers to display and/or hide map information. The legend includes only those icons for the default map view.

| SITE NAME: | SR 65 HOV | CLIENT: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ADDRESS: | SR 65 and Lincoln Boulevard | CONTACT: Laura Long Consulting |
|  | Lincoln CA 95648 | INQUIRY \#: 4009322.1s |
| LAT/LONG: | $38.8421 / 121.2996$ | DATE: $\quad$ July 18, 2014 7:59 pm |



This report includes Interactive Map Layers to display and/or hide map information. The legend includes only those icons for the default map view.

| SITE NAME: | SR 65 HOV |
| :--- | :--- |
| ADDRESS: | SR 65 and Lincoln Boulevard |
| LAT/LONG: | Lincoln CA 95648 |
| L8.8421 / 121.2996 |  |

## MAP FINDINGS SUMMARY

|  | Search <br> Distance <br> (Miles) | $\underline{l}$ | Target <br> Property | $\underline{<1 / 8}$ | $\underline{1 / 8-1 / 4}$ | $\underline{1 / 4-1 / 2}$ | $\underline{1 / 2-1}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## STANDARD ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

Federal NPL site list

| NPL | 1.000 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Proposed NPL | 1.000 |
| NPL LIENS | TP |

Federal Delisted NPL site list
Delisted NPL 1.000
Federal CERCLIS list

| CERCLIS | 0.500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FEDERAL FACILITY | 0.500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | 0 |
| Federal CERCLIS NFRAP site List |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CERC-NFRAP | 0.500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | 0 |
| Federal RCRA CORRACTS facilities list |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CORRACTS | 1.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | NR | 1 |
| Federal RCRA non-CORRACTS TSD facilities list |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RCRA-TSDF | 0.500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | 0 |
| Federal RCRA generators list |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RCRA-LQG | 0.250 | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| RCRA-SQG | 0.250 | 1 | 1 | NR | NR | NR | 2 |
| RCRA-CESQG | 0.250 | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | NR |  |

Federal institutional controls /
engineering controls registries

| US ENG CONTROLS | 0.500 |
| :--- | :--- |
| US INST CONTROL | 0.500 |
| LUCIS | 0.500 |


| 0 | 0 | 0 | $N R$ | $N R$ | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | $N R$ | $N R$ | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | $N R$ | $N R$ | 0 |

Federal ERNS list

| ERNS | TP | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State- and tribal - equivalent NPL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RESPONSE | 1.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | 0 |
| State- and tribal - equivalent CERCLIS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ENVIROSTOR | 1.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | NR | 4 |
| State and tribal landfill and/or solid waste disposal site lists |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SWF/LF | 0.500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | 0 |
| State and tribal leaking storage tank lists |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LUST | 0.500 | 0 | 0 | 1 | NR | NR | 1 |

## MAP FINDINGS SUMMARY

| Database | Search Distance (Miles) | Target Property | < 1/8 | 1/8-1/4 | 1/4-1/2 | 1/2-1 | >1 | Total Plotted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SLIC | 0.500 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | 0 |
| INDIAN LUST | 0.500 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | 0 |
| State and tribal registered storage tank lists |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UST | 0.250 |  | 1 | 0 | NR | NR | NR | 1 |
| AST | 0.250 |  | 0 | 1 | NR | NR | NR | 1 |
| INDIAN UST | 0.250 |  | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| FEMA UST | 0.250 |  | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| State and tribal voluntary cleanup sites |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| INDIAN VCP | 0.500 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | 0 |
| VCP | 0.500 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | 0 |

ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

## Local Brownfield lists

US BROWNFIELDS
Local Lists of Landfill / Solid
Waste Disposal Sites

Waste Disposal Sites

| DEBRIS REGION 9 | 0.500 |
| :--- | :---: |
| ODI | 0.500 |
| SWRCY | 0.500 |
| HAULERS | TP |
| INDIAN ODI | 0.500 |
| WMUDS/SWAT | 0.500 |

Local Lists of Hazardous waste /
Contaminated Sites

| US CDL | TP | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HIST Cal-Sites | 1.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $N R$ | 0 |
| SCH | 0.250 | 0 | 0 | $N R$ | $N R$ | $N R$ | 0 |
| Toxic Pits | 1.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $N R$ | 0 |
| CDL | TP | NR | $N R$ | $N R$ | $N R$ | $N R$ | 0 |
| US HIST CDL | TP | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |

## Local Lists of Registered Storage Tanks

| CA FID UST | 0.250 | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HIST UST | 0.250 | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| SWEEPS UST | 0.250 | 1 | 0 | NR | NR | NR | 1 |
| Local Land Records |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LIENS 2 | TP | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| LIENS | TP | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| DEED | 0.500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | 0 |
| Records of Emergency Release Reports |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HMIRS | TP | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| CHMIRS | TP | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| LDS | TP | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |

MAP FINDINGS SUMMARY

| Database | Search Distance (Miles) | Target Property | < 1/8 | 1/8-1/4 | 1/4-1/2 | 1/2-1 | > 1 | Total Plotted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MCS | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| SPILLS 90 | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| Other Ascertainable Records |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RCRA NonGen / NLR | 0.250 |  | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| DOT OPS | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| DOD | 1.000 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | 0 |
| FUDS | 1.000 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | 0 |
| CONSENT | 1.000 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | 0 |
| ROD | 1.000 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | 0 |
| UMTRA | 0.500 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | 0 |
| US MINES | 0.250 |  | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| TRIS | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| TSCA | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| FTTS | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| HIST FTTS | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| SSTS | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| ICIS | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| PADS | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| MLTS | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| RADINFO | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| FINDS | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| RAATS | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| RMP | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| CA BOND EXP. PLAN | 1.000 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | 0 |
| UIC | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| NPDES | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| Cortese | 0.500 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | NR | NR | 1 |
| HIST CORTESE | 0.500 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | NR | NR | 1 |
| CA PLACER CO. MS | 0.250 |  | 4 | 10 | NR | NR | NR | 14 |
| CUPA Listings | 0.250 |  | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| Notify 65 | 1.000 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | 0 |
| DRYCLEANERS | 0.250 |  | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| WIP | 0.250 |  | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| ENF | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| HAZNET | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| EMI | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| INDIAN RESERV | 1.000 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | 0 |
| SCRD DRYCLEANERS | 0.500 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | 0 |
| US AIRS | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| PRP | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| 2020 COR ACTION | 0.250 |  | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| LEAD SMELTERS | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| EPA WATCH LIST | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| PROC | 0.500 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | 0 |
| Financial Assurance | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| PCB TRANSFORMER | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| HWP | 1.000 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | NR | 1 |
| US FIN ASSUR | TP |  | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| COAL ASH EPA | 0.500 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | 0 |
| HWT | 0.250 |  | 0 | 0 | NR | NR | NR | 0 |


| MAP FINDINGS SUMMARY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Database | Search Distance (Miles) | Target Property | < 1/8 | 1/8-1/4 | 1/4-1/2 | 1/2-1 | >1 | Total Plotted |
| COAL ASH DOE MWMP WDS | $\begin{gathered} \text { TP } \\ 0.250 \\ \text { TP } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { NR } \\ 0 \\ \text { NR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NR } \\ 0 \\ \text { NR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NR } \\ & \text { NR } \\ & \text { NR } \end{aligned}$ | NR <br> NR <br> NR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NR } \\ & \text { NR } \\ & \text { NR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
| EDR HIGH RISK HISTORICAL RECORDS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EDR Exclusive Records |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EDR MGP <br> EDR US Hist Auto Stat EDR US Hist Cleaners | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 0.250 \\ & 0.250 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \text { NR } \\ \text { NR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \text { NR } \\ \text { NR } \end{gathered}$ | NR <br> NR <br> NR | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
| EDR RECOVERED GOVERNMENT ARCHIVES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Exclusive Recovered Govt. Archives |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RGA LUST RGA LF | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TP } \\ & \text { TP } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NR } \\ & \text { NR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NR } \\ & \text { NR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NR } \\ & \text { NR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NR } \\ & \text { NR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NR } \\ & \text { NR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
| NOTES: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TP = Target Property |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NR = Not Requested Sites may be listed in | s Search | NR = Not Requested at this Search Distance |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Map ID
Direction

| Distance |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Elevation |

## MAP FINDINGS

Database(s)

A1 GAP, INC. (THE)
UST
South
< 1/8
0.089 mi .

468 ft .
ROCKLIN, CA 95765
Site 1 of $\mathbf{2}$ in cluster $\mathbf{A}$
Relative:
Lower
UST:
Facility ID: FA0002333
Latitude: $\quad 38.8153882$
Actual: Longitude: -121.2973882
136 ft .
Permitting AgencyPLACER COUNTY
PLACER CO. MS:
Facility ID: ..... FA0002333
Facility Status: ..... Active
2301Program:UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK - 1 TANKPR0003431Record Num:
18
District Code:FA0002333

Facility ID:
FA0002333
Facility Status: Active
Program Element Code: 2111
Program:
Record Num:
AS/US HAZMAT-NO WASTE <20,000/MONTH PR0003432
District Code: 18

Facility ID:
FA0002333
Facility Status: Closed
Program Element Code: 2268
Program:
Record Num: CONDITIONALLY EXEMPT SMALL QUANTITY GENERATOR PR0009601
District Code: 18

## SWEEPS UST:

| Status: | Active |
| :--- | :--- |
| Comp Number: | 2333 |

Comp Number. 2333
Number: $\quad 1$
Board Of Equalization: 44-035477
Referral Date: 03-14-94
Action Date: $\quad 03-14-94$
Created Date: 03-14-94
Owner Tank Id: TYCTK44-035477
SWRCB Tank Id: 31-000-002333-000001
Tank Status: A
Capacity: 9500
Active Date: 10-03-93
Tank Use: PETROLEUM
STG: P
Content: PETROLEUM
Number Of Tanks: 1

Elevation Site $\quad$ Database(s)

| Discharge City: |  | Rocklin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Discharge State: |  | California |
| Discharge Zip: |  | 95765 |
| PLACER CO. MS: |  |  |
| Facility ID: | FA0001831 |  |
| Facility Status: | Closed |  |
| Program Element Code: | 2106 |  |
| Program: | HAZMAT - AB | OVE GROUND WITH WASTE |
| Record Num: | PR0002603 |  |
| District Code: | 18 |  |
| Facility ID: | FA0001831 |  |
| Facility Status: | Closed |  |
| Program Element Code: | 2270 |  |
| Program: | SMALL QUAN | TITY GENERATOR |
| Record Num: | PR0007004 |  |
| District Code: | 18 |  |
| EMI: |  |  |
| Year: |  | 2008 |
| County Code: |  | 31 |
| Air Basin: |  | SV |
| Facility ID: |  | 2425 |
| Air District Name: |  | PLA |
| SIC Code: |  | 8221 |
| Air District Name: |  | PLACER COUNTY APCD |
| Community Health Air Pol | Info System: | Not reported |
| Consolidated Emission R | ting Rule: | Not reported |
| Total Organic Hydrocarbo | ases Tons/Yr: | . 0071056371387967787 |
| Reactive Organic Gases | /Yr: | . 003 |
| Carbon Monoxide Emissi | Tons/Yr: | . 047 |
| NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen | s/Yr: | . 056 |
| SOX - Oxides of Sulphur | /Yr: | . 0003 |
| Particulate Matter Tons/Y |  | . 004 |
| Part. Matter 10 Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: |  | . 004 |
| Year: |  | 2009 |
| County Code: |  | 31 |
| Air Basin: |  | SV |
| Facility ID: |  | 2425 |
| Air District Name: |  | PLA |
| SIC Code: |  | 8221 |
| Air District Name: |  | PLACER COUNTY APCD |
| Community Health Air Pollution Info System: |  | Not reported |
| Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: |  | Not reported |
| Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: |  | $8.9999999999999993 E-3$ |
| Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: |  | $3.7399999999999998 \mathrm{E}-3$ |
| Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: |  | $5.7119999999999997 \mathrm{E}-2$ |
| NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: |  | $6.8000000000000005 \mathrm{E}-2$ |
| SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: |  | 0.000408 |
| Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: |  | $5.1679999999999999 \mathrm{E}-3$ |
| Part. Matter 10 Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: |  | $5.0000000000000001 \mathrm{E}-3$ |
| Year: |  | 2010 |
| County Code: |  | 31 |


| Distance |  | EDR ID Number <br> Elevation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Site |  |  |$\quad$ Database(s) | EPA ID Number |
| :--- |


| WILLIAM JESSUP UNIVERSITY (Continued) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Air Basin: | SV |
| Facility ID: | 2425 |
| Air District Name: | PLA |
| SIC Code: | 8221 |
| Air District Name: | PLACER COUNTY APCD |
| Community Health Air Pollution Info System: | Not reported |
| Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: | Not reported |
| Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: | $1.1072951207958299 E-2$ |
| Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: | $4.6750000000000003 \mathrm{E}-3$ |
| Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: | $7.1400000000000005 \mathrm{E}-2$ |
| NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: | 8.5000000000000006 E -2 |
| SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: | $5.1000000000000004 \mathrm{E}-4$ |
| Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: | $6.4599999999999996 \mathrm{E}-3$ |
| Part. Matter 10 Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: | $6.4599999999999996 \mathrm{E}-3$ |
|  |  |
| Year: | 2011 |
| County Code: | 31 |
| Air Basin: | SV |
| Facility ID: | 2425 |
| Air District Name: | PLA |
| SIC Code: | 8221 |
| Air District Name: | PLACER COUNTY APCD |
| Community Health Air Pollution Info System: | Not reported |
| Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: | Not reported |
| Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: | 0.011072951208 |
| Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: | 0.004675 |
| Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: | 0.0714 |
| NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: | 0.085 |
| SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: | 0.00051 |
| Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: | 0.00646 |
| Part. Matter 10 Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: | 0.00646 |
| Year: |  |
| County Code: | 2012 |
| Air Basin: | 31 |
| Facility ID: | Sir District Name: |
| SIC Code: | 2425 |
| Air District Name: | PLA |
| Community Health Air Pollution Info System: | PLACER coported |
| Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: | Not reported |
| Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: | 0.011072951208 |
| Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: | 0.004675 |
| Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: | 0.0714 |
| NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: | 0.085 |
| SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: | 0.00051 |
| Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: | 0.00646 |
| Part. Matter 10 Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: | 0.00646 |
|  |  |


| Direction |
| :--- |
| Distance |
| Elevation |

Database(s)
EDR ID Number EPA ID Number

South
< $1 / 8$
0.121 mi .

641 ft .
Relative:
Lower
Actual: 136 ft .
HERMAN MILLER INC
333 SUNSET BLVD
ROCKLIN, CA
Site 2 of 2 in cluster C

Site 2 of 2 in cluster C
RCRA-SQG:
Date form received by agency:04/23/1992
Facility name: HERMAN MILLER INC
Facility address: 333 SUNSET BLVD
ROCKLIN, CA 95677
EPA ID:
CAD983633371
Contact:
ALLEN YUHL
Contact address: 333 SUNSET BLVD
ROCKLIN, CA 95677
Contact country:
US
Contact telephone: (916) 624-2448
Contact email: Not reported
EPA Region: 09
Classification: Small Small Quantity Generator
Description: $\quad$ Handler: generates more than 100 and less than 1000 kg of hazardous waste during any calendar month and accumulates less than 6000 kg of hazardous waste at any time; or generates 100 kg or less of hazardous waste during any calendar month, and accumulates more than 1000 kg of hazardous waste at any time

Owner/Operator Summary:

| Owner/operator name: | HERMAN MILLER INC |
| :--- | :--- |
| Owner/operator address: | 8500 BYRON RD |
|  | ZEELAND, MI 49464 |
| Owner/operator country: | Not reported |
| Owner/operator telephone: | (616) 772-3300 |
| Legal status: | Private |
| Owner/Operator Type: | Owner |
| Owner/Op start date: | Not reported |
| Owner/Op end date: | Not reported |

Handler Activities Summary:
U.S. importer of hazardous waste: No

Mixed waste (haz. and radioactive): No
Recycler of hazardous waste: No
Transporter of hazardous waste: No
Treater, storer or disposer of HW: No
Underground injection activity: No
On-site burner exemption: No
Furnace exemption: No
Used oil fuel burner: No
Used oil processor: No
User oil refiner: No
Used oil fuel marketer to burner: No
Used oil Specification marketer: No
Used oil transfer facility: No
Used oil transporter: No
Violation Status: No violations found
FINDS:
Registry ID:
110002874300

| Distance |  | EDR ID Number <br> Elevation <br> Site$\quad$ Database(s) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| EPA ID Number |  |  |

## HERMAN MILLER INC (Continued)

1000686112
Environmental Interest/Information System
RCRAInfo is a national information system that supports the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) program through the tracking of events and activities related to facilities that generate, transport, and treat, store, or dispose of hazardous waste. RCRAInfo allows RCRA program staff to track the notification, permit, compliance, and corrective action activities required under RCRA.

| HAZNET: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Year: | 2001 |
| Gepaid: | CAD983633371 |
| Contact: | EVELYN CROSBY-YUHL-ENV COORD |
| Telephone: | 9166324260 |
| Mailing Name: | Not reported |
| Mailing Address: | 333 SUNSET BLVD |
| Mailing City,St,Zip: | ROCKLIN, CA 957653707 |
| Gen County: | Not reported |
| TSD EPA ID: | CAD980884183 |
| TSD County: | Not reported |
| Waste Category: | Adhesives |
| Disposal Method: | Disposal, Other |
| Tons: | 0.62 |
| Facility County: | Placer |
|  |  |
| Year: | 2001 |
| Gepaid: | CAD983633371 |
| Contact: | EVELYN CROSBY-YUHL-ENV COORD |
| Telephone: | 9166324260 |
| Mailing Name: | Not reported |
| Mailing Address: | 333 SUNSET BLVD |
| Mailing City,St,Zip: | ROCKLIN, CA 957653707 |
| Gen County: | Not reported |
| TSD EPA ID: | CAD980884183 |
| TSD County: | Not reported |
| Waste Category: | Unspecified sludge waste |
| Disposal Method: | Disposal, Other |
| Tons: | 1.18 |
| Facility County: | Placer |
| Year: |  |
| Gepaid: | 2001 |
| Contact: | CAD983633371 |
| Telephone: | EVELYN CROSBY-YUHL-ENV COORD |
| Mailing Name: | 9166324260 |
| Mailing Address: | Not reported |
| Mailing City,St,Zip: | ROCKLIN, CA 957653707 |
| Gen County: | Not reported |
| TSD EPA ID: | CAD028409019 |
| TSD County: | Not reported |
| Waste Category: | Halogenated solvents (chloroforms, methyl chloride, perchloroethylene, |
|  | etc) |
| Disposal Method: | Transfer Station |
| Tons: | 0.1 |
| Facility County: | Placer |
|  |  |
| Year: | 2001 |
|  |  |


| Distance |
| :--- |
| Elevation |
| Site |


| HERMAN MILLER INC | (Continued) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Gepaid: | CAD983633371 |
| Contact: | EVELYN CROSBY-YUHL-ENV COORD |
| Telephone: | 9166324260 |
| Mailing Name: | Not reported |
| Mailing Address: | 333 SUNSET BLVD |
| Mailing City,St,Zip: | ROCKLIN, CA 957653707 |
| Gen County: | Not reported |
| TSD EPA ID: | CAD028409019 |
| TSD County: | Not reported |
| Waste Category: | Halogenated solvents (chloroforms, methyl chloride, perchloroethylene, |
|  | etc) |
| Disposal Method: | Transfer Station |
| Tons: | 0.1 |
| Facility County: | Placer |
|  |  |
| Year: | 2001 |
| Gepaid: | CAD983633371 |
| Contact: | EVELYN CROSBY-YUHL-ENV COORD |
| Telephone: | 9166324260 |
| Mailing Name: | Not reported |
| Mailing Address: | 333 SUNSET BLVD |
| Mailing City,St,Zip: | ROCKLIN, CA 957653707 |
| Gen County: | Not reported |
| TSD EPA ID: | CADO28409019 |
| TSD County: | Not reported |
| Waste Category: | Halogenated solvents (chloroforms, methyl chloride, perchloroethylene, |
|  |  |
| Disposal Method: | Transfer Station |
| Tons: | 0.1 |
| Facility County: | Placer |
|  |  |

Click this hyperlink while viewing on your computer to access 49 additional CA_HAZNET: record(s) in the EDR Site Report.

| D6 | 017-300-072-000 |  | CA PLACER CO. MS | S103880067 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| South | 1091 TINKER WAY |  |  | N/A |
| 1/8-1/4 | ROCKLIN, CA 95677 |  |  |  |
| 0.142 mi . |  |  |  |  |
| 749 ft . | Site 1 of 3 in cluster D |  |  |  |
| Relative: | PLACER CO. MS: |  |  |  |
| Lower | Facility ID: | FA0004277 |  |  |
|  | Facility Status: | Closed |  |  |
| Actual: | Program Element Code: | 2105 |  |  |
| 132 ft . | Program: | HAZMAT BUSINESS PLAN |  |  |
|  | Record Num: | PR0007282 |  |  |
|  | District Code: | 22 |  |  |



## CANNON WATER TECHNOLOGY

CA PLACER CO. MS S110496665
233 TECHNOLOGY WAY 9 ROCKLIN, CA 95765
0.203 mi .

1073 ft .
Relative:
Lower
Actual:
130 ft .

D11
South
1/8-1/4
0.212 mi . 1118 ft .

Relative: Lower

Actual: 131 ft .

PLACER CO. MS:
Facility ID: FA0017894
Facility Status: Active
Program Element Code: 2105
Program:
Record Num:
District Code:

MAINTENANCE WAREHOUSE
1111 TINKER RD
RCRA-SQG
FINDS
CA PLACER CO. MS
ROCKLIN, CA
Site 2 of 3 in cluster D
RCRA-SQG:
Date form received by agency:08/01/2000
Facility name:
Facility address:
EPA ID:
Mailing address:
Contact:
Contact address:
Contact country:
Contact telephone: (800) 451-8346
Contact email: Not reported
EPA Region: 09
Classification:
Description:

MAINTENANCE WAREHOUSE
1111 TINKER RD
ROCKLIN, CA 95765
CAR000079632
1905 ASTON AVE
CARLSBAD, CA 92008
PETER KRUCKER
1905 ASTON AVE
CARLSBAD, CA 92008
US

09
Small Small Quantity Generator
Handler: generates more than 100 and less than 1000 kg of hazardous waste during any calendar month and accumulates less than 6000 kg of hazardous waste at any time; or generates 100 kg or less of hazardous waste during any calendar month, and accumulates more than 1000 kg of hazardous waste at any time

Owner/Operator Summary:
Owner/operator name: MAINTENANCE WAREHOUSE
Owner/operator address: 5505 MOREHOUSE DR STE 100
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121
Owner/operator country: Not reported
Owner/operator telephone: (858) 831-2000
Legal status:
Private
Owner/Operator Type: Owner
Owner/Op start date: Not reported
Owner/Op end date: Not reported

Handler Activities Summary:
U.S. importer of hazardous waste: No

Mixed waste (haz. and radioactive): No
Recycler of hazardous waste: No
Transporter of hazardous waste: No
Treater, storer or disposer of HW: No

| Map ID |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Direction |  | MAP FINDINGS |
| Distance |  | EDR ID Number |
| Elevation | Site |  |


| MAINTENANCE WAREHOUSE (Continued) |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Underground injection activity: | No |
| On-site burner exemption: | No |
| Furnace exemption: | No |
| Used oil fuel burner: | No |
| Used oil processor: | No |
| User oil refiner: | No |
| Used oil fuel marketer to burner: | No |
| Used oil Specification marketer: | No |
| Used oil transfer facility: | No |
| Used oil transporter: | No |

1004675989

Hazardous Waste Summary:

Waste code:
Waste name:

Waste code:
Waste name:

Violation Status:
D001
IGNITABLE HAZARDOUS WASTES ARE THOSE WASTES WHICH HAVE A FLASHPOINT OF LESS THAN 140 DEGREES FAHRENHEIT AS DETERMINED BY A PENSKY-MARTENS CLOSED CUP FLASH POINT TESTER. ANOTHER METHOD OF DETERMINING THE FLASH POINT OF A WASTE IS TO REVIEW THE MATERIAL SAFETY DATA SHEET, WHICH CAN BE OBTAINED FROM THE MANUFACTURER OR DISTRIBUTOR OF THE MATERIAL. LACQUER THINNER IS AN EXAMPLE OF A COMMONLY USED SOLVENT WHICH WOULD BE CONSIDERED AS IGNITABLE HAZARDOUS WASTE.

INDS:
Registry ID: 110002941390
Environmental Interest/Information System
RCRAInfo is a national information system that supports the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) program through the tracking of events and activities related to facilities that generate, transport, and treat, store, or dispose of hazardous waste. RCRAInfo allows RCRA program staff to track the notification, permit, compliance, and corrective action activities required under RCRA.

PLACER CO. MS:
Facility ID: FA0004314
Facility Status: Closed
Program Element Code: 2105
Program:
Record Num:
HAZMAT BUSINESS PLAN
District Code: 22
PR0007362


| Air District Name: | PLACER COUNTY APCD |
| :--- | :--- |
| Community Health Air Pollution Info System: | Not reported |
| Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: | Not reported |
| Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: | $2.9999999999999999 E-2$ |
| Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: | 0.0263076 |
| Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: | $6.0587200000000001 \mathrm{E}-2$ |
| NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: | 0.13392960000000001 |
| SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: | 0.0151468 |
| Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: | $1.7999999999999999 \mathrm{E}-2$ |
| Part. Matter 10 Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: | $1.7538399999999999 \mathrm{E}-2$ |
|  |  |
| Year: | 2010 |
| County Code: | 31 |
| Air Basin: | SV |
| Facility ID: | 898 |
| Air District Name: | PLA |
| SIC Code: | 5651 |
| Air District Name: | PLACER COUNTY APCD |
| Community Health Air Pollution Info System: | Not reported |
| Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: | Not reported |
| Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: | $6.4655910123102595 \mathrm{E}-2$ |
| Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: | $5.4097600000000003 \mathrm{E}-2$ |
| Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: | 0.1124672 |
| NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: | 0.26176959999999999 |
| SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: | $2.811680000000001 \mathrm{E}-2$ |
| Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: | 0.0301213114754098 |
| Part. Matter 10 Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: | $2.9398400000000002 \mathrm{E}-2$ |
| Year: |  |
| County Code: | 2011 |
| Air Basin: | 31 |
| Facility ID: | SV |
| Air District Name: | SIC Code: |
| Air District Name: | PLA |
| Community Health Air Pollution Info System: | Not reported |
| Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: | Not reported |
| Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: | 0.064655910123 |
| Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: | 0.0540976 |
| Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: | 0.1124672 |
| NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: | 0.2617696 |
| SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: | 0.0281168 |
| Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: | 0.030121311475 |
| Part. Matter 10 Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: | 0.0293984 |
|  |  |
| Year: | 2012 |
| County Code: | 31 |
| Air Basin: | FLACER COUNTY APCD |
| Facility ID: | Air District Name: |
| SIC Code: | Air District Name: |
| Community Health Air Pollution Info System: | Not reported |
| Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: | Not reported |
| Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: | 0.064655910123 |
| Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: | 0.0540976 |
| Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: | 0.1124672 |
|  |  |


| Site |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| GAP INC (Continued) |  |
| NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: | 0.2617696 |
| SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: | 0.0281168 |
| Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: |  |
| Part. Matter 10 Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: | 0.030121311475 |

E14

## South

1/8-1/4
0.230 mi .

1217 ft .
Relative:

## Lower

Actual: 135 ft .

## E15

## South

1/8-1/4
0.236 mi .
1247 ft .

Relative: Lower

Actual:
135 ft .

GAP INC. - ON LINE ORDERING AND CUSTOMER SERVICE
AST A100271611
3830 ATHERTON ROAD
N/A
ROCKLIN, CA 95765
Site 3 of 5 in cluster E
AST:
Owner: GAP INC. - TECHNICAL CENTER
Total Gallons: $\quad 4,000$
Certified Unified Program Agencies: Placer
$\qquad$

GEOCHEMICAL SERVICES, INC
CA PLACER CO. MS S109518315
3805 ATHERTON RD 6
ROCKLIN, CA 95765
Site 4 of 5 in cluster E
PLACER CO. MS:
Facility ID:
FA0001667
Facility Status:
Closed
Program Element Code: 2106
Program:
HAZMAT - ABOVE GROUND WITH WASTE
Record Num:
PR0002434
District Code:
18


| Direction |  | EDR ID Number <br> Distance <br> Elevation Site | Database(s)EPA ID Number |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 17 | THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP | NPDES | S106571359 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
| WSW | 1200 ATHENS AVENUE | Cortese | N/A |
| $1 / 4-1 / 2$ | LINCOLN, CA 95648 | ENF |  |
| 0.383 mi. |  | WDS |  |

## 2020 ft.

Relative: NPDES:

## Lower

Npdes Number: CA0084697
Facility Status: Active
Actual:
122 ft .
Agency Id: 485093
Region: 5S
Regulatory Measure Id: 373269
Order No:
Regulatory Measure Type:
R5-2010-0005
Place Id:
NPDES Permits
WDID: 5A31NP00001
Program Type:
NPDMUNIOTH
Adoption Date Of Regulatory Measure: 01/28/2010
Effective Date Of Regulatory Measure: 03/19/2010
Expiration Date Of Regulatory Measure: 01/01/2015
Termination Date Of Regulatory Measure: Not reported
Discharge Name:
United Auburn Indian Community
Discharge Address: 10720 Indian Hill Road
Discharge City:
Discharge State:
Discharge Zip:
Auburn
CA
95603-9403

CORTESE:

Region:
Envirostor Id:
Site/Facility Type:
Cleanup Status:
Status Date:
Site Code:
Latitude:
Longitude:
Owner:
Enf Type:
Swat R:
Flag:
Order No:
Waste Discharge System No:
Effective Date:
Region 2:
WID Id:
Solid Waste Id No:
Waste Management Uit Name:

ENF:
Region: 5 S
Facility Id:
Agency Name:
Place Type:
Place Subtype:
Facility Type:
Agency Type:
\# Of Agencies:
Place Latitude:

CORTESE
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
CORTESE
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported

206730
Not reported
All Other
Dredge/Fill Site
Municipal/Domestic
Not reported
Not reported
38.839044999999

EDR ID Number EPA ID Number

3269

206730

Database(s)

WDS

| Distance |  | EDR ID Number <br> Elevation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Site |  |  |$\quad$ Database(s) | EPA ID Number |
| :--- |

## THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)

| Place Longitude: | -121.307402 |
| :---: | :---: |
| SIC Code 1: | 1522 |
| SIC Desc 1: | General Contractors-Residential Buildings, Other Than Single-Family |
| SIC Code 2: | 7011 |
| SIC Desc 2: | Hotels and Motels |
| SIC Code 3: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 3: | Not reported |
| \# Of Places: | 1 |
| Source Of Facility: | Enf Action |
| Design Flow: | Not reported |
| Threat To Water Quality: | Not reported |
| Complexity: | Not reported |
| Pretreatment: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 2: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 3: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 4: | Not reported |
| Program: | Not reported |
| Program Category1: | Not reported |
| Program Category2: | NPDESWW |
| \# Of Programs: | Not reported |
| WDID: | Not reported |
| Reg Measure Id: | Not reported |
| Reg Measure Type: | Not reported |
| Region: | Not reported |
| Order \#: | Not reported |
| Npdes\# CA\#: | Not reported |
| Major-Minor: | Not reported |
| Npdes Type: | Not reported |
| Reclamation: | Not reported |
| Dredge Fill Fee: | Not reported |
| 301H: | Not reported |
| Application Fee Amt Received: | Not reported |
| Status: | Not reported |
| Status Date: | Not reported |
| Effective Date: | Not reported |
| Expiration/Review Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Amend: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Revise/Renew: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Rescind: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - No Action Required: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Pending: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Planned: | Not reported |
| Status Enrollee: | Not reported |
| Individual/General: | Not reported |
| Fee Code: | Not reported |
| Direction/Voice: | Not reported |
| Enforcement Id(EID): | 255804 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order / Resolution Number: | R5-2005-0033 |


| Distance |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Elevation | Site |$\quad$| EDR ID Number |
| :--- |

## THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)

S106571359

| Enforcement Action Type: | Cease and Desist Order |
| :---: | :---: |
| Effective Date: | 03/17/2005 |
| Adoption/Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Achieve Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | 12/06/2012 |
| ACL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| EPL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Status: | Historical |
| Title: | CDO R5-2005-0033 for United Auburn Indian Community |
| Description: | Cease and Desist Order issued in conjunction with NPDES permit that contained effluent limitations for aluminum, atrazine, boron, fluoride, MBAS, nitrate, EC, sulfate, arsenic, total trihalomethanes, persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides, ammonia |
| Program: | NPDESWW |
| Latest Milestone Completion Date: | Not reported |
| \# Of Programs1: | 1 |
| Total Assessment Amount: | 0 |
| Initial Assessed Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Project \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Paid: | 0 |
| Project \$ Completed: | 0 |
| Total \$ Paid/Completed Amount: | 0 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Facility Id: | 206730 |
| Agency Name: | United Auburn Indian Community |
| Place Type: | All Other |
| Place Subtype: | Dredge/Fill Site |
| Facility Type: | Municipal/Domestic |
| Agency Type: | Other |
| \# Of Agencies: | 1 |
| Place Latitude: | 38.839044999999 |
| Place Longitude: | -121.307402 |
| SIC Code 1: | 1522 |
| SIC Desc 1: | General Contractors-Residential Buildings, Other Than Single-Family |
| SIC Code 2: | 7011 |
| SIC Desc 2: | Hotels and Motels |
| SIC Code 3: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 3: | Not reported |
| \# Of Places: | 1 |
| Source Of Facility: | Reg Meas |
| Design Flow: | 0.10000000 |
| Threat To Water Quality: | 2 |
| Complexity: | B |
| Pretreatment: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 2: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 3: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 4: | Not reported |

Elevation Site $\quad$ Database(s)

## THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)

| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| :---: | :---: |
| Program Category1: | NPDESWW |
| Program Category2: | NPDESWW |
| \# Of Programs: | 1 |
| WDID: | 5A31NP00001 |
| Reg Measure Id: | 373269 |
| Reg Measure Type: | NPDES Permits |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order \#: | R5-2010-0005 |
| Npdes\# CA\#: | CA0084697 |
| Major-Minor: | Minor |
| Npdes Type: | MUN |
| Reclamation: | N - No |
| Dredge Fill Fee: | Not reported |
| 301H: | N |
| Application Fee Amt Received: | Not reported |
| Status: | Active |
| Status Date: | 01/13/2014 |
| Effective Date: | 03/19/2010 |
| Expiration/Review Date: | 01/01/2015 |
| Termination Date: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Amend: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Revise/Renew: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Rescind: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - No Action Required: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Pending: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Planned: | Not reported |
| Status Enrollee: | N |
| Individual/General: | 1 |
| Fee Code: | 66 - NPDES Based on Flow |
| Direction/Voice: | Passive |
| Enforcement Id(EID): | 396057 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order / Resolution Number: | Not reported |
| Enforcement Action Type: | Notice of Violation |
| Effective Date: | 04/30/2014 |
| Adoption/Issuance Date: | 04/30/2014 |
| Achieve Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | 04/30/2014 |
| ACL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| EPL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Status: | Historical |
| Title: | NOV 04/30/2014 for United Auburn Indian Community |
| Description: | Not reported |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Latest Milestone Completion Date: | Not reported |
| \# Of Programs1: | 1 |
| Total Assessment Amount: | 0 |
| Initial Assessed Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Project \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Paid: | 0 |
| Project \$ Completed: | 0 |
| Total \$ Paid/Completed Amount: | 0 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Facility Id: | 206730 |


| Distance |  | EDR ID Number <br> Elevation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Site |  |  |$\quad$ Database(s) | EPA ID Number |
| :--- |

THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)
S106571359

| Agency Name: | United Auburn Indian Community |
| :---: | :---: |
| Place Type: | All Other |
| Place Subtype: | Dredge/Fill Site |
| Facility Type: | Municipal/Domestic |
| Agency Type: | Other |
| \# Of Agencies: | 1 |
| Place Latitude: | 38.839044999999 |
| Place Longitude: | -121.307402 |
| SIC Code 1: | 1522 |
| SIC Desc 1: | General Contractors-Residential Buildings, Other Than Single-Family |
| SIC Code 2: | 7011 |
| SIC Desc 2: | Hotels and Motels |
| SIC Code 3: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 3: | Not reported |
| \# Of Places: | 1 |
| Source Of Facility: | Reg Meas |
| Design Flow: | 0.10000000 |
| Threat To Water Quality: | 2 |
| Complexity: | B |
| Pretreatment: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 2: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 3: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 4: | Not reported |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Program Category1: | NPDESWW |
| Program Category2: | NPDESWW |
| \# Of Programs: | 1 |
| WDID: | 5A31NP00001 |
| Reg Measure Id: | 373269 |
| Reg Measure Type: | NPDES Permits |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order \#: | R5-2010-0005 |
| Npdes\# CA\#: | CA0084697 |
| Major-Minor: | Minor |
| Npdes Type: | MUN |
| Reclamation: | N-No |
| Dredge Fill Fee: | Not reported |
| 301H: | N |
| Application Fee Amt Received: | Not reported |
| Status: | Active |
| Status Date: | 01/13/2014 |
| Effective Date: | 03/19/2010 |
| Expiration/Review Date: | 01/01/2015 |
| Termination Date: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Amend: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Revise/Renew: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Rescind: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - No Action Required: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Pending: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Planned: | Not reported |


| Distance |  |  | EDR ID Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elevation | Site | Database(s) | EPA ID Number |

THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)
S106571359

| Status Enrollee: | N |
| :---: | :---: |
| Individual/General: | 1 |
| Fee Code: | 66 - NPDES Based on Flow |
| Direction/Voice: | Passive |
| Enforcement Id(EID): | 392710 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order / Resolution Number: | Not reported |
| Enforcement Action Type: | Notice of Violation |
| Effective Date: | 08/12/2013 |
| Adoption/Issuance Date: | 08/12/2013 |
| Achieve Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | 08/12/2013 |
| ACL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| EPL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Status: | Historical |
| Title: | NOV 08/30/2013 for United Auburn Indian Community |
| Description: | Not reported |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Latest Milestone Completion Date: | Not reported |
| \# Of Programs1: | 1 |
| Total Assessment Amount: | 0 |
| Initial Assessed Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Project \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Paid: | 0 |
| Project \$ Completed: | 0 |
| Total \$ Paid/Completed Amount: | 0 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Facility Id: | 206730 |
| Agency Name: | United Auburn Indian Community |
| Place Type: | All Other |
| Place Subtype: | Dredge/Fill Site |
| Facility Type: | Municipal/Domestic |
| Agency Type: | Other |
| \# Of Agencies: | 1 |
| Place Latitude: | 38.839044999999 |
| Place Longitude: | -121.307402 |
| SIC Code 1: | 1522 |
| SIC Desc 1: | General Contractors-Residential Buildings, Other Than Single-Family |
| SIC Code 2: | 7011 |
| SIC Desc 2: | Hotels and Motels |
| SIC Code 3: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 3: | Not reported |
| \# Of Places: | 1 |
| Source Of Facility: | Reg Meas |
| Design Flow: | 0.10000000 |
| Threat To Water Quality: | 2 |
| Complexity: | B |
| Pretreatment: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type: | Not reported |


| Facility Waste Type 2: | Not reported |
| :---: | :---: |
| Facility Waste Type 3: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 4: | Not reported |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Program Category1: | NPDESWW |
| Program Category2: | NPDESWW |
| \# Of Programs: | 1 |
| WDID: | 5A31NP00001 |
| Reg Measure Id: | 373269 |
| Reg Measure Type: | NPDES Permits |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order \#: | R5-2010-0005 |
| Npdes\# CA\#: | CA0084697 |
| Major-Minor: | Minor |
| Npdes Type: | MUN |
| Reclamation: | N - No |
| Dredge Fill Fee: | Not reported |
| 301H: | N |
| Application Fee Amt Received: | Not reported |
| Status: | Active |
| Status Date: | 01/13/2014 |
| Effective Date: | 03/19/2010 |
| Expiration/Review Date: | 01/01/2015 |
| Termination Date: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Amend: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Revise/Renew: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Rescind: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - No Action Required: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Pending: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Planned: | Not reported |
| Status Enrollee: | N |
| Individual/General: | 1 |
| Fee Code: | 66 - NPDES Based on Flow |
| Direction/Voice: | Passive |
| Enforcement Id(EID): | 392709 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order / Resolution Number: | Not reported |
| Enforcement Action Type: | Notice of Violation |
| Effective Date: | 08/12/2013 |
| Adoption/Issuance Date: | 08/12/2013 |
| Achieve Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | 08/12/2013 |
| ACL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| EPL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Status: | Historical |
| Title: | NOV 08/12/2013 for United Auburn Indian Community |
| Description: | Not reported |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Latest Milestone Completion Date: | Not reported |
| \# Of Programs1: | 1 |
| Total Assessment Amount: | 0 |
| Initial Assessed Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Project \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Paid: | 0 |
| Project \$ Completed: | 0 |
| Total \$ Paid/Completed Amount: | 0 |


| Distance |  | EDR ID Number <br> Elevation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Site |  |  |$\quad$ Database(s) | EPA ID Number |
| :--- |

THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)
S106571359

| Region: | 5S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Facility Id: | 206730 |
| Agency Name: | United Auburn Indian Community |
| Place Type: | All Other |
| Place Subtype: | Dredge/Fill Site |
| Facility Type: | Municipal/Domestic |
| Agency Type: | Other |
| \# Of Agencies: | 1 |
| Place Latitude: | 38.839044999999 |
| Place Longitude: | -121.307402 |
| SIC Code 1: | 1522 |
| SIC Desc 1: | General Contractors-Residential Buildings, Other Than Single-Family |
| SIC Code 2: | 7011 |
| SIC Desc 2: | Hotels and Motels |
| SIC Code 3: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 3: | Not reported |
| \# Of Places: | 1 |
| Source Of Facility: | Reg Meas |
| Design Flow: | 0.10000000 |
| Threat To Water Quality: | 2 |
| Complexity: | B |
| Pretreatment: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 2: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 3: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 4: | Not reported |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Program Category1: | NPDESWW |
| Program Category2: | NPDESWW |
| \# Of Programs: | Not reported |
| WDID: | Not reported |
| Reg Measure Id: | Not reported |
| Reg Measure Type: | Not reported |
| Region: |  |
| Order \#: | Active |
| Npdes\# CA\#: |  |


| Distance |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Elevation | Site | Database(s) | EDR ID Number <br> EPA ID Number |

## THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)

S106571359

| WDR Review - Pending: | Not reported |
| :---: | :---: |
| WDR Review - Planned: | Not reported |
| Status Enrollee: | N |
| Individual/General: | 1 |
| Fee Code: | 66 - NPDES Based on Flow |
| Direction/Voice: | Passive |
| Enforcement Id(EID): | 386767 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order / Resolution Number: | Not reported |
| Enforcement Action Type: | Notice of Violation |
| Effective Date: | 07/31/2012 |
| Adoption/Issuance Date: | 07/31/2012 |
| Achieve Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | 07/31/2012 |
| ACL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| EPL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Status: | Historical |
| Title: | NOV 07/31/2012 for United Auburn Indian Community, Auburn Rancheria Casino WWTP |
| Description: | During the monitoring periods June 2012 and Second Quarter 2012 the discharge violated the limitations contained in the WDRs. |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Latest Milestone Completion Date: | Not reported |
| \# Of Programs1: | 1 |
| Total Assessment Amount: | 0 |
| Initial Assessed Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Project \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Paid: | 0 |
| Project \$ Completed: | 0 |
| Total \$ Paid/Completed Amount: | 0 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Facility Id: | 206730 |
| Agency Name: | United Auburn Indian Community |
| Place Type: | All Other |
| Place Subtype: | Dredge/Fill Site |
| Facility Type: | Municipal/Domestic |
| Agency Type: | Other |
| \# Of Agencies: | 1 |
| Place Latitude: | 38.839044999999 |
| Place Longitude: | -121.307402 |
| SIC Code 1: | 1522 |
| SIC Desc 1: | General Contractors-Residential Buildings, Other Than Single-Family |
| SIC Code 2: | 7011 |
| SIC Desc 2: | Hotels and Motels |
| SIC Code 3: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 3: | Not reported |
| \# Of Places: | 1 |
| Source Of Facility: | Reg Meas |


| Distance |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Elevation | Site |$\quad$| EDR ID Number |
| :--- |

THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)

| Design Flow: | 0.10000000 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Threat To Water Quality: | 2 |
| Complexity: | B |
| Pretreatment: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 2: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 3: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 4: | Not reported |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Program Category1: | NPDESWW |
| Program Category2: | NPDESWW |
| \# Of Programs: | 1 |
| WDID: | 5A31NP00001 |
| Reg Measure Id: | 373269 |
| Reg Measure Type: | NPDES Permits |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order \#: | R5-2010-0005 |
| Npdes\# CA\#: | CA0084697 |
| Major-Minor: | Minor |
| Npdes Type: | MUN |
| Reclamation: | N - No |
| Dredge Fill Fee: | Not reported |
| 301H: | N |
| Application Fee Amt Received: | Not reported |
| Status: | Active |
| Status Date: | 01/13/2014 |
| Effective Date: | 03/19/2010 |
| Expiration/Review Date: | 01/01/2015 |
| Termination Date: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Amend: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Revise/Renew: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Rescind: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - No Action Required: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Pending: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Planned: | Not reported |
| Status Enrollee: | N |
| Individual/General: | 1 |
| Fee Code: | 66 - NPDES Based on Flow |
| Direction/Voice: | Passive |
| Enforcement Id(EID): | 386611 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order / Resolution Number: | Not reported |
| Enforcement Action Type: | Notice of Violation |
| Effective Date: | 07/20/2012 |
| Adoption/Issuance Date: | 07/20/2012 |
| Achieve Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | 07/20/2012 |
| ACL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| EPL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Status: | Historical |
| Title: | NOV 07/20/2012 for United Auburn Indian Community, Auburn Rancheria Casino WWTP |
| Description: | During the monitoring period May 2012 the discharge violated the limitations contained in the WDRs. |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Latest Milestone Completion Date: | Not reported |
| \# Of Programs1: | 1 |


| Distance |  |  | EDR ID Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elevation | Site | Database(s) | EPA ID Number |

THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)
S106571359

| Total Assessment Amount: | 0 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Initial Assessed Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Project \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Paid: | 0 |
| Project \$ Completed: | 0 |
| Total \$ Paid/Completed Amount: | 0 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Facility Id: | 206730 |
| Agency Name: | United Auburn Indian Community |
| Place Type: | All Other |
| Place Subtype: | Dredge/Fill Site |
| Facility Type: | Municipal/Domestic |
| Agency Type: | Other |
| \# Of Agencies: | 1 |
| Place Latitude: | 38.839044999999 |
| Place Longitude: | -121.307402 |
| SIC Code 1: | 1522 |
| SIC Desc 1: | General Contractors-Residential Buildings, Other Than Single-Family |
| SIC Code 2: | 7011 |
| SIC Desc 2: | Hotels and Motels |
| SIC Code 3: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 3: | Not reported |
| \# Of Places: | 1 |
| Source Of Facility: | Reg Meas |
| Design Flow: | 0.10000000 |
| Threat To Water Quality: | 2 |
| Complexity: | B |
| Pretreatment: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 2 : | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 3: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 4: | Not reported |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Program Category1: | NPDESWW |
| Program Category2: | NPDESWW |
| \# Of Programs: | 1 |
| WDID: | 5A31NP00001 |
| Reg Measure Id: | 373269 |
| Reg Measure Type: | NPDES Permits |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order \#: | R5-2010-0005 |
| Npdes\# CA\#: | CA0084697 |
| Major-Minor: | Minor |
| Npdes Type: | MUN |
| Reclamation: | N - No |
| Dredge Fill Fee: | Not reported |
| 301H: | N |
| Application Fee Amt Received: | Not reported |
| Status: | Active |


| Distance |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Elevation | Site | Database(s) | EDR ID Number <br> EPA ID Number |

## THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)

S106571359

| Status Date: | 01/13/2014 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Effective Date: | 03/19/2010 |
| Expiration/Review Date: | 01/01/2015 |
| Termination Date: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Amend: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Revise/Renew: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Rescind: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - No Action Required: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Pending: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Planned: | Not reported |
| Status Enrollee: | N |
| Individual/General: | 1 |
| Fee Code: | 66 - NPDES Based on Flow |
| Direction/Voice: | Passive |
| Enforcement Id(EID): | 385933 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order / Resolution Number: | Not reported |
| Enforcement Action Type: | Notice of Violation |
| Effective Date: | 06/27/2012 |
| Adoption/Issuance Date: | 06/27/2012 |
| Achieve Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | 06/27/2012 |
| ACL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| EPL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Status: | Historical |
| Title: | NOV 06/27/2012 for United Auburn Indian Community, Auburn Rancheria Casino WWTP |
| Description: | During the monitoring period April 2012 the discharge violated the limitations contained in the WDRs. |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Latest Milestone Completion Date: | Not reported |
| \# Of Programs1: | 1 |
| Total Assessment Amount: | 0 |
| Initial Assessed Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Project \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Paid: | 0 |
| Project \$ Completed: | 0 |
| Total \$ Paid/Completed Amount: | 0 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Facility Id: | 206730 |
| Agency Name: | United Auburn Indian Community |
| Place Type: | All Other |
| Place Subtype: | Dredge/Fill Site |
| Facility Type: | Municipal/Domestic |
| Agency Type: | Other |
| \# Of Agencies: | 1 |
| Place Latitude: | 38.839044999999 |
| Place Longitude: | -121.307402 |
| SIC Code 1: | 1522 |
| SIC Desc 1: | General Contractors-Residential Buildings, Other Than Single-Family |
| SIC Code 2: | 7011 |
| SIC Desc 2: | Hotels and Motels |
| SIC Code 3: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 1: | Not reported |


| NAICS Desc 1: | Not reported |
| :---: | :---: |
| NAICS Code 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 3: | Not reported |
| \# Of Places: | 1 |
| Source Of Facility: | Reg Meas |
| Design Flow: | 0.10000000 |
| Threat To Water Quality: | 2 |
| Complexity: | B |
| Pretreatment: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 2: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 3: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 4: | Not reported |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Program Category1: | NPDESWW |
| Program Category2: | NPDESWW |
| \# Of Programs: | 1 |
| WDID: | 5A31NP00001 |
| Reg Measure Id: | 373269 |
| Reg Measure Type: | NPDES Permits |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order \#: | R5-2010-0005 |
| Npdes\# CA\#: | CA0084697 |
| Major-Minor: | Minor |
| Npdes Type: | MUN |
| Reclamation: | N - No |
| Dredge Fill Fee: | Not reported |
| 301H: | N |
| Application Fee Amt Received: | Not reported |
| Status: | Active |
| Status Date: | 01/13/2014 |
| Effective Date: | 03/19/2010 |
| Expiration/Review Date: | 01/01/2015 |
| Termination Date: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Amend: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Revise/Renew: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Rescind: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - No Action Required: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Pending: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Planned: | Not reported |
| Status Enrollee: | N |
| Individual/General: | 1 |
| Fee Code: | 66 - NPDES Based on Flow |
| Direction/Voice: | Passive |
| Enforcement Id(EID): | 385196 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order / Resolution Number: | Not reported |
| Enforcement Action Type: | Notice of Violation |
| Effective Date: | 05/09/2012 |
| Adoption/Issuance Date: | 05/09/2012 |
| Achieve Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | 05/09/2012 |
| ACL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| EPL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Status: | Historical |


| Distance |  | EDR ID Number <br> Elevation <br> Site |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | | Database(s) |
| :--- |
| EPA ID Number |

THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)

| Title: | NOV 05/09/2012 for United Auburn Indian Community, Auburn Rancheria |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Casino WWTP |
| Description: | During the monitoring period March 2012 the discharge |
|  | violated the limitations contained in the WDRs. |
| Program: | NPDMUNITH |
| Latest Milestone Completion Date: | Not reported |
| \# Of Programs1: | 1 |
| Total Assessment Amount: | 0 |
| Initial Assessed Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Project \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Paid: | 0 |
| Project \$ Completed: | 0 |
| Total \$ Paid/Completed Amount: | 0 |
|  |  |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Facility Id: | 206730 |
| Agency Name: | United Auburn Indian Community |
| Place Type: | All Other |
| Place Subtype: | Dredge/Fill Site |
| Facility Type: | Municipal/Domestic |
| Agency Type: | Other |
| \# Of Agencies: | 1 |
| Place Latitude: | 38.839044999999 |
| Place Longitude: | -121.307402 |
| SIC Code 1: | 1522 |
| SIC Desc 1: | General Contractors-Residential Buildings, Other Than Single-Family |
| SIC Code 2: | 7011 |
| SIC Desc 2: | Hotels and Motels |
| SIC Code 3: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 3: | Not reported |
| \# Of Places: | 1 |
| Source Of Facility: | Reg Meneas |
| Design Flow: | 0.10000000 |
| Threat To Water Quality: | 2 |
| Complexity: | B |
| Pretreatment: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 2: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 3: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 4: | Not reported |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Program Category1: | NPDESWW |
| Program Category2: | \# Of Programs: |
| WDID: | Reg Measure Id: |


| Distance |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Elevation | Site | Database(s) | EDR ID Number <br> EPA ID Number |

## THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)

| Major-Minor: | Minor |
| :---: | :---: |
| Npdes Type: | MUN |
| Reclamation: | N - No |
| Dredge Fill Fee: | Not reported |
| 301H: | N |
| Application Fee Amt Received: | Not reported |
| Status: | Active |
| Status Date: | 01/13/2014 |
| Effective Date: | 03/19/2010 |
| Expiration/Review Date: | 01/01/2015 |
| Termination Date: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Amend: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Revise/Renew: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Rescind: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - No Action Required: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Pending: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Planned: | Not reported |
| Status Enrollee: | N |
| Individual/General: | 1 |
| Fee Code: | 66 - NPDES Based on Flow |
| Direction/Voice: | Passive |
| Enforcement Id(EID): | 383564 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order / Resolution Number: | Not reported |
| Enforcement Action Type: | Notice of Violation |
| Effective Date: | 02/23/2012 |
| Adoption/Issuance Date: | 02/23/2012 |
| Achieve Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | 02/23/2012 |
| ACL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| EPL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Status: | Historical |
| Title: | NOV 02/23/2012 for United Auburn Indian Community, Auburn Rancheria Casino WWTP |
| Description: | During the monitoring period December 2011 the discharge violated the limitations contained in the WDRs. |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Latest Milestone Completion Date: | Not reported |
| \# Of Programs1: | 1 |
| Total Assessment Amount: | 0 |
| Initial Assessed Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Project \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Paid: | 0 |
| Project \$ Completed: | 0 |
| Total \$ Paid/Completed Amount: | 0 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Facility Id: | 206730 |
| Agency Name: | United Auburn Indian Community |
| Place Type: | All Other |
| Place Subtype: | Dredge/Fill Site |
| Facility Type: | Municipal/Domestic |
| Agency Type: | Other |
| \# Of Agencies: | 1 |
| Place Latitude: | 38.839044999999 |
| Place Longitude: | -121.307402 |


| Distance | Site | Database(s)EDR ID Number <br> Elevation <br> EPA ID Number |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

## THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)

| SIC Code 1: | 1522 |
| :---: | :---: |
| SIC Desc 1: | General Contractors-Residential Buildings, Other Than Single-Family |
| SIC Code 2: | 7011 |
| SIC Desc 2: | Hotels and Motels |
| SIC Code 3: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 3: | Not reported |
| \# Of Places: | 1 |
| Source Of Facility: | Reg Meas |
| Design Flow: | 0.10000000 |
| Threat To Water Quality: | 2 |
| Complexity: | B |
| Pretreatment: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 2: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 3: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 4: | Not reported |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Program Category1: | NPDESWW |
| Program Category2: | NPDESWW |
| \# Of Programs: | 1 |
| WDID: | 5A31NP00001 |
| Reg Measure Id: | 373269 |
| Reg Measure Type: | NPDES Permits |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order \#: | R5-2010-0005 |
| Npdes\# CA\#: | CA0084697 |
| Major-Minor: | Minor |
| Npdes Type: | MUN |
| Reclamation: | N - No |
| Dredge Fill Fee: | Not reported |
| 301H: | N |
| Application Fee Amt Received: | Not reported |
| Status: | Active |
| Status Date: | 01/13/2014 |
| Effective Date: | 03/19/2010 |
| Expiration/Review Date: | 01/01/2015 |
| Termination Date: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Amend: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Revise/Renew: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Rescind: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - No Action Required: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Pending: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Planned: | Not reported |
| Status Enrollee: | N |
| Individual/General: | 1 |
| Fee Code: | 66 - NPDES Based on Flow |
| Direction/Voice: | Passive |
| Enforcement Id(EID): | 383074 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order / Resolution Number: | Not reported |
| Enforcement Action Type: | Notice of Violation |


| Distance |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Elevation | Site |$\quad$| EDR ID Number |
| :--- |

THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)
S106571359

| Effective Date: | 01/24/2012 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Adoption/Issuance Date: | 01/24/2012 |
| Achieve Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | 01/24/2012 |
| ACL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| EPL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Status: | Historical |
| Title: | NOV 01/24/2012 for United Auburn Indian Community, Auburn Rancheria Casino WWTP |
| Description: | During the monitoring periods October 2011 and November 2011 the discharge violated the limitations contained in the WDRs. |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Latest Milestone Completion Date: | Not reported |
| \# Of Programs1: | 1 |
| Total Assessment Amount: | 0 |
| Initial Assessed Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Project \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Paid: | 0 |
| Project \$ Completed: | 0 |
| Total \$ Paid/Completed Amount: | 0 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Facility Id: | 206730 |
| Agency Name: | United Auburn Indian Community |
| Place Type: | All Other |
| Place Subtype: | Dredge/Fill Site |
| Facility Type: | Municipal/Domestic |
| Agency Type: | Other |
| \# Of Agencies: | 1 |
| Place Latitude: | 38.839044999999 |
| Place Longitude: | -121.307402 |
| SIC Code 1: | 1522 |
| SIC Desc 1: | General Contractors-Residential Buildings, Other Than Single-Family |
| SIC Code 2: | 7011 |
| SIC Desc 2: | Hotels and Motels |
| SIC Code 3: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 3: | Not reported |
| \# Of Places: | 1 |
| Source Of Facility: | Reg Meas |
| Design Flow: | 0.10000000 |
| Threat To Water Quality: | 2 |
| Complexity: | B |
| Pretreatment: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 2: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 3: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 4: | Not reported |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Program Category1: | NPDESWW |

Distance
Elevation
$\underline{\text { Site }} \quad \underline{\text { Database(s) }}$

## THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)

| Program Category2: | NPDESWW |
| :---: | :---: |
| \# Of Programs: | 1 |
| WDID: | 5A31NP00001 |
| Reg Measure Id: | 373269 |
| Reg Measure Type: | NPDES Permits |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order \#: | R5-2010-0005 |
| Npdes\# CA\#: | CA0084697 |
| Major-Minor: | Minor |
| Npdes Type: | MUN |
| Reclamation: | N - No |
| Dredge Fill Fee: | Not reported |
| 301H: | N |
| Application Fee Amt Received: | Not reported |
| Status: | Active |
| Status Date: | 01/13/2014 |
| Effective Date: | 03/19/2010 |
| Expiration/Review Date: | 01/01/2015 |
| Termination Date: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Amend: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Revise/Renew: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Rescind: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - No Action Required: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Pending: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Planned: | Not reported |
| Status Enrollee: | N |
| Individual/General: | 1 |
| Fee Code: | 66 - NPDES Based on Flow |
| Direction/Voice: | Passive |
| Enforcement Id(EID): | 382609 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order / Resolution Number: | Not reported |
| Enforcement Action Type: | Notice of Violation |
| Effective Date: | 12/23/2011 |
| Adoption/Issuance Date: | 12/23/2011 |
| Achieve Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | 12/23/2011 |
| ACL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| EPL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Status: | Historical |
| Title: | NOV 12/23/2011 for United Auburn Indian Community, Auburn Rancheria Casino WWTP |
| Description: | During the monitoring periods July 2011, August 2011, and September 2011 the discharge violated the limitation contained in the WDRs. |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Latest Milestone Completion Date: | Not reported |
| \# Of Programs1: | 1 |
| Total Assessment Amount: | 0 |
| Initial Assessed Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Project \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Paid: | 0 |
| Project \$ Completed: | 0 |
| Total \$ Paid/Completed Amount: | 0 |
| Region: | 5S |


| Distance | Site | Database(s)EDR ID Number <br> Elevation <br> EPA ID Number |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

## THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)

S106571359

| Facility Id: | 206730 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency Name: | United Auburn Indian Community |
| Place Type: | All Other |
| Place Subtype: | Dredge/Fill Site |
| Facility Type: | Municipal/Domestic |
| Agency Type: | Other |
| \# Of Agencies: | 1 |
| Place Latitude: | 38.839044999999 |
| Place Longitude: | -121.307402 |
| SIC Code 1: | 1522 |
| SIC Desc 1: | General Contractors-Residential Buildings, Other Than Single-Family |
| SIC Code 2: | 7011 |
| SIC Desc 2: | Hotels and Motels |
| SIC Code 3: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 3: | Not reported |
| \# Of Places: | 1 |
| Source Of Facility: | Reg Meas |
| Design Flow: | 0.10000000 |
| Threat To Water Quality: | 2 |
| Complexity: | B |
| Pretreatment: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 2: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 3: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 4: | Not reported |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Program Category1: | NPDESWW |
| Program Category2: | NPDESWW |
| \# Of Programs: | 1 |
| WDID: | 5A31NP00001 |
| Reg Measure Id: | 373269 |
| Reg Measure Type: | NPDES Permits |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order \#: | R5-2010-0005 |
| Npdes\# CA\#: | CA0084697 |
| Major-Minor: | Minor |
| Npdes Type: | MUN |
| Reclamation: | N-No |
| Dredge Fill Fee: | Not reported |
| 301H: | N |
| Application Fee Amt Received: | Not reported |
| Status: | Active |
| Status Date: | 01/13/2014 |
| Effective Date: | 03/19/2010 |
| Expiration/Review Date: | 01/01/2015 |
| Termination Date: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Amend: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Revise/Renew: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Rescind: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - No Action Required: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Pending: | Not reported |


| Distance |  |  | EDR ID Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elevation | Site | Database(s) | EPA ID Number |

## THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)

S106571359

| WDR Review - Planned: | Not reported |
| :---: | :---: |
| Status Enrollee: | N |
| Individual/General: | 1 |
| Fee Code: | 66 - NPDES Based on Flow |
| Direction/Voice: | Passive |
| Enforcement Id(EID): | 381344 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order / Resolution Number: | Not reported |
| Enforcement Action Type: | Notice of Violation |
| Effective Date: | 09/07/2011 |
| Adoption/Issuance Date: | 09/07/2011 |
| Achieve Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | 09/07/2011 |
| ACL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| EPL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Status: | Historical |
| Title: | NOV 09/07/2011 for United Auburn Indian Community, Auburn Rancheria Casino WWTP |
| Description: | Not reported |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Latest Milestone Completion Date: | Not reported |
| \# Of Programs1: | 1 |
| Total Assessment Amount: | 0 |
| Initial Assessed Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Project \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Paid: | 0 |
| Project \$ Completed: | 0 |
| Total \$ Paid/Completed Amount: | 0 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Facility Id: | 206730 |
| Agency Name: | United Auburn Indian Community |
| Place Type: | All Other |
| Place Subtype: | Dredge/Fill Site |
| Facility Type: | Municipal/Domestic |
| Agency Type: | Other |
| \# Of Agencies: | 1 |
| Place Latitude: | 38.839044999999 |
| Place Longitude: | -121.307402 |
| SIC Code 1: | 1522 |
| SIC Desc 1: | General Contractors-Residential Buildings, Other Than Single-Family |
| SIC Code 2: | 7011 |
| SIC Desc 2: | Hotels and Motels |
| SIC Code 3: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 3: | Not reported |
| \# Of Places: | 1 |
| Source Of Facility: | Reg Meas |
| Design Flow: | 0.10000000 |
| Threat To Water Quality: | 2 |
| Complexity: | B |


| Distance |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Elevation | Site |$\quad$| EDR ID Number |
| :--- |

THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)
S106571359

| Pretreatment: | Not reported |
| :---: | :---: |
| Facility Waste Type: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 2: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 3: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 4: | Not reported |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Program Category1: | NPDESWW |
| Program Category2: | NPDESWW |
| \# Of Programs: | 1 |
| WDID: | 5A31NP00001 |
| Reg Measure Id: | 373269 |
| Reg Measure Type: | NPDES Permits |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order \#: | R5-2010-0005 |
| Npdes\# CA\#: | CA0084697 |
| Major-Minor: | Minor |
| Npdes Type: | MUN |
| Reclamation: | N - No |
| Dredge Fill Fee: | Not reported |
| 301H: | N |
| Application Fee Amt Received: | Not reported |
| Status: | Active |
| Status Date: | 01/13/2014 |
| Effective Date: | 03/19/2010 |
| Expiration/Review Date: | 01/01/2015 |
| Termination Date: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Amend: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Revise/Renew: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Rescind: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - No Action Required: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Pending: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Planned: | Not reported |
| Status Enrollee: | N |
| Individual/General: | 1 |
| Fee Code: | 66 - NPDES Based on Flow |
| Direction/Voice: | Passive |
| Enforcement Id(EID): | 378868 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order / Resolution Number: | Not reported |
| Enforcement Action Type: | Notice of Violation |
| Effective Date: | 04/25/2011 |
| Adoption/Issuance Date: | 04/25/2011 |
| Achieve Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | 04/25/2011 |
| ACL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| EPL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Status: | Historical |
| Title: | NOV 04/25/2011 for United Auburn Indian Comm, Auburn Rancheria Casino WWTP |
| Description: | pH samples taken more than once per day, but only one result reported. Discharger is required by the WDR to report all sample analyses. |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Latest Milestone Completion Date: | Not reported |
| \# Of Programs1: | 1 |
| Total Assessment Amount: | 0 |
| Initial Assessed Amount: | 0 |


| Distance |  |  | EDR ID Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elevation | Site | Database(s) | EPA ID Number |

THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)
S106571359

Liability \$ Amount: 0
Project \$ Amount: 0
Liability \$ Paid: 0
Project \$ Completed: 0
Total \$ Paid/Completed Amount: 0
Region:
Facility Id:
Agency Name:
Place Type:
Place Subtype:
Facility Type:
Agency Type:
\# Of Agencies:
Place Latitude:
Place Longitude:
SIC Code 1:
SIC Desc 1:
SIC Code 2:
SIC Desc 2:
SIC Code 3:
SIC Desc 3:
NAICS Code 1:
NAICS Desc 1:
NAICS Code 2:
NAICS Desc 2:
NAICS Code 3:
NAICS Desc 3:
\# Of Places:
Source Of Facility:
Design Flow:
Threat To Water Quality:
Complexity:
Pretreatment:
Facility Waste Type:
Facility Waste Type 2:
Facility Waste Type 3 :
Facility Waste Type 4:
Program:
Program Category1:
Program Category2:
\# Of Programs:
WDID:
Reg Measure Id:
Reg Measure Type:
Region:
Order \#:
Npdes\# CA\#:
Major-Minor:
Npdes Type:
Reclamation:
Dredge Fill Fee:
301H:
Application Fee Amt Received:
Status:
Status Date:
Effective Date:
5S

1

1

2
B

1

5S

N

206730
United Auburn Indian Community
All Other
Dredge/Fill Site
Municipal/Domestic
Other
38.839044999999
-121.307402
1522
General Contractors-Residential Buildings, Other Than Single-Family

## 7011

Hotels and Motels
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Reg Meas
0.10000000

Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
NPDMUNIOTH
NPDESWW
NPDESWW
5A31NP00001
373269
NPDES Permits
R5-2010-0005
CA0084697
Minor
MUN
N - No
Not reported
Not reported
Active
01/13/2014
03/19/2010

| Distance |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Elevation | Site | Database(s) | EDR ID Number <br> EPA ID Number |

## THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)

S106571359

| Expiration/Review Date: | 01/01/2015 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Termination Date: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Amend: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Revise/Renew: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Rescind: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - No Action Required: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Pending: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Planned: | Not reported |
| Status Enrollee: | N |
| Individual/General: | 1 |
| Fee Code: | 66 - NPDES Based on Flow |
| Direction/Voice: | Passive |
| Enforcement Id(EID): | 373270 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order / Resolution Number: | R5-2010-0006 |
| Enforcement Action Type: | Time Schedule Order |
| Effective Date: | 01/28/2010 |
| Adoption/Issuance Date: | 01/28/2010 |
| Achieve Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | Not reported |
| ACL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| EPL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Status: | Active |
| Title: | TSO R5-2010-0006 for United Auburn Indian Comm, Auburn Rancheria Casino WWTP |
| Description: | The Discharger shall comply with the following time schedule to ensure compliance with cadmium, lead, and zinc effluent limitations at Discharge Point No. 001 at section IV.A.1.a and IV.A.2.a, contained in WDR Order No. R5-2010-0005 |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Latest Milestone Completion Date: | Not reported |
| \# Of Programs1: | 1 |
| Total Assessment Amount: | 0 |
| Initial Assessed Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Project \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Paid: | 0 |
| Project \$ Completed: | 0 |
| Total \$ Paid/Completed Amount: | 0 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Facility Id: | 206730 |
| Agency Name: | United Auburn Indian Community |
| Place Type: | All Other |
| Place Subtype: | Dredge/Fill Site |
| Facility Type: | Municipal/Domestic |
| Agency Type: | Other |
| \# Of Agencies: | 1 |
| Place Latitude: | 38.839044999999 |
| Place Longitude: | -121.307402 |
| SIC Code 1: | 1522 |
| SIC Desc 1: | General Contractors-Residential Buildings, Other Than Single-Family |
| SIC Code 2: | 7011 |
| SIC Desc 2: | Hotels and Motels |
| SIC Code 3: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 3: | Not reported |


| NAICS Code 1: | Not reported |
| :---: | :---: |
| NAICS Desc 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 3: | Not reported |
| \# Of Places: | 1 |
| Source Of Facility: | Reg Meas |
| Design Flow: | 0.10000000 |
| Threat To Water Quality: | 2 |
| Complexity: | B |
| Pretreatment: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 2: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 3: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 4: | Not reported |
| Program: | NPDMUNIOTH |
| Program Category1: | NPDESWW |
| Program Category2: | NPDESWW |
| \# Of Programs: | 1 |
| WDID: | 5A31NP00001 |
| Reg Measure Id: | 133346 |
| Reg Measure Type: | NPDES Permits |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order \#: | R5-2005-0032 |
| Npdes\# CA\#: | CA0084697 |
| Major-Minor: | Minor |
| Npdes Type: | MUN |
| Reclamation: | N - No |
| Dredge Fill Fee: | Not reported |
| 301H: | N |
| Application Fee Amt Received: | 2000 |
| Status: | Historical |
| Status Date: | 01/31/2014 |
| Effective Date: | 03/23/2005 |
| Expiration/Review Date: | 03/23/2010 |
| Termination Date: | 03/18/2010 |
| WDR Review - Amend: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Revise/Renew: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Rescind: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - No Action Required: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Pending: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Planned: | Not reported |
| Status Enrollee: | N |
| Individual/General: | 1 |
| Fee Code: | 66 - NPDES Based on Flow |
| Direction/Voice: | Passive |
| Enforcement Id(EID): | 308419 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order / Resolution Number: | R5-2006-0502 |
| Enforcement Action Type: | Admin Civil Liability |
| Effective Date: | 03/07/2006 |
| Adoption/Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Achieve Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | 12/31/2011 |
| ACL Issuance Date: | 03/07/2006 |
| EPL Issuance Date: | Not reported |

## THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)



| Distance |  |  | EDR ID Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elevation | Site | Database(s) | EPA ID Number |

THUNDER VALLEY CASINO WWTP (Continued)

\[\)|  or municipal water supply. Awsthetic impairment would include nuisance  |
| :--- |
|  from a waste treatment facility.  |

\]

Complexity:

| Category B - Any facility having a physical, chemical, or biological |
| :--- |
| waste treatment system (except for septic systems with subsurface |
| disposal), or any Class II or III disposal site, or facilities without |
| treatment systems that are complex, such as marinas with petroleum |
| products, solid wastes, and sewage pump out facilities. |

S106571359

TWELVE BRIDGES GOLF COURSE
HIST CORTESE:
Region: CORTESE
Facility County Code:
31
Reg By: LTNKA
Actual:
181 ft .

HEWLETT PACKARD 3625 CINCINNATI AVE ROCKLIN, CA 95677
3395 ft .

## Relative: Lower

Actual: 135 ft .

LUST N/A

LUST REG 5:
Region: 5
Status: Case Closed
Case Number: 310296
Case Type: Soil only
Substance: GASOLINE
Staff Initials: PRS
Lead Agency: Regional
Program: LUST
MTBE Code: 9
-
CA PLACER CO. MS S105513027
ENVIROSTOR N/A

PLACER CO. MS:
Facility ID:
Facility Status:
Program Element Code:
Program:
Record Num:
District Code:
FA0003865
Closed
2303
UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS - 3 TANKS
PR0005807
18
Facility ID:
FA0006974
Facility Status:
Closed
Program Element Code:
2105
Program:
Record Num:
HAZMAT BUSINESS PLAN
PR0008746
District Code:
18

ENVIROSTOR:
Facility ID:
31360001
Status: Refer: Other Agency

| HEWLETT PACKARD (Continued) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Status Date: 1 | 11/16/1994 |
| Site Code: N | Not reported |
| Site Type: H | Historical |
| Site Type Detailed: * | * Historical |
| Acres: N | Not reported |
| NPL: N | NO |
| Regulatory Agencies: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Lead Agency: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Program Manager: N | Not reported |
| Supervisor: R | Referred - Not Assigned |
| Division Branch: C | Cleanup Sacramento |
| Assembly: 06 | 06 |
| Senate: 04 | 04 |
| Special Program: N | Not reported |
| Restricted Use: N | NO |
| Site Mgmt Req: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Funding: N | Not reported |
| Latitude: 38 | 38.82105 |
| Longitude: -121 | -121.3108 |
| APN: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Past Use: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Potential COC: * | * UNSPECIFIED AQUEOUS SOLUTION * UNSPECIFIED SLUDGE WASTE |
| Confirmed COC: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Potential Description: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Alias Name: | CATO80014483 |
| Alias Type: | EPA Identification Number |
| Alias Name: | 31360001 |
| Alias Type: | Envirostor ID Number |
| Completed Info: |  |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name | me: Not reported |
| Completed Document Type | e: * Discovery |
| Completed Date: | 09/23/1981 |
| Comments: | FACILITY IDENTIFIED CHAMBER OF COMMERCE DIRECTORY. |
| Future Area Name: | Not reported |
| Future Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Future Document Type: | Not reported |
| Future Due Date: | Not reported |
| Schedule Area Name: | Not reported |
| Schedule Sub Area Name: | : Not reported |
| Schedule Document Type: | : Not reported |
| Schedule Due Date: | Not reported |
| Schedule Revised Date: | Not reported |


| F20 | FORMICA CORPORATION | CA FID UST | S101589719 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| SSW | 3500 CINCINNATI AVE | SWEEPS UST | N/A |
| $\mathbf{1 / 2 - 1}$ | ROCKLIN, CA 95677 | ENF |  |
| $\mathbf{0 . 6 4 9 ~ m i . ~}$ |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{3 4 2 9} \mathrm{ft}$. | Site $\mathbf{1}$ of $\mathbf{2}$ in cluster F |  |  |
| Relative: | CA FID UST: |  |  |
| Lower | Facility ID: | 31000138 |  |
|  | Regulated By: | UTNKA |  |
| Actual: | Regulated ID: | 00000846 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 3 6} \mathrm{ft}$. | Cortese Code: | Not reported |  |
|  | SIC Code: | Not reported |  |


| Distance | Site | Database(s)EDR ID Number <br> Elevation <br> EPA ID Number |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Facility Phone: 9 | 9166453301 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Mail To: N | Not reported |
| Mailing Address: P | P O BOX |
| Mailing Address 2: N | Not reported |
| Mailing City,St,Zip: R | ROCKLIN 95677 |
| Contact: N | Not reported |
| Contact Phone: N | Not reported |
| DUNs Number: N | Not reported |
| NPDES Number: N | Not reported |
| EPA ID: N | Not reported |
| Comments: N | Not reported |
| Status: A | Active |
| SWEEPS UST: |  |
| Status: | Active |
| Comp Number: | 846 |
| Number: | 9 |
| Board Of Equalization: | : Not reported |
| Referral Date: | 02-24-93 |
| Action Date: | 02-24-93 |
| Created Date: | 02-29-88 |
| Owner Tank Id: | 1 |
| SWRCB Tank Id: | 31-000-000846-000001 |
| Tank Status: | A |
| Capacity: | 12000 |
| Active Date: | 07-01-85 |
| Tank Use: | M.V. FUEL |
| STG: | P |
| Content: | DIESEL |
| Number Of Tanks: | 5 |
| Status: | Active |
| Comp Number: | 846 |
| Number: | 9 |
| Board Of Equalization: | : Not reported |
| Referral Date: | 02-24-93 |
| Action Date: | 02-24-93 |
| Created Date: | 02-29-88 |
| Owner Tank Id: | 2 |
| SWRCB Tank Id: | 31-000-000846-000002 |
| Tank Status: | A |
| Capacity: | 12000 |
| Active Date: | 07-01-85 |
| Tank Use: | M.V. FUEL |
| STG: | P |
| Content: | DIESEL |
| Number Of Tanks: | Not reported |
| Status: | Active |
| Comp Number: | 846 |
| Number: | 9 |
| Board Of Equalization: | : Not reported |
| Referral Date: | 02-24-93 |
| Action Date: | 02-24-93 |
| Created Date: | 02-29-88 |
| Owner Tank Id: | 3 |
| SWRCB Tank Id: | 31-000-000846-000003 |


| Distance |  |  | EDR ID Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elevation | Site | Database(s) | EPA ID Number |


| Tank Status: | A |
| :---: | :---: |
| Capacity: | 12000 |
| Active Date: | 07-01-85 |
| Tank Use: | M.V. FUEL |
| STG: | P |
| Content: | DIESEL |
| Number Of Tanks: | Not reported |
| Status: | Active |
| Comp Number: | 846 |
| Number: | 9 |
| Board Of Equalization: | Not reported |
| Referral Date: | 02-24-93 |
| Action Date: | 02-24-93 |
| Created Date: | 02-29-88 |
| Owner Tank Id: | 4 |
| SWRCB Tank Id: | 31-000-000846-000004 |
| Tank Status: | A |
| Capacity: | 12000 |
| Active Date: | 07-01-85 |
| Tank Use: | M.V. FUEL |
| STG: | P |
| Content: | DIESEL |
| Number Of Tanks: | Not reported |
| Status: | Active |
| Comp Number: | 846 |
| Number: | 9 |
| Board Of Equalization: | Not reported |
| Referral Date: | 02-24-93 |
| Action Date: | 02-24-93 |
| Created Date: | 02-29-88 |
| Owner Tank Id: | 5 |
| SWRCB Tank Id: | 31-000-000846-000005 |
| Tank Status: | A |
| Capacity: | 50000 |
| Active Date: | 07-01-85 |
| Tank Use: | UNKNOWN |
| STG: | P |
| Content: | Not reported |
| Number Of Tanks: | Not reported |
| ENF: |  |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Facility Id: | 256968 |
| Agency Name: | Formica Corp |
| Place Type: | Facility |
| Place Subtype: | Not reported |
| Facility Type: | Industrial |
| Agency Type: | Privately-Owned Business |
| \# Of Agencies: | 1 |
| Place Latitude: | 38.825257999999 |
| Place Longitude: | -121.311966 |
| SIC Code 1: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 1: | Not reported |
| SIC Code 2: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 2: | Not reported |


| SIC Code 3: | Not reported |
| :---: | :---: |
| SIC Desc 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 3: | Not reported |
| \# Of Places: | 1 |
| Source Of Facility: | Reg Meas |
| Design Flow: | 1 |
| Threat To Water Quality: | 1 |
| Complexity: | B |
| Pretreatment: | N - POTW does not have EPA approved pretreatment prog. |
| Facility Waste Type: | Cooling water: Noncontact |
| Facility Waste Type 2: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 3: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 4: | Not reported |
| Program: | NPDESWW |
| Program Category1: | NPDESWW |
| Program Category2: | NPDESWW |
| \# Of Programs: | 1 |
| WDID: | 5A312001001 |
| Reg Measure Id: | 303307 |
| Reg Measure Type: | NPDES Permits |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order \#: | R5-2005-0055 |
| Npdes\# CA\#: | CA0004057 |
| Major-Minor: | Minor |
| Npdes Type: | OTH |
| Reclamation: | N - No |
| Dredge Fill Fee: | Not reported |
| 301H: | N |
| Application Fee Amt Received: | Not reported |
| Status: | Historical |
| Status Date: | 05/21/2009 |
| Effective Date: | 04/29/2005 |
| Expiration/Review Date: | 04/29/2010 |
| Termination Date: | 04/23/2009 |
| WDR Review - Amend: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Revise/Renew: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Rescind: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - No Action Required: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Pending: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Planned: | Not reported |
| Status Enrollee: | N |
| Individual/General: | 1 |
| Fee Code: | 66 - NPDES Based on Flow |
| Direction/Voice: | Passive |
| Enforcement Id(EID): | 364731 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order / Resolution Number: | Not reported |
| Enforcement Action Type: | Notice of Violation |
| Effective Date: | 10/31/2008 |
| Adoption/Issuance Date: | 10/31/2008 |
| Achieve Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | 10/31/2008 |


| Distance |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Elevation | Site |$\quad$| EDR ID Number |
| :--- |

## FORMICA CORPORATION (Continued)

| ACL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| :---: | :---: |
| EPL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Status: | Historical |
| Title: | NOV 10/31/2008 for Formica Corp, Sierra Plant |
| Description: | NOV issued because several progress reports required by the NPDES permit and CDO were not submitted. Formica closed the facility and permanently ceased discharging to surface water $6 / 5 / 07$ and therefore the NPDES Permit and CDO are no longer necessary. |
| Program: | NPDESWW |
| Latest Milestone Completion Date: | Not reported |
| \# Of Programs1: | 1 |
| Total Assessment Amount: | 0 |
| Initial Assessed Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Project \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Paid: | 0 |
| Project \$ Completed: | 0 |
| Total \$ Paid/Completed Amount: | 0 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Facility Id: | 256968 |
| Agency Name: | Formica Corp |
| Place Type: | Facility |
| Place Subtype: | Not reported |
| Facility Type: | Industrial |
| Agency Type: | Privately-Owned Business |
| \# Of Agencies: | 1 |
| Place Latitude: | 38.825257999999 |
| Place Longitude: | -121.311966 |
| SIC Code 1: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 1: | Not reported |
| SIC Code 2: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 2: | Not reported |
| SIC Code 3: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 3: | Not reported |
| \# Of Places: | 1 |
| Source Of Facility: | Reg Meas |
| Design Flow: | 1 |
| Threat To Water Quality: | 1 |
| Complexity: | B |
| Pretreatment: | N - POTW does not have EPA approved pretreatment prog. |
| Facility Waste Type: | Cooling water: Noncontact |
| Facility Waste Type 2 : | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 3: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 4: | Not reported |
| Program: | NPDESWW |
| Program Category1: | NPDESWW |
| Program Category2: | NPDESWW |
| \# Of Programs: | 1 |
| WDID: | 5A312001001 |


| Distance |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Elevation | Site |$\quad$| EDR ID Number |
| :--- |

## FORMICA CORPORATION (Continued)

| Reg Measure Id: | 303307 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Reg Measure Type: | NPDES Permits |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order \#: | R5-2005-0055 |
| Npdes\# CA\#: | CA0004057 |
| Major-Minor: | Minor |
| Npdes Type: | OTH |
| Reclamation: | N - No |
| Dredge Fill Fee: | Not reported |
| 301H: | N |
| Application Fee Amt Received: | Not reported |
| Status: | Historical |
| Status Date: | 05/21/2009 |
| Effective Date: | 04/29/2005 |
| Expiration/Review Date: | 04/29/2010 |
| Termination Date: | 04/23/2009 |
| WDR Review - Amend: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Revise/Renew: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Rescind: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - No Action Required: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Pending: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Planned: | Not reported |
| Status Enrollee: | N |
| Individual/General: | 1 |
| Fee Code: | 66 - NPDES Based on Flow |
| Direction/Voice: | Passive |
| Enforcement Id(EID): | 344799 |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order / Resolution Number: | R5-2008-0520 |
| Enforcement Action Type: | Admin Civil Liability |
| Effective Date: | 05/05/2008 |
| Adoption/Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Achieve Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | 05/28/2008 |
| ACL Issuance Date: | 05/05/2008 |
| EPL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Status: | Historical |
| Title: | MMP Complaint R5-2008-0520 for Formica Corp, Sierra Plant |
| Description: | MMP Complaint issued in the amount of $\$ 6,000$. The discharger committed 6 Group I serious, 20 non-serious (8 subject to MMP) effluent violations from 1/1/00 to 12/31/07. MMP amount $\$ 42,000$ however discharger claims protection from MMPs for viols that accured before bankruptcy was entered on $6 / 10 / 04$. Thus, discharger assessed MMPs for 2 violations. |
| Program: | NPDESWW |
| Latest Milestone Completion Date: | 2008-05-28 |
| \# Of Programs1: | 1 |
| Total Assessment Amount: | 6000 |
| Initial Assessed Amount: | 6000 |
| Liability \$ Amount: | 6000 |
| Project \$ Amount: | 0 |
| Liability \$ Paid: | 6000 |
| Project \$ Completed: | 0 |
| Total \$ Paid/Completed Amount: | 6000 |
| Region: | 5S |


| Facility Id: | 256968 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency Name: | Formica Corp |
| Place Type: | Facility |
| Place Subtype: | Not reported |
| Facility Type: | Industrial |
| Agency Type: | Privately-Owned Business |
| \# Of Agencies: | 1 |
| Place Latitude: | 38.825257999999 |
| Place Longitude: | -121.311966 |
| SIC Code 1: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 1: | Not reported |
| SIC Code 2: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 2: | Not reported |
| SIC Code 3: | Not reported |
| SIC Desc 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 1: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 2: | Not reported |
| NAICS Code 3: | Not reported |
| NAICS Desc 3: | Not reported |
| \# Of Places: | 1 |
| Source Of Facility: | Reg Meas |
| Design Flow: | 1 |
| Threat To Water Quality: | 1 |
| Complexity: | B |
| Pretreatment: | N - POTW does not have EPA approved pretreatment prog. |
| Facility Waste Type: | Cooling water: Noncontact |
| Facility Waste Type 2: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 3: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 4: | Not reported |
| Program: | NPDESWW |
| Program Category1: | NPDESWW |
| Program Category2: | NPDESWW |
| \# Of Programs: | 1 |
| WDID: | 5A312001001 |
| Reg Measure Id: | 303307 |
| Reg Measure Type: | NPDES Permits |
| Region: | 5 S |
| Order \#: | R5-2005-0055 |
| Npdes\# CA\#: | CA0004057 |
| Major-Minor: | Minor |
| Npdes Type: | OTH |
| Reclamation: | N - No |
| Dredge Fill Fee: | Not reported |
| 301H: | N |
| Application Fee Amt Received: | Not reported |
| Status: | Historical |
| Status Date: | 05/21/2009 |
| Effective Date: | 04/29/2005 |
| Expiration/Review Date: | 04/29/2010 |
| Termination Date: | 04/23/2009 |
| WDR Review - Amend: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Revise/Renew: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Rescind: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - No Action Required: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Pending: | Not reported |


| Distance |  | EDR ID Number <br> Elevation <br> Site |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | | Database(s) |
| :--- |
| EPA ID Number |




## FORMICA CORPORATION (Continued)

S101589719

EPA Id:
Facility Type:
Unit Names:
Event Description:
Actual Date:
EPA Id:
Facility Type:
Unit Names:
Event Description:
Actual Date:

EPA Id:
Facility Type:
Unit Names:
Event Description:
Actual Date:
EPA Id:
Facility Type:
Unit Names:
Event Description:
Actual Date:
EPA Id:
Facility Type:
Unit Names:
Event Description:
Actual Date:
EPA Id:
Facility Type:
Unit Names:
Event Description:
Actual Date:
EPA Id:
Facility Type:
Unit Names:
Event Description:
Actual Date:
EPA Id:
Facility Type:
Unit Names:
Event Description:
Actual Date:

Closure:
EPA Id:
Facility Type:
Unit Names:
Event Description:
Actual Date:
EPA Id:
Facility Type:

CAD000415455
Historical - Non-Operating
CONTAIN1
New Operating Permit - FINAL PERMIT (EXPIRES)
09/12/1988
CAD000415455
Historical - Non-Operating
CONTAIN1
New Operating Permit - FINAL PERMIT
09/12/1983
CAD000415455
Historical - Non-Operating
CONTAIN1
New Operating Permit - PERMIT TERMINATED - TERMINATION APPROVED
09/23/1988
CAD000415455
Historical - Non-Operating
CONTAIN1
New Operating Permit - PUBLIC COMMENT (BEGIN)
05/01/1983
CAD000415455
Historical - Non-Operating
CONTAIN1
New Operating Permit - APPLICATION PART B RECEIVED 12/09/1982

CAD000415455
Historical - Non-Operating
CONTAIN1
New Operating Permit - APPLICATION PART A RECEIVED
11/19/1980
CAD000415455
Historical - Non-Operating
CONTAIN1
New Operating Permit - PERMIT TERMINATED - TERMINATION RECEIVED
07/20/1988
CAD000415455
Historical - Non-Operating
CONTAIN1
New Operating Permit - TECHNICAL COMPLETE LETTER 04/04/1983

CAD000415455
Historical - Non-Operating
CONTAIN1
Closure Final - RECEIVE CLOSURE CERTIFICATION
09/21/1988
CAD000415455
Historical - Non-Operating

| Distance |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Elevation | Site |
|  |  |
|  |  |

EDR ID Number EPA ID Number

S101589719

| Unit Names: | CONTAIN1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Event Description: | Closure Final - ISSUE CLOSURE VERIFICATION |
| Actual Date: | $12 / 05 / 1988$ |
|  |  |
| Alias: |  |
| EPA Id: | CAD000415455 |
| Facility Type: | Historical - Non-Operating |
| Alias Type: | Envirostor ID Number |
| Alias: | 31300003 |

Alias:

Historical - Non-Operating

31300003

FORMICA CORPORATION (Continued)

F21
SSW
1/2-1
0.649 mi . 3429 ft .

FORMICA CORP
3500 CINCINNATI AVE
SUNSET WHITNEY RANCH, CA 95677

Site 2 of 2 in cluster $F$

RCRA-TSDF
CERC-NFRAP CORRACTS RCRA-SQG HIST CORTESE LUST
Relative:
Lower
Actual: 136 ft .
LUST
SLIC
HIST UST
CA PLACER CO. MS
CHMIRS
VCP
EMI

| RCRA-TSDF: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date form received by agency:09/01/1996 |  |
| Facility name: | FORMICA CORP |
| Facility address: | 3500 CINCINNATI AVE |
|  | SUNSET WHITNEY RANCH, CA 95677 |
| EPA ID: | CAD000415455 |
| Mailing address: | PO BOX 519 |
|  | SUNSET WHITNEY RANCH, CA 95677 |
| Contact: | Not reported |
| Contact address: | Not reported |
|  | Not reported |
| Contact country: | Not reported |
| Contact telephone: | Not reported |
| Contact email: | Not reported |
| EPA Region: | 09 |
| Land type: | Facility is not located on Indian land. Additional information is not known. |
| Classification: | TSDF |
| Description: | Handler is engaged in the treatment, storage or disposal of hazardous |
|  | waste |
|  |  |
| Owner/Operator Summary: |  |
| Owner/operator name: | FORMICA CORPORATION |
| Owner/operator address: | P O BOX 519 |
|  | CITY NOT REPORTED, CA 99999 |
| Owner/operator country: | Not reported |
| Owner/operator telephone: | (916) 645-3301 |
| Legal status: | Private |
| Owner/Operator Type: | Operator |
| Owner/Op start date: | Not reported |
| Owner/Op end date: | Not reported |
|  |  |
| Owner/operator name: | FORMICA CORPORATION |

1000299404 CAD000415455

| Distance | Site | Database(s)EDR ID Number <br> Elevation <br> EPA ID Number |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |



Historical Generators:
Date form received by agency:09/01/1996
Facility name: FORMICA CORP
Classification: Small Quantity Generator
Date form received by agency:02/25/1992
Facility name: FORMICA CORP
Classification: Large Quantity Generator
Date form received by agency:08/01/1980
Facility name: FORMICA CORP
Classification: Large Quantity Generator
Corrective Action Summary:
Event date: 09/01/1989

Event: CA049PA
Event date: 04/23/1990
Event: CA Prioritization, Facility or area was assigned a low corrective action priority.

Event date: 04/23/1990
Event: CA049RE
Event date: 04/23/1990
Event: CA074LO

Facility Has Received Notices of Violations:
Regulation violated: Not reported

| Area of violation: | TSD - Financial Requirements |
| :---: | :---: |
| Date violation determined: | 08/04/1988 |
| Date achieved compliance: | 12/05/1988 |
| Violation lead agency: | State |
| Enforcement action: | WRITTEN INFORMAL |
| Enforcement action date: | 01/20/1988 |
| Enf. disposition status: | Not reported |
| Enf. disp. status date: | Not reported |
| Enforcement lead agency: | State |
| Proposed penalty amount: | Not reported |
| Final penalty amount: | Not reported |
| Paid penalty amount: | Not reported |
| Evaluation Action Summary: |  |
| Evaluation date: | 08/15/1988 |
| Evaluation: | COMPLIANCE EVALUATION INSPECTION ON-SITE |
| Area of violation: | Not reported |
| Date achieved compliance: | Not reported |
| Evaluation lead agency: | State |
| Evaluation date: | 08/04/1988 |
| Evaluation: | FINANCIAL RECORD REVIEW |
| Area of violation: | TSD - Financial Requirements |
| Date achieved compliance: | 12/05/1988 |
| Evaluation lead agency: | State |
| Evaluation date: | 10/06/1986 |
| Evaluation: | FINANCIAL RECORD REVIEW |
| Area of violation: | Not reported |
| Date achieved compliance: | Not reported |
| Evaluation lead agency: | State |
| Evaluation date: | 12/12/1985 |
| Evaluation: | COMPLIANCE EVALUATION INSPECTION ON-SITE |
| Area of violation: | Not reported |
| Date achieved compliance: | Not reported |
| Evaluation lead agency: | State |
| Evaluation date: | 07/29/1985 |
| Evaluation: | FINANCIAL RECORD REVIEW |
| Area of violation: | Not reported |
| Date achieved compliance: | Not reported |
| Evaluation lead agency: | State |
| CERC-NFRAP: |  |
| Site ID: | 0903277 |
| Federal Facility: | Not a Federal Facility |
| NPL Status: | Not on the NPL |
| Non NPL Status: | NFRAP-Site does not qualify for the NPL based on existing information |
| CERCLIS-NFRAP Site Contact Details: |  |
| Contact Sequence ID: | 13286556.00000 |
| Person ID: | 13003854.00000 |
| Contact Sequence ID: | 13292151.00000 |
| Person ID: | 13003858.00000 |


| Contact Sequence ID: | 13298009.00000 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Person ID: | 13004003.00000 |
|  |  |
| CERCLIS-NFRAP Assessment |  |
| Action: | DISCOV: |
| Action: Started: | $/ /$ |
| Date Completed: | $01 / 01 / 88$ |
| Priority Level: | Not reported |
|  |  |
| Action: | ARCHIVE SITE |
| Date Started: | $/ /$ |
| Date Completed: | $04 / 04 / 90$ |
| Priority Level: | Not reported |
|  |  |
| Action: | PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT |
| Date Started: | $/ /$ |
| Date Completed: | $04 / 04 / 90$ |
| Priority Level: | NFRAP-Site does not qualify for the NPL based on existing information |

## CORRACTS:

EPA ID: CAD000415455
EPA Region: 09
Area Name: ENTIRE FACILITY
Actual Date: 19900423
Action: CA075LO - CA Prioritization, Facility or area was assigned a low corrective action priority
NAICS Code(s): $\quad 325211326113326199$
Plastics Material and Resin Manufacturing
Unlaminated Plastics Film and Sheet (except Packaging) Manufacturing
All Other Plastics Product Manufacturing
Original schedule date: Not reported
Schedule end date: Not reported

HIST CORTESE:
Region: CORTESE
Facility County Code: 31
Reg By: LTNKA
Reg Id: 310173

LUST:
Region:
Global Id:
Latitude:
Longitude:
Case Type:
Status:
Status Date:
Lead Agency:
Case Worker:
Local Agency:
RB Case Number:
LOC Case Number:
File Location:
STATE
T0606100141
38.82356
-121.312245
LUST Cleanup Site
Completed - Case Closed
04/15/1996
PLACER COUNTY
Not reported
PLACER COUNTY
310173
Not reported
Potential Media Affect: Soil

| Distance |  | EDR ID Number <br> Elevation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Site |  |  |$\quad$ Database(s) | EPA ID Number |
| :--- |

## FORMICA CORP (Continued)

| Potential Contaminants of Concern: Diesel |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site History: | Not reported |

Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:

Contact:

## Global Id:

Contact Type:
Contact Name:
Organization Name:
Address:
City:
Email:
Phone Number:
Global Id:
Contact Type:
Contact Name:
Organization Name:
Address:
City:
Email:
Phone Number:

Status History:
Global Id:
Status:
Status Date:
Global Id:
Status:
Status Date:

Regulatory Activities:
Global Id:
Action Type:
Date:
Action:

T0606100141
Regional Board Caseworker
PAUL SANDERS
CENTRAL VALLEY RWQCB (REGION 5S)
11020 SUN CENTER DRIVE \#200
RANCHO CORDOVA
psanders@waterboards.ca.gov
Not reported
T0606100141
Local Agency Caseworker
WEST BOURGAULT
PLACER COUNTY
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 180
AUBURN
wbourgau@placer.ca.gov
Not reported

T0606100141
Completed - Case Closed
04/15/1996
T0606100141
Open - Case Begin Date
12/20/1991

T0606100141
Other
01/01/1950
Leak Reported

LUST REG 5:
Region: 5

Status: Case Closed
Case Number: 310173
Case Type: Soil only
Substance: DIESEL
Staff Initials: PRS
Lead Agency: Local
Program: LUST
MTBE Code: N/A

SLIC:
Region:
Facility Status:
STATE
Status Date:
Completed - Case Closed
Global Id:
09/22/2009
SL0606103517

| Distance |  | EDR ID Number <br> Elevation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Site |  |  |$\quad$ Database(s) | EPA ID Number |
| :--- |

FORMICA CORP (Continued)

| Lead Agency: | CENTRAL VALLEY RWQCB (REGION 5S) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lead Agency Case Number: | Not reported |
| Latitude: | 38.821923 |
| Longitude: | -121.313576 |
| Case Type: | Cleanup Program Site |
| Case Worker: | RPC |
| Local Agency: | Not reported |
| RB Case Number: | Not reported |
| File Location: | Not reported |
| Potential Media Affected: | Soil |
| Potential Contaminants of Concern: ${ }^{*}$ Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC), ${ }^{*}$ Metals |  |
| Site History: | Not reported |

Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:

HIST UST:

| Region: | STATE |
| :--- | :--- |
| Facility ID: | 00000000846 |
| Facility Type: | Other |
| Other Type: | MANUFACTURING |
| Total Tanks: | 0005 |
| Contact Name: | EDWARD J. MORRA-PLANT MGR. |
| Telephone: | 9166453301 |
| Owner Name: | AMERICAN CYANAMID COMPANY |
| Owner Address: | ONE CYANAMID PLAZA |
| Owner City,St,Zip: | WAYNE, NJ 07470 |

Tank Num: 001
Container Num: 1
Year Installed: 1965
Tank Capacity: 00012000
Tank Used for: PRODUCT
Type of Fuel: DIESEL
Tank Construction: 0.250 inches
Leak Detection: None
Tank Num: 002
Container Num: 2
Year Installed: 1965
Tank Capacity: 00012000
Tank Used for: PRODUCT
Type of Fuel: DIESEL
Tank Construction: 0.250 inches
Leak Detection: None
Tank Num: 003
Container Num: 3
Year Installed: Not reported
Tank Capacity: 00012000
Tank Used for: PRODUCT
Type of Fuel: DIESEL
Tank Construction: 0.250 inches
Leak Detection: None
Tank Num: 004
Container Num: 4
Year Installed: 1973

| Map ID | MAP FINDINGS |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Direction |  |  |
| Distance |  | EDR ID Number |
| Elevation | Site |  |


Element Code
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Program: } & \text { UNDERGRQ } \\ \text { Record Num: } & \text { PR0002714 }\end{array}$
District Code: 18
Facility ID: FA0001936
Facility Status: $\quad$ Closed
lement Code:
Record Num: PR0002715
District Code: 18
Facility ID: FA0001936
Facility Status: Closed
Program Element Code: 2275
Record Num: PR0006782
District Code: 18

| Distance |  | EDR ID Number <br> Elevation <br> Site |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | | Database(s) |
| :--- |
| EPA ID Number |

## FORMICA CORP (Continued)

| Special Studies 5: | Not reported |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Special Studies 6: | Not reported |  |
| More Than Two Substances In | nvolved?: | Not reported |
| Resp Agncy Personel \# Of De | contaminated: | Not reported |
| Responding Agency Personel | \# Of Injuries: | Not reported |
| Responding Agency Personel | \# Of Fatalities: | Not reported |
| Others Number Of Decontami | nated: | Not reported |
| Others Number Of Injuries: |  | Not reported |
| Others Number Of Fatalities: |  | Not reported |
| Vehicle Make/year: | Not reported |  |
| Vehicle License Number: | Not reported |  |
| Vehicle State: | Not reported |  |
| Vehicle Id Number: | Not reported |  |
| CA/DOT/PUC/ICC Number: | Not reported |  |
| Company Name: | Not reported |  |
| Reporting Officer Name/ID: | Not reported |  |
| Report Date: | Not reported |  |
| Comments: | Not reported |  |
| Facility Telephone: | Not reported |  |
| Waterway Involved: | No |  |
| Waterway: | Not reported |  |
| Spill Site: | Not reported |  |
| Cleanup By: | Unknown |  |
| Containment: | Not reported |  |
| What Happened: | Not reported |  |
| Type: | Not reported |  |
| Measure: | Not reported |  |
| Other: | Not reported |  |
| Date/Time: | Not reported |  |
| Year: | 2002 |  |
| Agency: | NRC |  |
| Incident Date: | 10/25/200212:00 | 00:00 AM |
| Admin Agency: | Placer County | Health Department |
| Amount: | Not reported |  |
| Contained: | Unknown |  |
| Site Type: | Other |  |
| E Date: | Not reported |  |
| Substance: | PCB |  |
| Quantity Released: | Not reported |  |
| BBLS: | 0 |  |
| Cups: | 0 |  |
| CUFT: | 0 |  |
| Gallons: | 0.000000 |  |
| Grams: | 0 |  |
| Pounds: | 0 |  |
| Liters: | 0 |  |
| Ounces: | 0 |  |
| Pints: | 0 |  |
| Quarts: | 0 |  |
| Sheen: | 0 |  |
| Tons: | 0 |  |
| Unknown: | 2 |  |
| Evacuations: | 0 |  |
| Number of Injuries: | 0 |  |
| Number of Fatalities: | 0 |  |
| Description: | HISTORIC SP missing. | LL: per NRC; The caller stated that PCB capacitors are |


| Distance |  |  | EDR ID Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elevation | Site | Database(s) | EPA ID Number |


| FORMICA CORP (Continued) | 10002 |
| :---: | :---: |
| VCP: |  |
| Facility ID: | 60001397 |
| Site Type: | Voluntary Cleanup |
| Site Type Detail: | Voluntary Cleanup |
| Site Mgmt. Req.: | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Acres: | 211.8 |
| National Priorities List: | NO |
| Cleanup Oversight Agencies: | SMBRP, PLACER COUNTY |
| Lead Agency: | SMBRP |
| Lead Agency Description: | DTSC - Site Cleanup Program |
| Project Manager: | Dean Wright |
| Supervisor: | Steven Becker |
| Division Branch: | Cleanup San Joaquin |
| Site Code: | 102111 |
| Assembly: | 06 |
| Senate: | 04 |
| Special Programs Code: | Voluntary Cleanup Program |
| Status: | No Further Action |
| Status Date: | 09/29/2011 |
| Restricted Use: | NO |
| Funding: | Responsible Party |
| Lat/Long: | 38.82503/-121.3106 |
| APN: | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Past Use: | ABOVE GROUND STORAGE TANKS, MANUFACTURING - OTHER |
| Potential COC: | 30024, 30025, 3002502, 30193, 30195, 30295, 30451 |
| Confirmed COC: | 30024-NO,30025-NO,30295-NO,30193-NO,30195-NO,3002502-NO,30451-NO |
| Potential Description: | SOIL |
| Alias Name: | 102111 |
| Alias Type: | Project Code (Site Code) |
| Alias Name: | 60001397 |
| Alias Type: | Envirostor ID Number |
| Completed Info: |  |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | Voluntary Cleanup Agreement |
| Completed Date: | 06/07/2011 |
| Comments: | Final VCA Amendment 1 completed. |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | Voluntary Cleanup Agreement |
| Completed Date: | 05/19/2011 |
| Comments: | Not reported |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | No Further Action Letter |
| Completed Date: | 09/28/2011 |
| Comments: | Not reported |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | Site Characterization Report |
| Completed Date: | 05/25/2011 |
| Comments: | Not reported |

315
Air Distric Name:3083LACER COUNTY APCD
Community Health Air Pollution Info System:Not reported
Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr:8
Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr:2
SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr:5
Part. Matter 10 Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr:1993
County CodeSV
Facility ID:PLA
SIC Code:PLACER COUNTY APCD
Community Health Air Pollution Info System:Not reported
Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr:678
Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr:41
POX Oxides of Sur Tons:7

| Distance |  | EDR ID Number <br> Elevation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Site |  |  |$\quad$ Database(s) | EPA ID Number |
| :--- |



## FORMICA CORP (Continued)

| Air District Name: | PLACER COUNTY APCD |
| :---: | :---: |
| Community Health Air Pollution Info System: | Not reported |
| Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: | Not reported |
| Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: | 678 |
| Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: | 678 |
| Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: | 5 |
| NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: | 41 |
| SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: | 0 |
| Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: | 7 |
| Part. Matter 10 Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: | 7 |
| Year: | 1999 |
| County Code: | 31 |
| Air Basin: | SV |
| Facility ID: | 5 |
| Air District Name: | PLA |
| SIC Code: | 3083 |
| Air District Name: | PLACER COUNTY APCD |
| Community Health Air Pollution Info System: | Not reported |
| Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: | Not reported |
| Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: | 3 |
| Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: | 2 |
| Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: | 3 |
| NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: | 57 |
| SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: | 0 |
| Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: | 9 |
| Part. Matter 10 Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: | 9 |
| Year: | 2000 |
| County Code: | 31 |
| Air Basin: | SV |
| Facility ID: | 5 |
| Air District Name: | PLA |
| SIC Code: | 3083 |
| Air District Name: | PLACER COUNTY APCD |
| Community Health Air Pollution Info System: | Not reported |
| Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: | Not reported |
| Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: | 3 |
| Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: | 2 |
| Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: | 3 |
| NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: | 57 |
| SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: | 0 |
| Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: | 9 |
| Part. Matter 10 Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: | 9 |
| Year: | 2001 |
| County Code: | 31 |
| Air Basin: | SV |
| Facility ID: | 5 |
| Air District Name: | PLA |
| SIC Code: | 3083 |
| Air District Name: | PLACER COUNTY APCD |
| Community Health Air Pollution Info System: | Y |
| Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: | Not reported |
| Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: | 3 |
| Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: | 2 |
| Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: | 3 |


| FORMICA CORP (Continued) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: | 57 |
| SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: | 0 |
| Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: | 9 |
| Part. Matter 10 Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: | 9 |
| Year: | 2002 |
| County Code: | 31 |
| Air Basin: | SV |
| Facility ID: | 5 |
| Air District Name: | PLA |
| SIC Code: | 3083 |
| Air District Name: | PLACER COUNTY APCD |
| Community Health Air Pollution Info System: | Y |
| Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: | Not reported |
| Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: | 2 |
| Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: | 2 |
| Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: | 3 |
| NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: | 61 |
| SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: | 0 |
| Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: | 9 |
| Part. Matter 10 Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: | 9 |
| Year: | 2003 |
| County Code: | 31 |
| Air Basin: | SV |
| Facility ID: | 5 |
| Air District Name: | PLA |
| SIC Code: | 3083 |
| Air District Name: | PLACER COUNTY APCD |
| Community Health Air Pollution Info System: | Not reported |
| Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: | Not reported |
| Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: | 2 |
| Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: | 2 |
| Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: | 3 |
| NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: | 57 |
| SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: | 0 |
| Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: | 9 |
| Part. Matter 10 Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: | 7 |
| Year: | 2004 |
| County Code: | 31 |
| Air Basin: | SV |
| Facility ID: | 5 |
| Air District Name: | PLA |
| SIC Code: | 3083 |
| Air District Name: | PLACER COUNTY APCD |
| Community Health Air Pollution Info System: | Not reported |
| Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: | Not reported |
| Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: | 1.6592227 |
| Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: | 1.3435433 |
| Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: | 2.326677 |
| NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: | 53.7551807 |
| SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: | 0.0649306 |
| Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: | 8.7758348 |
| Part. Matter 10 Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: | 7.1002614 |
| Year: | 2005 |

SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: 0
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: } \\ \text { Part. Matter } 10 \text { Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: } & 9\end{array}$

Year: 2002
Air Basin: SV
Facility ID: 5
Air District Name: PLA
SIC Code: 3083
Community Health Air Pollution Info System: Y
Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: 2
Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: 2
NOX Oxides of Nitrogin Tor:
SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: 0
Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: 9
Part. Matter 10 Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: 9
Year: 2003

Facility ID: 5
SIC Code: 3083
Air District Name: PLACER COUNTY APCD
Community Health Air Pollution Info System: Not reported
Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: Not reported
Tons/Yr. 2
Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: 3
NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: 57
OX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr.
Part. Matter 10 Micrometers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: 7
Year: 2004
County Code. 31
Facility ID: 5
District Name.

Air District Name: PLACER COUNTY APCD
Community Health Air Pollution Info System: Not reported
Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: Not reported
Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr. 1.659222
Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: 2.326677
NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: 53.7551807
SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: 0.0649306
Particulate Matter Tons/Yr.

Year:
2005

| County Code: |  | 31 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Air Basin: |  | SV |
| Facility ID: |  | 5 |
| Air District Name: |  | PLA |
| SIC Code: |  | 3083 |
| Air District Name: |  | PLACER COUNTY APCD |
| Community Health Air Po | ollution Info System: | Not reported |
| Consolidated Emission R | Reporting Rule: | Not reported |
| Total Organic Hydrocarbo | on Gases Tons/Yr: | 1.3112227 |
| Reactive Organic Gases | Tons/Yr: | . 9207164 |
| Carbon Monoxide Emissi | ions Tons/Yr: | 2.5710207 |
| NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen | Tons/Yr: | 66.4161162 |
| SOX - Oxides of Sulphur | Tons/Yr: | . 0761102 |
| Particulate Matter Tons/Y |  | 9.771 |
| Part. Matter 10 Micromet | ers \& Smllr Tons/Yr: | 8.2744419 |
| ENVIROSTOR: |  |  |
| Facility ID: | 31300003 |  |
| Status: | Refer: RWQCB |  |
| Status Date: | 09/15/1989 |  |
| Site Code: | Not reported |  |
| Site Type: | Evaluation |  |
| Site Type Detailed: | Evaluation |  |
| Acres: | 1 |  |
| NPL: | NO |  |
| Regulatory Agencies: | NONE SPECIFIED |  |
| Lead Agency: | NONE SPECIFIED |  |
| Program Manager: | Not reported |  |
| Supervisor: | Referred - Not Assig |  |
| Division Branch: | Cleanup Sacrament |  |
| Assembly: | 06 |  |
| Senate: | 04 |  |
| Special Program: | * CERC2 |  |
| Restricted Use: | NO |  |
| Site Mgmt Req: | NONE SPECIFIED |  |
| Funding: | Not reported |  |
| Latitude: | 38.82190 |  |
| Longitude: | -121.3133 |  |
| APN: | NONE SPECIFIED |  |
| Past Use: | NONE SPECIFIED |  |
| Potential COC: | * UNSPECIFIED SL | UDGE WASTE |
| Confirmed COC: | NONE SPECIFIED |  |
| Potential Description: | NONE SPECIFIED |  |
| Alias Name: | CAD00041545 |  |
| Alias Type: | EPA Identificat | on Number |
| Alias Name: | SL0606103517 |  |
| Alias Type: | GeoTracker Gl | bal ID |
| Alias Name: | T0606100141 |  |
| Alias Type: | GeoTracker Gl | bal ID |
| Alias Name: | 31300003 |  |
| Alias Type: | Envirostor ID N | umber |
| Completed Info: |  |  |
| Completed Area Name:Completed Sub Area Name | PROJECT WIDE |  |
|  | me: Not reported |  |
| Completed Document TypeCompleted Date: | : Preliminary Assessment Report |  |
|  | 09/15/1989 |  |


| Distance |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Elevation | Site | Database(s) | EDR ID Number <br> EPA ID Number |

## FORMICA CORP (Continued)


Distance
Elevation
$\underline{\text { Site }} \quad \underline{\text { Database(s) }}$

| Alias Type: | Envirostor ID Number |
| :---: | :---: |
| Completed Info: |  |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type | Voluntary Cleanup Agreement |
| Completed Date: | 06/07/2011 |
| Comments: | Final VCA Amendment 1 completed. |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type | Voluntary Cleanup Agreement |
| Completed Date: | 05/19/2011 |
| Comments: | Not reported |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type | No Further Action Letter |
| Completed Date: | 09/28/2011 |
| Comments: | Not reported |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type | Site Characterization Report |
| Completed Date: | 05/25/2011 |
| Comments: | Not reported |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type | Site Characterization Workplan |
| Completed Date: | 06/08/2011 |
| Comments: | Work plan approved. |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type | Site Characterization Report |
| Completed Date: | 09/28/2011 |
| Comments: | Report accepted with no comments. No Further Action letter sent on 9/28/2011. |
| Future Area Name: | Not reported |
| Future Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Future Document Type: | Not reported |
| Future Due Date: | Not reported |
| Schedule Area Name: | Not reported |
| Schedule Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Schedule Document Type: | Not reported |
| Schedule Due Date: | Not reported |
| Schedule Revised Date: | Not reported |
| Facility ID: 8000 | 01300 |
| Status: No | Further Action |
| Status Date: 09 | 29/2011 |
| Site Code: N | reported |
| Site Type: C | rective Action |
| Site Type Detailed: C | rective Action |
| Acres: 0 |  |
| NPL: N |  |


| Regulatory Agencies: SMB | SMBRP |
| :---: | :---: |
| Lead Agency: W | WM |
| Program Manager: No | Not reported |
| Supervisor: * | * Unknown |
| Division Branch: Cl | Cleanup Sacramento |
| Assembly: 06 | 06 |
| Senate: 04 | 04 |
| Special Program: Not | Not reported |
| Restricted Use: NO | NO |
| Site Mgmt Req: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Funding: Not | Not reported |
| Latitude: 38 | 38.82147 |
| Longitude: -1 | -121.3111 |
| APN: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Past Use: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Potential COC: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Confirmed COC: NO | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Potential Description: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Alias Name: | CAD000415455 |
| Alias Type: | EPA Identification Number |
| Alias Name: | 31300003 |
| Alias Type: | Envirostor ID Number |
| Alias Name: | 80001300 |
| Alias Type: | Envirostor ID Number |
| Completed Info: |  |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name | me: Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | e: Preliminary Assessment Report |
| Completed Date: | 09/01/1989 |
| Comments: | Not reported |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name | me: Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | e: Preliminary Assessment Report |
| Completed Date: | 04/23/1990 |
| Comments: | Not reported |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name | ne: Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | ee: Other Report |
| Completed Date: | 01/20/2010 |
| Comments: | Not reported |
| Future Area Name: | Not reported |
| Future Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Future Document Type: | Not reported |
| Future Due Date: | Not reported |
| Schedule Area Name: | Not reported |
| Schedule Sub Area Name: | : Not reported |
| Schedule Document Type: | : Not reported |
| Schedule Due Date: | Not reported |
| Schedule Revised Date: | Not reported |



| Responding Agency Personel | \# Of Fatalities: | Not reported |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Others Number Of Decontamin | nated: | Not reported |
| Others Number Of Injuries: |  | Not reported |
| Others Number Of Fatalities: |  | Not reported |
| Vehicle Make/year: | Not reported |  |
| Vehicle License Number: | Not reported |  |
| Vehicle State: | Not reported |  |
| Vehicle Id Number: | Not reported |  |
| CA/DOT/PUC/ICC Number: | Not reported |  |
| Company Name: | Not reported |  |
| Reporting Officer Name/ID: | Not reported |  |
| Report Date: | Not reported |  |
| Comments: | Not reported |  |
| Facility Telephone: | Not reported |  |
| Waterway Involved: | No |  |
| Waterway: | Not reported |  |
| Spill Site: | Road |  |
| Cleanup By: | Unknown |  |
| Containment: | Not reported |  |
| What Happened: | Not reported |  |
| Type: | Not reported |  |
| Measure: | Cu.Ft. |  |
| Other: | Not reported |  |
| Date/Time: | 1209 |  |
| Year: | 2008 |  |
| Agency: | Roseville Fire | Dept |
| Incident Date: | 10/21/2008 |  |
| Admin Agency: | Roseville Fire | Department |
| Amount: | Not reported |  |
| Contained: | Yes |  |
| Site Type: | Not reported |  |
| E Date: | Not reported |  |
| Substance: | Natural Gas |  |
| Quantity Released: | 100,000 |  |
| BBLS: | Not reported |  |
| Cups: | Not reported |  |
| CUFT: | Not reported |  |
| Gallons: | Not reported |  |
| Grams: | Not reported |  |
| Pounds: | Not reported |  |
| Liters: | Not reported |  |
| Ounces: | Not reported |  |
| Pints: | Not reported |  |
| Quarts: | Not reported |  |
| Sheen: | Not reported |  |
| Tons: | Not reported |  |
| Unknown: | Not reported |  |
| Evacuations: | 0 |  |
| Number of Injuries: | 0 |  |
| Number of Fatalities: | 0 |  |
| Description: | Caller states a half hole in the approximately states there w Caller states th release was s | backhoe struck line. Caller sta one hour. Call a shelter ine shelter in-pla cured. |


| Distance |  | EDR ID Number <br> Elevation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Site |  |  |$\quad$ Database(s) | EPA ID Number |
| :--- |

CBS ROSEVILLE INDUSTRIAL IMPROVEMENT (Continued)
S103963687

| DEED: |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Area: PROJECT | PROJECT WIDE |
| Sub Area: Not reporte | Not reported |
| Site Type: VOLUNTAR | VOLUNTARY CLEANUP |
| Status: CERTIFIED | CERTIFIED O\&M - LAND USE RESTRICTIONS ONLY |
| Agency: Not reporte | Not reported |
| Covenant Uploadeldot reported |  |
| Deed Date(s): 10/17/2000 | 10/17/2000 |
| EDR Link ID: 31320001 | 31320001 |
| VCP: |  |
| Facility ID: | 31320001 |
| Site Type: | Voluntary Cleanup |
| Site Type Detail: | Voluntary Cleanup |
| Site Mgmt. Req.: | DAY, HOS, LUC, EX, NOWN, HS, RES |
| Acres: | 5.5 |
| National Priorities List: | NO |
| Cleanup Oversight Agencies: | SMBRP |
| Lead Agency: | MBR |
| Lead Agency Description: | Not reported |
| Project Manager: | Steven Ross |
| Supervisor: | William Beckman |
| Division Branch: | Cleanup Sacramento |
| Site Code: | 100894 |
| Assembly: | 06 |
| Senate: | 04 |
| Special Programs Code: | Voluntary Cleanup Program |
| Status: | Certified O\&M - Land Use Restrictions Only |
| Status Date: | 11/30/2000 |
| Restricted Use: | YES |
| Funding: | Responsible Party |
| Lat/Long: | 38.78389 / -121.3018 |
| APN: | 017-121-007-000, 360070001000, 360070009000, 360070010000, $360070011000,360070012000,360070013000,360070014000,360070015000$, $360070016000,360070017000,360070018000,360070019000,360070020000$, $360070021000,360070022000,360070023000$ |
| Past Use: | MANUFACTURING - CERAMICS |
| Potential COC: | 30013 |
| Confirmed COC: | 30013 |
| Potential Description: | SOIL |
| Alias Name: | 017-121-007-000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070001000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070009000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070010000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070011000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070012000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070013000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070014000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |


| Alias Name: | 360070015000 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070016000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070017000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070018000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070019000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070020000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070021000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070022000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070023000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | CAD980637425 |
| Alias Type: | EPA Identification Number |
| Alias Name: | 110008264207 |
| Alias Type: | EPA (FRS \#) |
| Alias Name: | 100894 |
| Alias Type: | Project Code (Site Code) |
| Alias Name: | 31320001 |
| Alias Type: | Envirostor ID Number |
| Completed Info: |  |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | Correspondence |
| Completed Date: | 11/30/2000 |
| Comments: | Not reported |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | Land Use Restriction - Site Inspection/Visit |
| Completed Date: | 03/17/2009 |
| Comments: | A site visit was performed to review whether conditions have changed on the $2+$ acre restricted parcel of the property subject to a land use covenant. Current work on this parcel performed under an approved work plan. |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | Preliminary Endangerment Assessment Report |
| Completed Date: | 11/30/2000 |
| Comments: | A Preliminary Endangerment Assessment was completed on 11/30/00. No further action is recommended for the site. |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | Phase 1 |
| Completed Date: | 06/30/1987 |
| Comments: | Site Screening done. Preliminary Assessment done under RCRA. |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |


| Distance |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Elevation | Site | Database(s) | EDR ID Number <br> EPA ID Number |

CBS ROSEVILLE INDUSTRIAL IMPROVEMENT (Continued)
S103963687

| Completed Document Type: | Soils Management Plan |
| :---: | :---: |
| Completed Date: | 04/09/2008 |
| Comments: | The final Soil Management and Health \& Safety plans are approved. |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | Voluntary Cleanup Agreement Termination Notification |
| Completed Date: | 07/24/2013 |
| Comments: | VCA termination for convenience notice effective in 30 days. |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | Land Use Restriction |
| Completed Date: | 10/17/2000 |
| Comments: | A Covenant to Restrict Use of Property was recorded on October 17, 2000 with the Placer County Recorder. The property restricted is 2.652 acres and represents a portion of the site. Lead contaminated soils remain in the vicinity of the pond areas. The deed restriction identifies restrictions for the owner of the land regarding uses of the property. |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | Voluntary Cleanup Consultation |
| Completed Date: | 12/31/1997 |
| Comments: | Comments were sent to Proponent describing deficiencies in the site investigation and remediation fulfilling DTSC's obligation under the VCA. |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | Voluntary Cleanup Agreement |
| Completed Date: | 08/21/2007 |
| Comments: | A Voluntary Cleanup Agreement was sent for the project proponent to prepare a soils management plan and health and safety plan. Upon approval, the project proponent will implement appropriate measures to assure proper work practices on deed restricted property. |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | Land Use Restriction - Site Inspection/Visit |
| Completed Date: | 12/22/2010 |
| Comments: | LUC inspection completed. |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | Voluntary Cleanup Agreement |
| Completed Date: | 02/16/1999 |
| Comments: | A Chapter 6.5 agreement was completed for continuing work with the PEA. |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | Voluntary Cleanup Agreement |
| Completed Date: | 07/17/1997 |
| Comments: | A Voluntary Cleanup Agreement was signed with a private party to review existing information regarding onsite investigation and |

remediation of contamination.

| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| :---: | :---: |
| Completed Sub Area Name | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | * Discovery |
| Completed Date: | 10/12/1983 |
| Comments: | Facility identified from ERRIS |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | * Discovery |
| Completed Date: | 11/10/1981 |
| Comments: | Facility drive-by. Two inactive ponds observed. One active pond observed. Sludge ponds suspected of lead and other heavy metals from sample collected. |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | Land Use Restriction - Site Inspection/Visit |
| Completed Date: | 03/28/2008 |
| Comments: | No observed activities contrary to the conditions set forth in the land use Covenant. |
| Future Area Name: | Not reported |
| Future Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Future Document Type: | Not reported |
| Future Due Date: | Not reported |
| Schedule Area Name: | Not reported |
| Schedule Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Schedule Document Type: | Not reported |
| Schedule Due Date: | Not reported |
| Schedule Revised Date: | Not reported |
| ENVIROSTOR: |  |
| Facility ID: 31 | 20001 |
| Status: C | tified O\&M - Land Use Restrictions Only |
| Status Date: 11/30 | 30/2000 |
| Site Code: 100 | 894 |
| Site Type: Volur | untary Cleanup |
| Site Type Detailed: Volur | untary Cleanup |
| Acres: 5.5 |  |
| NPL: NO |  |
| Regulatory Agencies: S | BRP |
| Lead Agency: M |  |
| Program Manager: St | ven Ross |
| Supervisor: W | iam Beckman |
| Division Branch: Clear | anup Sacramento |
| Assembly: 06 |  |
| Senate: 04 |  |
| Special Program: Vo | untary Cleanup Program |
| Restricted Use: YES |  |
| Site Mgmt Req: DAY | , HOS, LUC, EX, NOWN, HS, RES |
| Funding: R | ponsible Party |
| Latitude: 38 | 8389 |
| Longitude: -1 | 1.3018 |
| APN: 36 | -121-007-000, 360070001000, 360070009000, 360070010000, $070011000,360070012000,360070013000,360070014000,360070015000$, |


| Distance | Site | Database(s)EDR ID Number <br> Elevation <br> EPA ID Number |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

## CBS ROSEVILLE INDUSTRIAL IMPROVEMENT (Continued)

|  | 360070016000, 360070017000, 360070018000, 360070019000, 360070020000, 360070021000, 360070022000, 360070023000 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Past Use: MA | MANUFACTURING - CERAMICS |
| Potential COC: Lead | Lead |
| Confirmed COC: Lead | Lead |
| Potential Description: SOIL | SOIL |
| Alias Name: | 017-121-007-000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070001000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070009000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070010000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070011000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070012000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070013000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070014000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070015000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070016000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070017000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070018000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070019000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070020000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070021000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070022000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | 360070023000 |
| Alias Type: | APN |
| Alias Name: | CAD980637425 |
| Alias Type: | EPA Identification Number |
| Alias Name: | 110008264207 |
| Alias Type: | EPA (FRS \#) |
| Alias Name: | 100894 |
| Alias Type: | Project Code (Site Code) |
| Alias Name: | 31320001 |
| Alias Type: | Envirostor ID Number |
| Completed Info: |  |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | e: Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | e: Correspondence |
| Completed Date: | 11/30/2000 |
| Comments: | Not reported |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | e: Not reported |


| Distance |  | EDR ID Number <br> Elevation <br> Site$\quad$ Database(s) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

## CBS ROSEVILLE INDUSTRIAL IMPROVEMENT (Continued)

S103963687

| Completed Document Type: | Land Use Restriction - Site Inspection/Visit <br> Completed Date: |
| :--- | :--- |
| O3/17/2009 |  |


| Distance |  | EDR ID Number <br> Elevation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Site |  |  |$\quad$ Database(s) | EPA ID Number |
| :--- |

approval, the project proponent will implement appropriate measures to assure proper work practices on deed restricted property.

| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| :---: | :---: |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | Land Use Restriction - Site Inspection/Visit |
| Completed Date: | 12/22/2010 |
| Comments: | LUC inspection completed. |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | Voluntary Cleanup Agreement |
| Completed Date: | 02/16/1999 |
| Comments: | A Chapter 6.5 agreement was completed for continuing work with the PEA. |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | Voluntary Cleanup Agreement |
| Completed Date: | 07/17/1997 |
| Comments: | A Voluntary Cleanup Agreement was signed with a private party to review existing information regarding onsite investigation and remediation of contamination. |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | * Discovery |
| Completed Date: | 10/12/1983 |
| Comments: | Facility identified from ERRIS |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | * Discovery |
| Completed Date: | 11/10/1981 |
| Comments: | Facility drive-by. Two inactive ponds observed. One active pond observed. Sludge ponds suspected of lead and other heavy metals from sample collected. |
| Completed Area Name: | PROJECT WIDE |
| Completed Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Document Type: | Land Use Restriction - Site Inspection/Visit |
| Completed Date: | 03/28/2008 |
| Comments: | No observed activities contrary to the conditions set forth in the land use Covenant. |
| Future Area Name: | Not reported |
| Future Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Future Document Type: | Not reported |
| Future Due Date: | Not reported |
| Schedule Area Name: | Not reported |
| Schedule Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Schedule Document Type: | Not reported |
| Schedule Due Date: | Not reported |
| Schedule Revised Date: | Not reported |



RCRA-SQG:
Date form received by agency:03/04/1999
Facility name: HEWLETT-PACKARD ROSEVILLE DIVISION
Site name:
Facility address
EPA ID:
Contact:
Contact address:
Contact country: Not reported
HEWLETT-PACKARD/ROSEVILLE SITE
8000 FOOTHILLS BLVD.
ROSEVILLE, CA 957475609
CAT080014483
RICHARD BOULDT
Not reported
Not reported
Contact telephone: (916) 785-4233
Contact email:
EPA Region:
Not reported
Land type:
Classification:
Description:
09
Facility is not located on Indian land. Additional information is not known. Small Small Quantity Generator
Handler: generates more than 100 and less than 1000 kg of hazardous waste during any calendar month and accumulates less than 6000 kg of hazardous waste at any time; or generates 100 kg or less of hazardous waste during any calendar month, and accumulates more than 1000 kg of hazardous waste at any time

Handler Activities Summary:
U.S. importer of hazardous waste: No

Mixed waste (haz. and radioactive): No
Recycler of hazardous waste: No
Transporter of hazardous waste: No
Treater, storer or disposer of HW: No
Underground injection activity: No
On-site burner exemption: No
Furnace exemption: No
Used oil fuel burner: No
Used oil processor: No
User oil refiner: No
Used oil fuel marketer to burner: No
Used oil Specification marketer: No
Used oil transfer facility: No
Used oil transporter: No

Historical Generators:
Date form received by agency:01/29/1998
Facility name: HEWLETT-PACKARD ROSEVILLE DIVISION
Classification: Small Quantity Generator
Date form received by agency:01/29/1998
Facility name: HEWLETT-PACKARD ROSEVILLE DIVISION

| FOOTHILLS SUBSTATION (Continued) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Classification: | Large Quantity Generator |
| Date form received by agency:09/01/1996 |  |
| Facility name: | HEWLETT-PACKARD ROSEVILLE DIVISION |
| Classification: | Large Quantity Generator |
| Date form received by agency:02/22/1996 |  |
| Facility name: | HEWLETT-PACKARD ROSEVILLE DIVISION |
| Site name: | HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY |
| Classification: | Large Quantity Generator |
| Date form received by agency:03/18/1994 |  |
| Facility name: | HEWLETT-PACKARD ROSEVILLE DIVISION |
| Site name: | HEWLETT PACKARD ROSEVILLE SITE |
| Classification: | Large Quantity Generator |
| Date form received by agency:02/26/1992 |  |
| Facility name: | HEWLETT-PACKARD ROSEVILLE DIVISION |
| Site name: | HEWLETT-PACKARD/ROSEVILLE DIV |
| Classification: | Large Quantity Generator |
| Date form received by agency: $11 / 21 / 1980$ |  |
| Facility name: | HEWLETT-PACKARD ROSEVILLE DIVISION |
| Classification: | Large Quantity Generator |
| Date form received by agency: $11 / 21 / 1980$ |  |
| Facility name: | HEWLETT-PACKARD ROSEVILLE DIVISION |
| Classification: | Large Quantity Generator |
| Violation Status: | No violations found |
| Evaluation Action Summary: |  |
| Evaluation date: | 09/10/1986 |
| Evaluation: | FINANCIAL RECORD REVIEW |
| Area of violation: | Not reported |
| Date achieved compliance: | Not reported |
| Evaluation lead agency: | State |
| Evaluation date: | 06/06/1986 |
| Evaluation: | FINANCIAL RECORD REVIEW |
| Area of violation: | Not reported |
| Date achieved compliance: | Not reported |
| Evaluation lead agency: | State |
| Evaluation date: | 10/05/1984 |
| Evaluation: | FINANCIAL RECORD REVIEW |
| Area of violation: | Not reported |
| Date achieved compliance: | Not reported |
| Evaluation lead agency: | State |
| FINDS: |  |
| Registry ID: | 110055738135 |
| Environmental Interest/Inform | ation System |

Date form received by agency:09/01/1996
Facility name: HEWLETT-PACKARD ROSEVILLE DIVISION

Date form received by agency:02/22/1996
Facility name: HEWLETT-PACKARD ROSEVILLE DIVISION
Ste name. HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY

Date form received by agency:03/18/1994
Facility name: HEWLETT-PACKARD ROSEVILLE DIVISION
HEWLETT PACKARD ROSEVILLE SITE

Date form received by agency:02/26/1992
Facility name: HEWLETT-PACKARD ROSEVILLE DIVISION
HEWLETT-PACKARD/ROSEVILLE DIV

Date form received by agency: 11/21/1980
Facility name: HEWLETT-PACKARD ROSEVILLE DIVISION
Large Quantity Generator
Date form received by agency:11/21/1980
Facility name: HEWLETT-PACKARD ROSEVILLE DIVISION
Classification: Large Quantity Generator
Violation Status: No violations found
valuation Action Summary:
Evaluation: FINANCIAL RECORD REVIEW
Area of violation: Not reported
Date achieved compliance: Not reported

Evaluation date: 06/06/1986
Evaluation: FINANCIAL RECORD REVIEW
Not reported
Date achieved compliance: Not reported
Evaluation lead agency: State
Evaluation date: 10/05/1984
Evaluation FINANCIAL RECORD REVIEW
Date achieved compliance: Not reported
Date achieved compliance: Not reported
Evaluation lead agency.

Registry ID:
Environmental Interest/Information System

| NPDES: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Npdes Number: |  | CAS000002 |
| Facility Status: |  | Terminated |
| Agency Id: |  | 0 |
| Region: |  | 5S |
| Regulatory Measure Id: |  | 422266 |
| Order No: |  | 2009-0009-DWQ |
| Regulatory Measure Type: |  | Enrollee |
| Place Id: |  | Not reported |
| WDID: |  | 5S31C362788 |
| Program Type: |  | Construction |
| Adoption Date Of Regulatory Measure: |  | Not reported |
| Effective Date Of Regulatory Measure: |  | 01/11/2012 |
| Expiration Date Of Regulatory Measure: |  | Not reported |
| Termination Date Of Regulatory Measure: |  | 05/09/2012 |
| Discharge Name: |  | Hewlett Packard |
| Discharge Address: |  | 8000 Foothills Blvd |
| Discharge City: |  | Roseville |
| Discharge State: |  | California |
| Discharge Zip: |  | 95747 |
| Npdes Number: |  | CAS000001 |
| Facility Status: |  | Active |
| Agency Id: |  | 0 |
| Region: |  | 5S |
| Regulatory Measure Id: |  | 199186 |
| Order No: |  | 97-03-DWQ |
| Regulatory Measure Type: |  | Enrollee |
| Place Id: |  | Not reported |
| WDID: |  | 5S311003707 |
| Program Type: |  | Industrial |
| Adoption Date Of Regulatory Measure: |  | Not reported |
| Effective Date Of Regulatory Measure: |  | 04/06/1992 |
| Expiration Date Of Regulatory Measure: |  | Not reported |
| Termination Date Of Regulatory Measure: |  | Not reported |
| Discharge Name: |  | Hewlett Packard - Roseville |
| Discharge Address: |  | 8000 Foothills Blvd |
| Discharge City: |  | Roseville |
| Discharge State: |  | California |
| Discharge Zip: |  | 95747 |
| CA FID UST: |  |  |
| Facility ID: | 31000009 |  |
| Regulated By: | UTNKA |  |
| Regulated ID: | 00016490 |  |
| Cortese Code: | Not reported |  |
| SIC Code: | Not reported |  |
| Facility Phone: | 9167868000 |  |
| Mail To: | Not reported |  |
| Mailing Address: | 8000 FOOTHILLS B |  |
| Mailing Address 2 : | Not reported |  |
| Mailing City,St,Zip: | ROSEVILLE 95678 |  |
| Contact: | Not reported |  |
| Contact Phone: | Not reported |  |
| DUNs Number: | Not reported |  |
| NPDES Number: | Not reported |  |


| Distance |  | EDR ID Number <br> Elevation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Site |  |  |$\quad$ Database(s) | EPA ID Number |
| :--- |



00000016490
MANUFACTUR
0003
M.A.NELSON

PALO ALTO, CA 94304
Tank Num: 001
Container Num. R3-D
Tank Capacity: 00012000
PRODUCT
DIESEL
Type of Fuel:
Not reported

002
R3-G
198
PRODUCT
UNLEADED
Not reported

003
RB-G

| Distance | Site | Database(s)EDR ID Number <br> Elevation <br> EPA ID Number |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| FOOTHILLS SUBSTATION (Continued) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Year Installed: 19 | 1980 |
| Tank Capacity: 00 | 00001000 |
| Tank Used for: PR | PRODUCT |
| Type of Fuel: UN | UNLEADED |
| Tank Construction: No | Not reported |
| Leak Detection: No | None |
| AST: |  |
| Owner: | HEWLETT PACKARD |
| Total Gallons: | 5,760 |
| Certified Unified Program Agencies: Roseville |  |
| SWEEPS UST: |  |
| Status: | Active |
| Comp Number: | 16490 |
| Number: | 9 |
| Board Of Equalization: | ก 44-017392 |
| Referral Date: | 07-01-85 |
| Action Date: | Not reported |
| Created Date: | 02-29-88 |
| Owner Tank Id: | R3-D |
| SWRCB Tank Id: | 31-015-016490-000001 |
| Tank Status: | A |
| Capacity: | 12000 |
| Active Date: | 07-01-85 |
| Tank Use: | M.V. FUEL |
| STG: | P |
| Content: | DIESEL |
| Number Of Tanks: | 3 |
| Status: | Active |
| Comp Number: | 16490 |
| Number: | 9 |
| Board Of Equalization: | ) 44-017392 |
| Referral Date: | 07-01-85 |
| Action Date: | Not reported |
| Created Date: | 02-29-88 |
| Owner Tank Id: | R3-G |
| SWRCB Tank Id: | 31-015-016490-000002 |
| Tank Status: | A |
| Capacity: | 8000 |
| Active Date: | 07-01-85 |
| Tank Use: | M.V. FUEL |
| STG: | P |
| Content: | REG UNLEADED |
| Number Of Tanks: | Not reported |
| Status: | Active |
| Comp Number: | 16490 |
| Number: | 9 |
| Board Of Equalization: | : 44-017392 |
| Referral Date: | 07-01-85 |
| Action Date: | Not reported |
| Created Date: | 02-29-88 |
| Owner Tank Id: | RB-G |
| SWRCB Tank Id: | 31-015-016490-000003 |

1000281840

| Tank Status: | A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Capacity: | 1000 |
| Active Date: | $07-01-85$ |
| Tank Use: | M.V. FUEL |
| STG: | P |
| Content: | REG UNLEADED |
| Number Of Tanks: | Not reported |

CHMIRS:

| OES Incident Number: | $98-0920$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| OES notification: | $02 / 22 / 1998$ |
| OES Date: | Not reported |
| OES Time: | Not reported |
| Incident Date: | Not reported |
| Date Completed: | Not reported |
| Property Use: | Not reported |
| Agency Id Number: | Not reported |
| Agency Incident Number: | Not reported |
| Time Notified: | Not reported |
| Time Completed: | Not reported |
| Surrounding Area: | Not reported |
| Estimated Temperature: | Not reported |
| Property Management: | Not reported |
| Special Studies 1: | Not reported |
| Special Studies 2: | Not reported |
| Special Studies 3: | Not reported |
| Special Studies 4: | Not reported |
| Special Studies 5: | Not reported |
| Special Studies 6: | Not reported |

More Than Two Substances Involved?:
Resp Agncy Personel \# Of Decontaminated:
Responding Agency Personel \# Of Injuries:
Responding Agency Personel \# Of Fatalities:
Others Number Of Injuries:
Others Number Of Fatalities:
Vehicle Make/year: $\quad$ Not reported
Vehicle License Number: Not reported
Vehicle State: Not reported
Vehicle Id Number: Not reported
CA/DOT/PUC/ICC Number: Not reported
Company Name: Not reported
Reporting Officer Name/ID: Not reported
Report Date: Not reported
Comments: Not reported
Facility Telephone: Not reported
Waterway Involved: No
Waterway
Spill Site:
Cleanup By:
Containment:
What Happened:
Type:
Measure:
Other:
Date/Time:
Year:

Not reported
Not reported
Unknown
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
1998

Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported
Not reported

| Distance |  | EDR ID Number <br> Elevation <br> Site |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | | Database(s) |
| :--- |
| EPA ID Number |


| FOOTHILLS SUBSTATION (Continued) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency: | Roseville Fire |  |
| Incident Date: | 2/22/199812:00:00 AM |  |
| Admin Agency: | Roseville Fire Department |  |
| Amount: | Not reported |  |
| Contained: | Yes |  |
| Site Type: | Industrial Plant |  |
| E Date: | Not reported |  |
| Substance: | Unknown |  |
| Quantity Released: | Not reported |  |
| BBLS: | 0 |  |
| Cups: | 0 |  |
| CUFT: | 0 |  |
| Gallons: | 0.000000 |  |
| Grams: | 0 |  |
| Pounds: | 0 |  |
| Liters: | 0 |  |
| Ounces: | 0 |  |
| Pints: | 0 |  |
| Quarts: | 0 |  |
| Sheen: | 0 |  |
| Tons: | 0 |  |
| Unknown: | 0 |  |
| Evacuations: | 0 |  |
| Number of Injuries: | 18 |  |
| Number of Fatalities: | 0 |  |
| Description: | Large cases of computer chassis opened, releasing white powder substance which caused burning eyes, rash on arms, face neck and back and itching in same areas |  |
| OES Incident Number: | 05-5684 |  |
| OES notification: | 09/30/2005 |  |
| OES Date: | Not reported |  |
| OES Time: | Not reported |  |
| Incident Date: | Not reported |  |
| Date Completed: | Not reported |  |
| Property Use: | Not reported |  |
| Agency Id Number: | Not reported |  |
| Agency Incident Number: | Not reported |  |
| Time Notified: | Not reported |  |
| Time Completed: | Not reported |  |
| Surrounding Area: | Not reported |  |
| Estimated Temperature: | Not reported |  |
| Property Management: | Not reported |  |
| Special Studies 1: | Not reported |  |
| Special Studies 2: | Not reported |  |
| Special Studies 3: | Not reported |  |
| Special Studies 4: | Not reported |  |
| Special Studies 5: | Not reported |  |
| Special Studies 6: | Not reported |  |
| More Than Two Substances | nvolved?: | Not reported |
| Resp Agncy Personel \# Of | contaminated: | Not reported |
| Responding Agency Person | \# Of Injuries: | Not reported |
| Responding Agency Person | \# Of Fatalities: | Not reported |
| Others Number Of Deconta | nated: | Not reported |
| Others Number Of Injuries: |  | Not reported |
| Others Number Of Fatalities |  | Not reported |
| Vehicle Make/year: | Not reported |  |


| Distance | Site | Database(s)EDR ID Number <br> Elevation <br> EPA ID Number |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| FOOTHILLS SUBSTATION (Continued) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Vehicle License Number: | Not reported |
| Vehicle State: | Not reported |
| Vehicle Id Number: | Not reported |
| CA/DOT/PUC/ICC Number: | Not reported |
| Company Name: | Not reported |
| Reporting Officer Name/ID: | Not reported |
| Report Date: | Not reported |
| Comments: | Not reported |
| Facility Telephone: | Not reported |
| Waterway Involved: | Not reported |
| Waterway: | Not reported |
| Spill Site: | Not reported |
| Cleanup By: | Unknown |
| Containment: | Not reported |
| What Happened: | Not reported |
| Type: | Not reported |
| Measure: | Not reported |
| Other: | Not reported |
| Date/Time: | Not reported |
| Year: | 2005 |
| Agency: | Roseville Fire |
| Incident Date: | $9 / 30 / 200512: 00: 00$ AM |
| Admin Agency: | Roseville Fire Department |
| Amount: | Not reported |
| Contained: | Yes |
| Site Type: | Other |
| E Date: | Not reported |
| Substance: | Freon |
| Quantity Released: | Not reported |
| BBLS: | 0 |
| Cups: | 0 |
| CUFT: | 0 |
| Gallons: | Grams: |


| ENVIROSTOR: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Facility ID: | 71003536 |
| Status: | Inactive - Needs Evaluation |
| Status Date: | Not reported |
| Site Code: | Not reported |
| Site Type: | Tiered Permit |
| Site Type Detailed: | Tiered Permit |
| Acres: | Not reported |


| FOOTHILLS SUBSTATION (Continued) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| NPL: N | NO |
| Regulatory Agencies: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Lead Agency: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Program Manager: N | Not reported |
| Supervisor: N | Not reported |
| Division Branch: C | Cleanup Sacramento |
| Assembly: 06 | 06 |
| Senate: 04 | 04 |
| Special Program: N | Not reported |
| Restricted Use: N | NO |
| Site Mgmt Req: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Funding: N | Not reported |
| Latitude: 38 | 38.78800 |
| Longitude: -1 | -121.3213 |
| APN: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Past Use: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Potential COC: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Confirmed COC: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Potential Description: N | NONE SPECIFIED |
| Alias Name: | CAT080014483 |
| Alias Type: | EPA Identification Number |
| Alias Name: | 110000899029 |
| Alias Type: | EPA (FRS \#) |
| Alias Name: | 71003536 |
| Alias Type: | Envirostor ID Number |
| Completed Info: |  |
| Completed Area Name: | Not reported |
| Completed Sub Area Name | me: Not reported |
| Completed Document Type | e: Not reported |
| Completed Date: | Not reported |
| Comments: | Not reported |
| Future Area Name: | Not reported |
| Future Sub Area Name: | Not reported |
| Future Document Type: | Not reported |
| Future Due Date: | Not reported |
| Schedule Area Name: | Not reported |
| Schedule Sub Area Name: | : Not reported |
| Schedule Document Type: | : Not reported |
| Schedule Due Date: | Not reported |
| Schedule Revised Date: | Not reported |

CA WDS:

| Facility ID: | 5S 311003707 <br> Industrial - Facility that treats and/or disposes of liquid or <br> semisolid wastes from any servicing, producing, manufacturing or <br> processing operation of whatever nature, including mining, gravel <br> washing, geothermal operations, air conditioning, ship building and <br> repairing, oil production, storage and disposal operations, water <br> pumping. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Active - Any facility with a continuous or seasonal discharge that is |  |


| Distance |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Elevation | Site | EDR ID Number <br> Database(s) | | EDA ID Number |
| :--- |



| City | EDR ID | Site Name | Site Address | Zip | Database(s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LINCOLN | 1004677533 | ENERGY 2001 | 3901 ATHENS AVE |  | FINDS,RCRA-SQG |
| LINCOLN | 1006932059 | VALLEY VIEW MINE | 2020 WALAGA SPRINGS DRIVE |  | CERCLIS |
| LINCOLN | 1007211144 | THUNDER MOUNTAIN TRAIN WRECK SITE | NEAR TO INDUSTRIAL AVE |  | CERCLIS |
| LINCOLN | 1014950721 | SAFEWAY STORE NO 1761 | 405 S HWY 65 | 95648 | RCRA-NLR |
| LINCOLN | 1015740286 | CVS PHARMACY NO 9535 | 63 LINCOLN BLVD | 95648 | RCRA-LQG |
| LINCOLN | A100184377 | KIEWIT PACIFIC | SOUTH OF 12 BRIDGES DR | 95648 | AST |
| LINCOLN | A100338389 | LINCOLN SAWMILL AND PLANER | 1445 N HWY 65 | 95648 | AST |
|  | A100339830 | CAL TRANS WHITMORE | 4 MILES EAST OF BAXTER |  | AST |
| LINCOLN | A100339904 | CAMP FAR WEST LAKE | 9300 MC COURTNEY | 95648 | AST |
| LINCOLN | A100339977 | A \& A CONCRETE | 2930 LEVOS CT | 95648 | AST |
|  | M300002441 | GLADDING MCBEAN \& CO | LINCOLN PIT |  | MINES |
|  | M300003127 | RMC PACIFIC MATERIALS | PATTERSON SAND \& GRAVEL - SHER |  | MINES |
| LINCOLN | S100833486 | BOHEMIA, INC. | HIGHWAY 65 | 95648 | BEP |
| LINCOLN | S100925127 | GLADDING MCBEAN | PLACER COUNTY | 95648 | TOXIC |
| LINCOLN CA | S103442075 | TRMT OF PETROLEUM CONTAM. SOIL | HWY 65 | 95648 | WMUDS/SWAT |
| LINCOLN CA | S104384457 | ALPHA EXPLOSIVES | E. OF HWY 65, N. OF WISE RD | 95648 | WMUDS/SWAT |
| LINCOLN | S109518376 | NICHOLAS TURKEY BREEDING FARM CLOS | UNIT NEWCASTLE HWY 1895 | 95648 | MS PLACER |
| ROCKLIN | S109518507 | FIBREWOOD CORPORATION | SUNSET \& HWY BLVD 65 | 95765 | MS PLACER |
| LINCOLN | S113150003 | LOWE'S OF LINCOLN \#2499 | 535 S HIGHWAY 65 | 95648 | MS PLACER,HAZNET |
| LINCOLN | U001613217 | LINCOLN SMALL LOG SAWMILL | HIGHWAY 65 | 95648 | HIST UST,SWEEPS UST |

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

To maintain currency of the following federal and state databases, EDR contacts the appropriate governmental agency on a monthly or quarterly basis, as required.

Number of Days to Update: Provides confirmation that EDR is reporting records that have been updated within 90 days from the date the government agency made the information available to the public.

## STANDARD ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

## Federal NPL site list

NPL: National Priority List
National Priorities List (Superfund). The NPL is a subset of CERCLIS and identifies over 1,200 sites for priority cleanup under the Superfund Program. NPL sites may encompass relatively large areas. As such, EDR provides polygon coverage for over 1,000 NPL site boundaries produced by EPA's Environmental Photographic Interpretation Center (EPIC) and regional EPA offices.

Date of Government Version: 10/25/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/11/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/28/2014
Number of Days to Update: 78

Source: EPA<br>Telephone: N/A<br>Last EDR Contact: 07/08/2014<br>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/20/2014<br>Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

NPL Site Boundaries
Sources:
EPA's Environmental Photographic Interpretation Center (EPIC)
Telephone: 202-564-7333

EPA Region 1
Telephone 617-918-1143
EPA Region 3
Telephone 215-814-5418
EPA Region 4
Telephone 404-562-8033
EPA Region 5
Telephone 312-886-6686
EPA Region 10
Telephone 206-553-8665

EPA Region 6
Telephone: 214-655-6659
EPA Region 7
Telephone: 913-551-7247
EPA Region 8
Telephone: 303-312-6774
EPA Region 9
Telephone: 415-947-4246

Proposed NPL: Proposed National Priority List Sites
A site that has been proposed for listing on the National Priorities List through the issuance of a proposed rule in the Federal Register. EPA then accepts public comments on the site, responds to the comments, and places on the NPL those sites that continue to meet the requirements for listing.

Date of Government Version: 10/25/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/11/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/28/2014
Number of Days to Update: 78

Source: EPA
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: 07/08/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/20/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

NPL LIENS: Federal Superfund Liens
Federal Superfund Liens. Under the authority granted the USEPA by CERCLA of 1980, the USEPA has the authority to file liens against real property in order to recover remedial action expenditures or when the property owner received notification of potential liability. USEPA compiles a listing of filed notices of Superfund Liens.

Date of Government Version: 10/15/1991
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/02/1994
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/30/1994
Number of Days to Update: 56

Source: EPA
Telephone: 202-564-4267
Last EDR Contact: 08/15/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/28/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

## Federal Delisted NPL site list

DELISTED NPL: National Priority List Deletions
The National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) establishes the criteria that the EPA uses to delete sites from the NPL. In accordance with 40 CFR 300.425.(e), sites may be deleted from the NPL where no further response is appropriate.

Date of Government Version: 10/25/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/11/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/28/2014
Number of Days to Update: 78

Source: EPA
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: 07/08/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/20/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## Federal CERCLIS list

CERCLIS: Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System
CERCLIS contains data on potentially hazardous waste sites that have been reported to the USEPA by states, municipalities, private companies and private persons, pursuant to Section 103 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). CERCLIS contains sites which are either proposed to or on the National Priorities List (NPL) and sites which are in the screening and assessment phase for possible inclusion on the NPL.

Date of Government Version: 10/25/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/11/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/13/2014
Number of Days to Update: 94

Source: EPA
Telephone: 703-412-9810
Last EDR Contact: 05/29/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/08/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

FEDERAL FACILITY: Federal Facility Site Information listing
A listing of National Priority List (NPL) and Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) sites found in the Comprehensive
Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) Database where EPA Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse Office is involved in cleanup activities.

Date of Government Version: 05/31/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/08/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 12/06/2013
Number of Days to Update: 151

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 703-603-8704
Last EDR Contact: 07/08/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/20/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## Federal CERCLIS NFRAP site List

CERCLIS-NFRAP: CERCLIS No Further Remedial Action Planned
Archived sites are sites that have been removed and archived from the inventory of CERCLIS sites. Archived status indicates that, to the best of EPA's knowledge, assessment at a site has been completed and that EPA has determined no further steps will be taken to list this site on the National Priorities List (NPL), unless information indicates this decision was not appropriate or other considerations require a recommendation for listing at a later time. This decision does not necessarily mean that there is no hazard associated with a given site; it only means that, based upon available information, the location is not judged to be a potential NPL site.

Date of Government Version: 10/25/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/11/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/13/2014
Number of Days to Update: 94

Source: EPA
Telephone: 703-412-9810
Last EDR Contact: 05/29/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/08/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## Federal RCRA CORRACTS facilities list

CORRACTS: Corrective Action Report
CORRACTS identifies hazardous waste handlers with RCRA corrective action activity.

# GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING 

Date of Government Version: 03/11/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/13/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/09/2014
Number of Days to Update: 27

Source: EPA
Telephone: 800-424-9346
Last EDR Contact: 07/02/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## Federal RCRA non-CORRACTS TSD facilities list

RCRA-TSDF: RCRA - Treatment, Storage and Disposal
RCRAInfo is EPA's comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. The database includes selective information on sites which generate, transport, store, treat and/or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Transporters are individuals or entities that move hazardous waste from the generator offsite to a facility that can recycle, treat, store, or dispose of the waste. TSDFs treat, store, or dispose of the waste.

Date of Government Version: 03/11/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/13/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/09/2014
Number of Days to Update: 27

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: (415) 495-8895
Last EDR Contact: 07/02/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## Federal RCRA generators list

RCRA-LQG: RCRA - Large Quantity Generators
RCRAInfo is EPA's comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. The database includes selective information on sites which generate, transport, store, treat and/or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Large quantity generators (LQGs) generate over 1,000 kilograms ( kg ) of hazardous waste, or over 1 kg of acutely hazardous waste per month.

Date of Government Version: 03/11/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/13/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/09/2014
Number of Days to Update: 27

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: (415) 495-8895
Last EDR Contact: 07/02/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

RCRA-SQG: RCRA - Small Quantity Generators
RCRAInfo is EPA's comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. The database includes selective information on sites which generate, transport, store, treat and/or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Small quantity generators (SQGs) generate between 100 kg and $1,000 \mathrm{~kg}$ of hazardous waste per month.

Date of Government Version: 03/11/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/13/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/09/2014
Number of Days to Update: 27

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: (415) 495-8895
Last EDR Contact: 07/02/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

RCRA-CESQG: RCRA - Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generators
RCRAInfo is EPA's comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. The database includes selective information on sites which generate, transport, store, treat and/or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Conditionally exempt small quantity generators (CESQGs) generate less than 100 kg of hazardous waste, or less than 1 kg of acutely hazardous waste per month.

Date of Government Version: 03/11/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/13/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/09/2014 Number of Days to Update: 27

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: (415) 495-8895
Last EDR Contact: 07/02/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

## Federal institutional controls / engineering controls registries

US ENG CONTROLS: Engineering Controls Sites List
A listing of sites with engineering controls in place. Engineering controls include various forms of caps, building foundations, liners, and treatment methods to create pathway elimination for regulated substances to enter environmental media or effect human health.

Date of Government Version: 03/19/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/21/2014
Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 703-603-0695
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/15/2014
Last EDR Contact: 06/05/2014
Number of Days to Update: 116
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/22/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies
US INST CONTROL: Sites with Institutional Controls
A listing of sites with institutional controls in place. Institutional controls include administrative measures, such as groundwater use restrictions, construction restrictions, property use restrictions, and post remediation care requirements intended to prevent exposure to contaminants remaining on site. Deed restrictions are generally required as part of the institutional controls.
Date of Government Version: 03/19/2014 Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/21/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/15/2014
Number of Days to Update: 116

Telephone: 703-603-0695
Last EDR Contact: 06/05/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/22/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

LUCIS: Land Use Control Information System
LUCIS contains records of land use control information pertaining to the former Navy Base Realignment and Closure properties.

Date of Government Version: 05/28/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/30/2014
Source: Department of the Navy
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/17/2014
Telephone: 843-820-7326
Number of Days to Update: 18
Last EDR Contact: 05/19/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/01/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## Federal ERNS list

ERNS: Emergency Response Notification System
Emergency Response Notification System. ERNS records and stores information on reported releases of oil and hazardous substances.

Date of Government Version: 09/30/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/01/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 12/06/2013
Number of Days to Update: 66

Source: National Response Center, United States Coast Guard
Telephone: 202-267-2180
Last EDR Contact: 07/03/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 07/14/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually

## State- and tribal - equivalent NPL

RESPONSE: State Response Sites
Identifies confirmed release sites where DTSC is involved in remediation, either in a lead or oversight capacity.
These confirmed release sites are generally high-priority and high potential risk.

Date of Government Version: 06/05/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/06/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/09/2014
Number of Days to Update: 33

Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control
Telephone: 916-323-3400
Last EDR Contact: 06/06/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/18/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

ENVIROSTOR: EnviroStor Database
The Department of Toxic Substances Control's (DTSC's) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program's (SMBRP's) EnviroStor database identifes sites that have known contamination or sites for which there may be reasons to investigate further. The database includes the following site types: Federal Superfund sites (National Priorities List (NPL)); State Response, including Military Facilities and State Superfund; Voluntary Cleanup; and School sites. EnviroStor provides similar information to the information that was available in CalSites, and provides additional site information, including, but not limited to, identification of formerly-contaminated properties that have been released for reuse, properties where environmental deed restrictions have been recorded to prevent inappropriate land uses, and risk characterization information that is used to assess potential impacts to public health and the environment at contaminated sites.
Date of Government Version: 06/05/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/06/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/09/2014
Number of Days to Update: 33
Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control
Telephone: $916-323-3400$
Last EDR Contact: 06/06/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/18/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## State and tribal landfill and/or solid waste disposal site lists

SWF/LF (SWIS): Solid Waste Information System
Active, Closed and Inactive Landfills. SWF/LF records typically contain an inve ntory of solid waste disposal facilities or landfills. These may be active or i nactive facilities or open dumps that failed to meet RCRA Section 4004 criteria for solid waste landfills or disposal sites.

Date of Government Version: 05/19/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/20/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/22/2014
Number of Days to Update: 2

Source: Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery
Telephone: 916-341-6320
Last EDR Contact: 05/20/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/01/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## State and tribal leaking storage tank lists

LUST REG 6V: Leaking Underground Storage Tank Case Listing
Leaking Underground Storage Tank locations. Inyo, Kern, Los Angeles, Mono, San Bernardino counties.

Date of Government Version: 06/07/2005
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/07/2005
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/29/2005
Number of Days to Update: 22

Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Victorville Branch Office (6) Telephone: 760-241-7365
Last EDR Contact: 09/12/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/26/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

LUST REG 7: Leaking Underground Storage Tank Case Listing
Leaking Underground Storage Tank locations. Imperial, Riverside, San Diego, Santa Barbara counties.
Date of Government Version: 02/26/2004
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Colorado River Basin Region (7)
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/26/2004 Telephone: 760-776-8943
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/24/2004 Last EDR Contact: 08/01/2011
Number of Days to Update: 27
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/14/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned
LUST REG 5: Leaking Underground Storage Tank Database
Leaking Underground Storage Tank locations. Alameda, Alpine, Amador, Butte, Colusa, Contra Costa, Calveras, El
Dorado, Fresno, Glenn, Kern, Kings, Lake, Lassen, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, Modoc, Napa, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Shasta, Solano, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tehama, Tulare, Tuolumne, Yolo, Yuba counties.

Date of Government Version: 07/01/2008
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/22/2008
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/31/2008
Number of Days to Update: 9

Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Valley Region (5)
Telephone: 916-464-4834
Last EDR Contact: 07/01/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/17/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

LUST REG 9: Leaking Underground Storage Tank Report
Orange, Riverside, San Diego counties. For more current information, please refer to the State Water Resources Control Board's LUST database.

Date of Government Version: 03/01/2001
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/23/2001
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Diego Region (9)
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/21/2001
Telephone: 858-637-5595
Number of Days to Update: 28
Last EDR Contact: 09/26/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 01/09/2012
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned
LUST: Geotracker's Leaking Underground Fuel Tank Report
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Incident Reports. LUST records contain an inventory of reported leaking underground storage tank incidents. Not all states maintain these records, and the information stored varies by state. For more information on a particular leaking underground storage tank sites, please contact the appropriate regulatory agency.

Date of Government Version: 06/16/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/17/2014
Source: State Water Resources Control Board

Date Made Active in Reports: 07/10/2014
Number of Days to Update: 23
Telephone: see region list
Last EDR Contact: 06/17/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/29/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly
LUST REG 1: Active Toxic Site Investigation
Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, Modoc, Siskiyou, Sonoma, Trinity counties. For more current information, please refer to the State Water Resources Control Board's LUST database.

Date of Government Version: 02/01/2001
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/28/2001
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/29/2001
Number of Days to Update: 29

Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board North Coast (1)
Telephone: 707-570-3769
Last EDR Contact: 08/01/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/14/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

LUST REG 2: Fuel Leak List
Leaking Underground Storage Tank locations. Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa
Clara, Solano, Sonoma counties.

Date of Government Version: 09/30/2004
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/20/2004
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/19/2004
Number of Days to Update: 30

Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region (2) Telephone: 510-622-2433
Last EDR Contact: 09/19/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 01/02/2012
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

LUST REG 3: Leaking Underground Storage Tank Database
Leaking Underground Storage Tank locations. Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz counties.

Date of Government Version: 05/19/2003
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/19/2003
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/02/2003
Number of Days to Update: 14

Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Coast Region (3)
Telephone: 805-542-4786
Last EDR Contact: 07/18/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/31/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

LUST REG 6L: Leaking Underground Storage Tank Case Listing
For more current information, please refer to the State Water Resources Control Board's LUST database.

Date of Government Version: 09/09/2003
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/10/2003
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/07/2003
Number of Days to Update: 27

Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Lahontan Region (6) Telephone: 530-542-5572
Last EDR Contact: 09/12/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/26/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

LUST REG 8: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks
California Regional Water Quality Control Board Santa Ana Region (8). For more current information, please refer to the State Water Resources Control Board's LUST database.

Date of Government Version: 02/14/2005
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/15/2005
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/28/2005
Number of Days to Update: 41

Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Santa Ana Region (8)
Telephone: 909-782-4496
Last EDR Contact: 08/15/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/28/2011
Data Release Frequency: Varies

LUST REG 4: Underground Storage Tank Leak List
Los Angeles, Ventura counties. For more current information, please refer to the State Water Resources Control Board's LUST database.

Date of Government Version: 09/07/2004
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/07/2004
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/12/2004
Number of Days to Update: 35

Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Los Angeles Region (4)
Telephone: 213-576-6710
Last EDR Contact: 09/06/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/19/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

SLIC: Statewide SLIC Cases
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.

Date of Government Version: 06/16/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/17/2014
Source: State Water Resources Control Board
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/11/2014
Number of Days to Update: 24
Telephone: 866-480-1028
Last EDR Contact: 06/17/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/29/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies
SLIC REG 1: Active Toxic Site Investigations
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality
from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.
Date of Government Version: 04/03/2003
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region (1)
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/07/2003
Telephone: 707-576-2220
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/25/2003 Last EDR Contact: 08/01/2011
Number of Days to Update: 18
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/14/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned
SLIC REG 2: Spills, Leaks, Investigation \& Cleanup Cost Recovery Listing
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.

Date of Government Version: 09/30/2004
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/20/2004
Source: Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region (2) Telephone: 510-286-0457
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/19/2004 Last EDR Contact: 09/19/2011
Number of Days to Update: 30
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 01/02/2012
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly
SLIC REG 3: Spills, Leaks, Investigation \& Cleanup Cost Recovery Listing
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.

Date of Government Version: 05/18/2006
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/18/2006
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/15/2006
Number of Days to Update: 28

Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Coast Region (3) Telephone: 805-549-3147
Last EDR Contact: 07/18/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/31/2011
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

SLIC REG 4: Spills, Leaks, Investigation \& Cleanup Cost Recovery Listing
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.

Date of Government Version: 11/17/2004 Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/18/2004
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/04/2005
Number of Days to Update: 47

Source: Region Water Quality Control Board Los Angeles Region (4) Telephone: 213-576-6600
Last EDR Contact: 07/01/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/17/2011
Data Release Frequency: Varies

SLIC REG 5: Spills, Leaks, Investigation \& Cleanup Cost Recovery Listing
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.

Date of Government Version: 04/01/2005
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/05/2005
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/21/2005
Number of Days to Update: 16

Source: Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Valley Region (5)
Telephone: 916-464-3291
Last EDR Contact: 09/12/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/26/2011
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

SLIC REG 6V: Spills, Leaks, Investigation \& Cleanup Cost Recovery Listing
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.

Date of Government Version: 05/24/2005
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/25/2005
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/16/2005
Number of Days to Update: 22

Source: Regional Water Quality Control Board, Victorville Branch
Telephone: 619-241-6583
Last EDR Contact: 08/15/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/28/2011
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

## SLIC REG 6L: SLIC Sites

The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.

Date of Government Version: 09/07/2004
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/07/2004
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/12/2004
Number of Days to Update: 35

Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region Telephone: 530-542-5574
Last EDR Contact: 08/15/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/28/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

SLIC REG 7: SLIC List
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.
Date of Government Version: 11/24/2004
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/29/2004
Source: California Regional Quality Control Board, Colorado River Basin Region Telephone: 760-346-7491
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/04/2005 Last EDR Contact: 08/01/2011
Number of Days to Update: 36
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/14/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned
SLIC REG 8: Spills, Leaks, Investigation \& Cleanup Cost Recovery Listing
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.
Date of Government Version: 04/03/2008
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/03/2008
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/14/2008
Number of Days to Update: 11

Source: California Region Water Quality Control Board Santa Ana Region (8) Telephone: 951-782-3298
Last EDR Contact: 09/12/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/26/2011
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

SLIC REG 9: Spills, Leaks, Investigation \& Cleanup Cost Recovery Listing
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.
Date of Government Version: 09/10/2007
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/11/2007
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Diego Region (9)
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/28/2007
Number of Days to Update: 17
Telephone: 858-467-2980
Last EDR Contact: 08/08/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/21/2011
Data Release Frequency: Annually
INDIAN LUST R6: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land LUSTs on Indian land in New Mexico and Oklahoma.

Date of Government Version: 05/14/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/15/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/15/2014
Number of Days to Update: 61

Source: EPA Region 6
Telephone: 214-665-6597
Last EDR Contact: 02/21/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 05/12/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

INDIAN LUST R4: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land LUSTs on Indian land in Florida, Mississippi and North Carolina.

Date of Government Version: 04/24/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/25/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/17/2014
Number of Days to Update: 53

Source: EPA Region 4
Telephone: 404-562-8677
Last EDR Contact: 04/22/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

INDIAN LUST R1: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
A listing of leaking underground storage tank locations on Indian Land.
Date of Government Version: 02/01/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/01/2013
Source: EPA Region 1
Telephone: 617-918-1313
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/01/2013
Last EDR Contact: 05/02/2014
Number of Days to Update: 184
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies
INDIAN LUST R8: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land LUSTs on Indian land in Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming.

Date of Government Version: 08/27/2012
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/28/2012
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/16/2012
Number of Days to Update: 49

Source: EPA Region 8
Telephone: 303-312-6271
Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

INDIAN LUST R9: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land LUSTs on Indian land in Arizona, California, New Mexico and Nevada

Date of Government Version: 03/01/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/01/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/12/2013
Number of Days to Update: 42

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 415-972-3372
Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

INDIAN LUST R10: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land LUSTs on Indian land in Alaska, Idaho, Oregon and Washington.

Date of Government Version: 11/06/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/07/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 12/06/2013
Number of Days to Update: 29

Source: EPA Region 10
Telephone: 206-553-2857
Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

INDIAN LUST R5: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land Leaking underground storage tanks located on Indian Land in Michigan, Minnesota and Wisconsin.

Date of Government Version: 05/12/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/12/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/17/2014
Number of Days to Update: 36

Source: EPA, Region 5
Telephone: 312-886-7439
Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

INDIAN LUST R7: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land LUSTs on Indian land in lowa, Kansas, and Nebraska

Date of Government Version: 04/28/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/01/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/17/2014
Number of Days to Update: 47

Source: EPA Region 7
Telephone: 913-551-7003
Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## State and tribal registered storage tank lists

UST: Active UST Facilities
Active UST facilities gathered from the local regulatory agencies

Date of Government Version: 06/16/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/17/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/10/2014
Number of Days to Update: 23

Source: SWRCB
Telephone: 916-341-5851
Last EDR Contact: 06/17/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/29/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

AST: Aboveground Petroleum Storage Tank Facilities
A listing of aboveground storage tank petroleum storage tank locations.

Date of Government Version: 08/01/2009
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/10/2009
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/01/2009
Number of Days to Update: 21

Source: California Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 916-327-5092
Last EDR Contact: 07/01/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/20/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

INDIAN UST R1: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 1 (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont and ten Tribal Nations)

Date of Government Version: 02/01/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/01/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/27/2014
Number of Days to Update: 271

Source: EPA, Region 1
Telephone: 617-918-1313
Last EDR Contact: 05/02/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

INDIAN UST R4: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 4 (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee and Tribal Nations)

Date of Government Version: 04/24/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/25/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/17/2014
Number of Days to Update: 53

Source: EPA Region 4
Telephone: 404-562-9424
Last EDR Contact: 04/22/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

INDIAN UST R5: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 5 (Michigan, Minnesota and Wisconsin and Tribal Nations).

Date of Government Version: 05/12/2014<br>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/12/2014<br>Source: EPA Region 5<br>Date Made Active in Reports: 06/17/2014<br>Number of Days to Update: 36<br>Telephone: 312-886-6136<br>Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014<br>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014<br>Data Release Frequency: Varies

INDIAN UST R6: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 6 (Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Texas and 65 Tribes).

Date of Government Version: 05/14/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/15/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/17/2014
Number of Days to Update: 33

Source: EPA Region 6
Telephone: 214-665-7591
Last EDR Contact: 01/27/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 05/12/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

INDIAN UST R7: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 7 (lowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and 9 Tribal Nations).

Date of Government Version: 05/28/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/01/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/17/2014
Number of Days to Update: 47

Source: EPA Region 7
Telephone: 913-551-7003
Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

INDIAN UST R8: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 8 (Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming and 27 Tribal Nations).

Date of Government Version: 05/07/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/09/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/17/2014
Number of Days to Update: 39

Source: EPA Region 8
Telephone: 303-312-6137
Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

INDIAN UST R9: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 9 (Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, the Pacific Islands, and Tribal Nations).

Date of Government Version: 05/12/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/14/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/17/2014
Number of Days to Update: 34

Source: EPA Region 9
Telephone: 415-972-3368
Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

INDIAN UST R10: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 10 (Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and Tribal Nations).

Date of Government Version: 04/04/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/08/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/17/2014
Number of Days to Update: 70

Source: EPA Region 10
Telephone: 206-553-2857
Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

FEMA UST: Underground Storage Tank Listing
A listing of all FEMA owned underground storage tanks.

Date of Government Version: 01/01/2010
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/16/2010
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/12/2010
Number of Days to Update: 55

Source: FEMA
Telephone: 202-646-5797
Last EDR Contact: 07/08/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/27/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## State and tribal voluntary cleanup sites

INDIAN VCP R7: Voluntary Cleanup Priority Lisitng
A listing of voluntary cleanup priority sites located on Indian Land located in Region 7.

Date of Government Version: 03/20/2008
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/22/2008
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/19/2008
Number of Days to Update: 27

Source: EPA, Region 7
Telephone: 913-551-7365
Last EDR Contact: 04/20/2009
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 07/20/2009
Data Release Frequency: Varies

INDIAN VCP R1: Voluntary Cleanup Priority Listing
A listing of voluntary cleanup priority sites located on Indian Land located in Region 1.

Date of Government Version: 03/20/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/01/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/17/2014
Number of Days to Update: 77

Source: EPA, Region 1
Telephone: 617-918-1102
Last EDR Contact: 07/01/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

VCP: Voluntary Cleanup Program Properties
Contains low threat level properties with either confirmed or unconfirmed releases and the project proponents have request that DTSC oversee investigation and/or cleanup activities and have agreed to provide coverage for DTSC's costs.

Date of Government Version: 06/05/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/06/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/09/2014
Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control
Telephone: 916-323-3400
Last EDR Contact: 06/06/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/18/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

## Local Brownfield lists

US BROWNFIELDS: A Listing of Brownfields Sites
Brownfields are real property, the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant. Cleaning up and reinvesting in these properties takes development pressures off of undeveloped, open land, and both improves and protects the environment. Assessment, Cleanup and Redevelopment Exchange System (ACRES) stores information reported by EPA Brownfields grant recipients on brownfields properties assessed or cleaned up with grant funding as well as information on Targeted Brownfields Assessments performed by EPA Regions. A listing of ACRES Brownfield sites is obtained from Cleanups in My Community. Cleanups in My Community provides information on Brownfields properties for which information is reported back to EPA, as well as areas served by Brownfields grant programs.

Date of Government Version: 03/20/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/20/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/09/2014
Number of Days to Update: 20

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 202-566-2777
Last EDR Contact: 07/03/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/06/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

## Local Lists of Landfill / Solid Waste Disposal Sites

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

DEBRIS REGION 9: Torres Martinez Reservation Illegal Dump Site Locations
A listing of illegal dump sites location on the Torres Martinez Indian Reservation located in eastern Riverside
County and northern Imperial County, California.
Date of Government Version: 01/12/2009
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/07/2009
Source: EPA, Region 9
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/21/2009
Number of Days to Update: 137
Telephone: 415-947-4219
Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned
ODI: Open Dump Inventory
An open dump is defined as a disposal facility that does not comply with one or more of the Part 257 or Part 258 Subtitle D Criteria.
Date of Government Version: 06/30/1985
Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/09/2004
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/17/2004
Number of Days to Update: 39
Telephone: 800-424-9346
Last EDR Contact: 06/09/2004
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned
SWRCY: Recycler Database
A listing of recycling facilities in California.
Date of Government Version: 06/16/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/17/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/11/2014
Number of Days to Update: 24
Source: Department of Conservation
Telephone: 916-323-3836
Last EDR Contact: 06/17/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/29/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly
HAULERS: Registered Waste Tire Haulers Listing
A listing of registered waste tire haulers.
Date of Government Version: 02/18/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/20/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/27/2014
Number of Days to Update: 35
Source: Integrated Waste Management Board
Telephone: 916-341-6422
Last EDR Contact: 05/19/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/01/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies
INDIAN ODI: Report on the Status of Open Dumps on Indian Lands
Location of open dumps on Indian land.
Date of Government Version: 12/31/1998
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 12/03/2007
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/24/2008
Number of Days to Update: 52

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 703-308-8245
Last EDR Contact: 05/02/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/18/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

WMUDS/SWAT: Waste Management Unit Database
Waste Management Unit Database System. WMUDS is used by the State Water Resources Control Board staff and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards for program tracking and inventory of waste management units. WMUDS is composed of the following databases: Facility Information, Scheduled Inspections Information, Waste Management Unit Information, SWAT Program Information, SWAT Report Summary Information, SWAT Report Summary Data, Chapter 15 (formerly Subchapter 15) Information, Chapter 15 Monitoring Parameters, TPCA Program Information, RCRA Program Information, Closure Information, and Interested Parties Information.

Date of Government Version: 04/01/2000
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/10/2000
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/10/2000
Number of Days to Update: 30
Source: State Water Resources Control Board
Telephone: 916-227-4448
Last EDR Contact: 05/07/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/25/2014
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

## Local Lists of Hazardous waste / Contaminated Sites

## US CDL: Clandestine Drug Labs

A listing of clandestine drug lab locations. The U.S. Department of Justice ("the Department") provides this web site as a public service. It contains addresses of some locations where law enforcement agencies reported they found chemicals or other items that indicated the presence of either clandestine drug laboratories or dumpsites. In most cases, the source of the entries is not the Department, and the Department has not verified the entry and does not guarantee its accuracy. Members of the public must verify the accuracy of all entries by, for example, contacting local law enforcement and local health departments.

Date of Government Version: 05/28/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/20/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/15/2014
Number of Days to Update: 25

Source: Drug Enforcement Administration
Telephone: 202-307-1000
Last EDR Contact: 06/04/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/15/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

HIST CAL-SITES: Calsites Database
The Calsites database contains potential or confirmed hazardous substance release properties. In 1996, California EPA reevaluated and significantly reduced the number of sites in the Calsites database. No longer updated by the state agency. It has been replaced by ENVIROSTOR.

Date of Government Version: 08/08/2005
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/03/2006
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/24/2006
Number of Days to Update: 21

Source: Department of Toxic Substance Control
Telephone: 916-323-3400
Last EDR Contact: 02/23/2009
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 05/25/2009
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

## SCH: School Property Evaluation Program

This category contains proposed and existing school sites that are being evaluated by DTSC for possible hazardous materials contamination. In some cases, these properties may be listed in the CalSites category depending on the level of threat to public health and safety or the environment they pose.

Date of Government Version: 06/05/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/06/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/09/2014
Number of Days to Update: 33

Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control<br>Telephone: 916-323-3400<br>Last EDR Contact: 06/06/2014<br>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/18/2014<br>Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

TOXIC PITS: Toxic Pits Cleanup Act Sites
Toxic PITS Cleanup Act Sites. TOXIC PITS identifies sites suspected of containing hazardous substances where cleanup has not yet been completed.

Date of Government Version: 07/01/1995
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/30/1995
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/26/1995
Number of Days to Update: 27

Source: State Water Resources Control Board
Telephone: 916-227-4364
Last EDR Contact: 01/26/2009
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 04/27/2009
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

CDL: Clandestine Drug Labs
A listing of drug lab locations. Listing of a location in this database does not indicate that any illegal drug lab materials were or were not present there, and does not constitute a determination that the location either requires or does not require additional cleanup work.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/28/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/20/2014
Number of Days to Update: 20

Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control Telephone: 916-255-6504
Last EDR Contact: 07/14/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/27/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

US HIST CDL: National Clandestine Laboratory Register
A listing of clandestine drug lab locations. The U.S. Department of Justice ("the Department") provides this web site as a public service. It contains addresses of some locations where law enforcement agencies reported they found chemicals or other items that indicated the presence of either clandestine drug laboratories or dumpsites. In most cases, the source of the entries is not the Department, and the Department has not verified the entry and does not guarantee its accuracy. Members of the public must verify the accuracy of all entries by, for example, contacting local law enforcement and local health departments.

Date of Government Version: 05/28/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/20/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/15/2014
Number of Days to Update: 25

Source: Drug Enforcement Administration
Telephone: 202-307-1000
Last EDR Contact: 06/04/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/15/2014
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

## Local Lists of Registered Storage Tanks

## CA FID UST: Facility Inventory Database

The Facility Inventory Database (FID) contains a historical listing of active and inactive underground storage tank locations from the State Water Resource Control Board. Refer to local/county source for current data.

Date of Government Version: 10/31/1994
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/05/1995
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/29/1995
Number of Days to Update: 24

Source: California Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 916-341-5851
Last EDR Contact: 12/28/1998
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

UST MENDOCINO: Mendocino County UST Database
A listing of underground storage tank locations in Mendocino County.

Date of Government Version: 09/23/2009
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/23/2009
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/01/2009
Number of Days to Update: 8

Source: Department of Public Health
Telephone: 707-463-4466
Last EDR Contact: 06/02/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/15/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually

HIST UST: Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database
The Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database is a historical listing of UST sites. Refer to local/county source for current data.

Date of Government Version: 10/15/1990
Source: State Water Resources Control Board
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 01/25/1991
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/12/1991
Telephone: 916-341-5851
Number of Days to Update: 18
Last EDR Contact: 07/26/2001
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned
SWEEPS UST: SWEEPS UST Listing
Statewide Environmental Evaluation and Planning System. This underground storage tank listing was updated and maintained by a company contacted by the SWRCB in the early 1990's. The listing is no longer updated or maintained. The local agency is the contact for more information on a site on the SWEEPS list.

Date of Government Version: 06/01/1994
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/07/2005
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/11/2005
Number of Days to Update: 35

Source: State Water Resources Control Board
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: 06/03/2005
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

## Local Land Records

LIENS 2: CERCLA Lien Information
A Federal CERCLA ('Superfund') lien can exist by operation of law at any site or property at which EPA has spent
Superfund monies. These monies are spent to investigate and address releases and threatened releases of contamination. CERCLIS provides information as to the identity of these sites and properties.

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

Date of Government Version: 02/18/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/18/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/24/2014
Number of Days to Update: 37

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 202-564-6023
Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

LIENS: Environmental Liens Listing
A listing of property locations with environmental liens for California where DTSC is a lien holder.

Date of Government Version: 05/05/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/06/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/19/2014
Number of Days to Update: 13

Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control
Telephone: 916-323-3400
Last EDR Contact: 06/09/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/22/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

DEED: Deed Restriction Listing
Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Facility Sites with Deed Restrictions \& Hazardous Waste Management Program Facility Sites with Deed / Land Use Restriction. The DTSC Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program (SMBRP) list includes sites cleaned up under the program's oversight and generally does not include current or former hazardous waste facilities that required a hazardous waste facility permit. The list represents deed restrictions that are active. Some sites have multiple deed restrictions. The DTSC Hazardous Waste Management Program (HWMP) has developed a list of current or former hazardous waste facilities that have a recorded land use restriction at the local county recorder's office. The land use restrictions on this list were required by the DTSC HWMP as a result of the presence of hazardous substances that remain on site after the facility (or part of the facility) has been closed or cleaned up. The types of land use restriction include deed notice, deed restriction, or a land use restriction that binds current and future owners.

Date of Government Version: 06/09/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/11/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/09/2014
Number of Days to Update: 28

Source: DTSC and SWRCB
Telephone: 916-323-3400
Last EDR Contact: 06/11/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/22/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

## Records of Emergency Release Reports

HMIRS: Hazardous Materials Information Reporting System
Hazardous Materials Incident Report System. HMIRS contains hazardous material spill incidents reported to DOT.

Date of Government Version: 03/31/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/01/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/15/2014
Number of Days to Update: 105

Source: U.S. Department of Transportation
Telephone: 202-366-4555
Last EDR Contact: 07/01/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually

CHMIRS: California Hazardous Material Incident Report System
California Hazardous Material Incident Reporting System. CHMIRS contains information on reported hazardous material incidents (accidental releases or spills).
Date of Government Version: 02/04/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/29/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/09/2014
Number of Days to Update: 10

Source: Office of Emergency Services
Telephone: 916-845-8400
Last EDR Contact: 04/29/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

LDS: Land Disposal Sites Listing
The Land Disposal program regulates of waste discharge to land for treatment, storage and disposal in waste management units.

Date of Government Version: 06/16/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/17/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/10/2014
Number of Days to Update: 23

Source: State Water Qualilty Control Board
Telephone: 866-480-1028
Last EDR Contact: 06/17/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/29/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

MCS: Military Cleanup Sites Listing
The State Water Resources Control Board and nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards partner with the Department of Defense (DoD) through the Defense and State Memorandum of Agreement (DSMOA) to oversee the investigation and remediation of water quality issues at military facilities.

Date of Government Version: 06/16/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/17/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/10/2014
Number of Days to Update: 23

Source: State Water Resources Control Board
Telephone: 866-480-1028
Last EDR Contact: 06/17/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/29/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

SPILLS 90: SPILLS90 data from FirstSearch
Spills 90 includes those spill and release records available exclusively from FirstSearch databases. Typically, they may include chemical, oil and/or hazardous substance spills recorded after 1990. Duplicate records that are already included in EDR incident and release records are not included in Spills 90.

Date of Government Version: 06/06/2012
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 01/03/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/22/2013
Number of Days to Update: 50

Source: FirstSearch
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: 01/03/2013
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

## Other Ascertainable Records

RCRA NonGen / NLR: RCRA - Non Generators
RCRAInfo is EPA's comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. The database includes selective information on sites which generate, transport, store, treat and/or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Non-Generators do not presently generate hazardous waste.

Date of Government Version: 03/11/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/13/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/09/2014
Number of Days to Update: 27

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: (415) 495-8895
Last EDR Contact: 07/02/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

DOT OPS: Incident and Accident Data
Department of Transporation, Office of Pipeline Safety Incident and Accident data.

Date of Government Version: 07/31/2012
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/07/2012
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/18/2012
Number of Days to Update: 42

Source: Department of Transporation, Office of Pipeline Safety
Telephone: 202-366-4595
Last EDR Contact: 05/06/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/18/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

DOD: Department of Defense Sites
This data set consists of federally owned or administered lands, administered by the Department of Defense, that have any area equal to or greater than 640 acres of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2005
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/10/2006
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/11/2007
Number of Days to Update: 62

Source: USGS
Telephone: 888-275-8747
Last EDR Contact: 04/18/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 07/28/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

## FUDS: Formerly Used Defense Sites

The listing includes locations of Formerly Used Defense Sites properties where the US Army Corps of Engineers is actively working or will take necessary cleanup actions.

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2012
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/28/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/24/2014
Number of Days to Update: 55

Source: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Telephone: 202-528-4285
Last EDR Contact: 06/04/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/22/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

CONSENT: Superfund (CERCLA) Consent Decrees
Major legal settlements that establish responsibility and standards for cleanup at NPL (Superfund) sites. Released periodically by United States District Courts after settlement by parties to litigation matters.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 01/24/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/24/2014
Number of Days to Update: 31

Source: Department of Justice, Consent Decree Library
Telephone: Varies
Last EDR Contact: 06/30/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

ROD: Records Of Decision
Record of Decision. ROD documents mandate a permanent remedy at an NPL (Superfund) site containing technical and health information to aid in the cleanup.
Date of Government Version: 11/25/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 12/12/2013
Source: EPA
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/24/2014
Telephone: 703-416-0223
Number of Days to Update: 74
Last EDR Contact: 06/10/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/22/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually
UMTRA: Uranium Mill Tailings Sites
Uranium ore was mined by private companies for federal government use in national defense programs. When the mills shut down, large piles of the sand-like material (mill tailings) remain after uranium has been extracted from the ore. Levels of human exposure to radioactive materials from the piles are low; however, in some cases tailings were used as construction materials before the potential health hazards of the tailings were recognized.

Date of Government Version: 09/14/2010
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/07/2011
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/01/2012
Number of Days to Update: 146

Source: Department of Energy
Telephone: 505-845-0011
Last EDR Contact: 02/25/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 06/09/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

US MINES: Mines Master Index File
Contains all mine identification numbers issued for mines active or opened since 1971. The data also includes violation information.

Date of Government Version: 01/30/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/05/2014
Source: Department of Labor, Mine Safety and Health Administration
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/15/2014
Number of Days to Update: 132
Telephone: 303-231-5959
Last EDR Contact: 06/06/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/15/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually
TRIS: Toxic Chemical Release Inventory System
Toxic Release Inventory System. TRIS identifies facilities which release toxic chemicals to the air, water and land in reportable quantities under SARA Title III Section 313.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2011
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/31/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/13/2013
Number of Days to Update: 44

Source: EPA
Telephone: 202-566-0250
Last EDR Contact: 05/30/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/08/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually

TSCA: Toxic Substances Control Act
Toxic Substances Control Act. TSCA identifies manufacturers and importers of chemical substances included on the TSCA Chemical Substance Inventory list. It includes data on the production volume of these substances by plant site.

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2006
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/29/2010
Date Made Active in Reports: 12/02/2010
Number of Days to Update: 64

Source: EPA
Telephone: 202-260-5521
Last EDR Contact: 06/25/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/06/2014
Data Release Frequency: Every 4 Years

FTTS: FIFRA/ TSCA Tracking System - FIFRA (Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, \& Rodenticide Act)/TSCA (Toxic Substances Control Act) FTTS tracks administrative cases and pesticide enforcement actions and compliance activities related to FIFRA, TSCA and EPCRA (Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act). To maintain currency, EDR contacts the Agency on a quarterly basis.

Date of Government Version: 04/09/2009
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/16/2009
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/11/2009
Number of Days to Update: 25

Source: EPA/Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances
Telephone: 202-566-1667
Last EDR Contact: 05/22/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/08/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

FTTS INSP: FIFRA/ TSCA Tracking System - FIFRA (Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, \& Rodenticide Act)/TSCA (Toxic Substances Control Act) A listing of FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System (FTTS) inspections and enforcements.
Date of Government Version: 04/09/2009
Source: EPA
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/16/2009
Telephone: 202-566-1667
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/11/2009
Last EDR Contact: 05/22/2014
Number of Days to Update: 25
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/08/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly
HIST FTTS: FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System Administrative Case Listing
A complete administrative case listing from the FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System (FTTS) for all ten EPA regions. The information was obtained from the National Compliance Database (NCDB). NCDB supports the implementation of FIFRA (Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act) and TSCA (Toxic Substances Control Act). Some EPA regions are now closing out records. Because of that, and the fact that some EPA regions are not providing EPA Headquarters with updated records, it was decided to create a HIST FTTS database. It included records that may not be included in the newer FTTS database updates. This database is no longer updated.

Date of Government Version: 10/19/2006
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/01/2007
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/10/2007
Number of Days to Update: 40

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 202-564-2501
Last EDR Contact: 12/17/2007
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 03/17/2008
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

HIST FTTS INSP: FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System Inspection \& Enforcement Case Listing
A complete inspection and enforcement case listing from the FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System (FTTS) for all ten EPA regions. The information was obtained from the National Compliance Database (NCDB). NCDB supports the implementation of FIFRA (Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act) and TSCA (Toxic Substances Control Act). Some EPA regions are now closing out records. Because of that, and the fact that some EPA regions are not providing EPA Headquarters with updated records, it was decided to create a HIST FTTS database. It included records that may not be included in the newer FTTS database updates. This database is no longer updated.

Date of Government Version: 10/19/2006
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/01/2007
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/10/2007
Number of Days to Update: 40

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 202-564-2501
Last EDR Contact: 12/17/2008
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 03/17/2008
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

SSTS: Section 7 Tracking Systems
Section 7 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, as amended (92 Stat. 829) requires all registered pesticide-producing establishments to submit a report to the Environmental Protection Agency by March 1 st each year. Each establishment must report the types and amounts of pesticides, active ingredients and devices being produced, and those having been produced and sold or distributed in the past year.

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2009
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 12/10/2010
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/25/2011
Number of Days to Update: 77

Source: EPA
Telephone: 202-564-4203
Last EDR Contact: 04/29/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually

ICIS: Integrated Compliance Information System
The Integrated Compliance Information System (ICIS) supports the information needs of the national enforcement and compliance program as well as the unique needs of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program.
Date of Government Version: 05/06/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/16/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/17/2014
Number of Days to Update: 32

Source: Environmental Protection Agency<br>Telephone: 202-564-5088<br>Last EDR Contact: 10/09/2014<br>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/27/2014<br>Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

PADS: PCB Activity Database System
PCB Activity Database. PADS Identifies generators, transporters, commercial storers and/or brokers and disposers of PCB's who are required to notify the EPA of such activities.

Date of Government Version: 06/01/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/17/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/01/2013
Number of Days to Update: 107

Source: EPA
Telephone: 202-566-0500
Last EDR Contact: 04/18/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 07/28/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually

MLTS: Material Licensing Tracking System
MLTS is maintained by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and contains a list of approximately 8,100 sites which possess or use radioactive materials and which are subject to NRC licensing requirements. To maintain currency, EDR contacts the Agency on a quarterly basis.

Date of Government Version: 07/22/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/02/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/01/2013
Number of Days to Update: 91

Source: Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Telephone: 301-415-7169
Last EDR Contact: 06/05/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/22/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

RADINFO: Radiation Information Database
The Radiation Information Database (RADINFO) contains information about facilities that are regulated by U.S.
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations for radiation and radioactivity.

Date of Government Version: 04/08/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/09/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/17/2014
Number of Days to Update: 69

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 202-343-9775
Last EDR Contact: 07/10/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/20/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

FINDS: Facility Index System/Facility Registry System
Facility Index System. FINDS contains both facility information and 'pointers' to other sources that contain more detail. EDR includes the following FINDS databases in this report: PCS (Permit Compliance System), AIRS (Aerometric Information Retrieval System), DOCKET (Enforcement Docket used to manage and track information on civil judicial enforcement cases for all environmental statutes), FURS (Federal Underground Injection Control), C-DOCKET (Criminal Docket System used to track criminal enforcement actions for all environmental statutes), FFIS (Federal Facilities Information System), STATE (State Environmental Laws and Statutes), and PADS (PCB Activity Data System).

Date of Government Version: 11/18/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/27/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/12/2014
Number of Days to Update: 13

Source: EPA
Telephone: (415) 947-8000
Last EDR Contact: 06/13/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/22/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

RAATS: RCRA Administrative Action Tracking System
RCRA Administration Action Tracking System. RAATS contains records based on enforcement actions issued under RCRA pertaining to major violators and includes administrative and civil actions brought by the EPA. For administration actions after September 30, 1995, data entry in the RAATS database was discontinued. EPA will retain a copy of the database for historical records. It was necessary to terminate RAATS because a decrease in agency resources made it impossible to continue to update the information contained in the database.

Date of Government Version: 04/17/1995
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/03/1995
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/07/1995
Number of Days to Update: 35

Source: EPA
Telephone: 202-564-4104
Last EDR Contact: 06/02/2008
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/01/2008
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

RMP: Risk Management Plans
When Congress passed the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, it required EPA to publish regulations and guidance for chemical accident prevention at facilities using extremely hazardous substances. The Risk Management Program Rule (RMP Rule) was written to implement Section 112(r) of these amendments. The rule, which built upon existing industry codes and standards, requires companies of all sizes that use certain flammable and toxic substances to develop a Risk Management Program, which includes a(n): Hazard assessment that details the potential effects of an accidental release, an accident history of the last five years, and an evaluation of worst-case and alternative accidental releases; Prevention program that includes safety precautions and maintenance, monitoring, and employee training measures; and Emergency response program that spells out emergency health care, employee training measures and procedures for informing the public and response agencies (e.g the fire department) should an accident occur.

Date of Government Version: 11/01/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 12/12/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/13/2014
Number of Days to Update: 63

Source: Environmental Protection Agency<br>Telephone: 202-564-8600<br>Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014<br>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014<br>Data Release Frequency: Varies

BRS: Biennial Reporting System
The Biennial Reporting System is a national system administered by the EPA that collects data on the generation and management of hazardous waste. BRS captures detailed data from two groups: Large Quantity Generators (LQG) and Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2011
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/26/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/19/2013
Number of Days to Update: 52

Source: EPA/NTIS
Telephone: 800-424-9346
Last EDR Contact: 05/30/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/08/2014
Data Release Frequency: Biennially

CA BOND EXP. PLAN: Bond Expenditure Plan
Department of Health Services developed a site-specific expenditure plan as the basis for an appropriation of Hazardous Substance Cleanup Bond Act funds. It is not updated.

Date of Government Version: 01/01/1989
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/27/1994
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/02/1994
Number of Days to Update: 6

Source: Department of Health Services
Telephone: 916-255-2118
Last EDR Contact: 05/31/1994
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

UIC: UIC Listing
A listing of wells identified as underground injection wells, in the California Oil and Gas Wells database.
Date of Government Version: 01/15/2014
Source: Deaprtment of Conservation
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/18/2014
Telephone: 916-445-2408
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/24/2014
Last EDR Contact: 06/20/2014
Number of Days to Update: 37
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/29/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

NPDES: NPDES Permits Listing
A listing of NPDES permits, including stormwater.

Date of Government Version: 05/19/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/20/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/28/2014
Number of Days to Update: 8

Source: State Water Resources Control Board
Telephone: 916-445-9379
Last EDR Contact: 05/20/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/01/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

CORTESE: "Cortese" Hazardous Waste \& Substances Sites List
The sites for the list are designated by the State Water Resource Control Board (LUST), the Integrated Waste Board (SWF/LS), and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (Cal-Sites).

Date of Government Version: 03/31/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/02/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/29/2014
Number of Days to Update: 27

Source: CAL EPA/Office of Emergency Information
Telephone: 916-323-3400
Last EDR Contact: 07/01/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

HIST CORTESE: Hazardous Waste \& Substance Site List
The sites for the list are designated by the State Water Resource Control Board [LUST], the Integrated Waste Board [SWF/LS], and the Department of Toxic Substances Control [CALSITES]. This listing is no longer updated by the state agency.

Date of Government Version: 04/01/2001
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 01/22/2009
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/08/2009
Number of Days to Update: 76

Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control
Telephone: 916-323-3400
Last EDR Contact: 01/22/2009
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

NOTIFY 65: Proposition 65 Records
Listings of all Proposition 65 incidents reported to counties by the State Water Resources Control Board and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. This database is no longer updated by the reporting agency.

Date of Government Version: 10/21/1993
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/01/1993
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/19/1993
Number of Days to Update: 18

Source: State Water Resources Control Board
Telephone: 916-445-3846
Last EDR Contact: 06/17/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/06/2014
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

DRYCLEANERS: Cleaner Facilities
A list of drycleaner related facilities that have EPA ID numbers. These are facilities with certain SIC codes: power laundries, family and commercial; garment pressing and cleaner's agents; linen supply; coin-operated laundries and cleaning; drycleaning plants, except rugs; carpet and upholster cleaning; industrial launderers; laundry and garment services.

Date of Government Version: 09/10/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/11/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/16/2013
Number of Days to Update: 35

Source: Department of Toxic Substance Control
Telephone: 916-327-4498
Last EDR Contact: 06/09/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/22/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually

WIP: Well Investigation Program Case List
Well Investigation Program case in the San Gabriel and San Fernando Valley area.

Date of Government Version: 07/03/2009
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/21/2009
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/03/2009
Number of Days to Update: 13

Source: Los Angeles Water Quality Control Board
Telephone: 213-576-6726
Last EDR Contact: 06/25/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

ENF: Enforcement Action Listing
A listing of Water Board Enforcement Actions. Formal is everything except Oral/Verbal Communication, Notice of Violation, Expedited Payment Letter, and Staff Enforcement Letter.

Date of Government Version: 05/30/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/30/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/07/2014
Number of Days to Update: 38

Source: State Water Resoruces Control Board
Telephone: 916-445-9379
Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

HAZNET: Facility and Manifest Data
Facility and Manifest Data. The data is extracted from the copies of hazardous waste manifests received each year by the DTSC. The annual volume of manifests is typically $700,000-1,000,000$ annually, representing approximately $350,000-500,000$ shipments. Data are from the manifests submitted without correction, and therefore many contain some invalid values for data elements such as generator ID, TSD ID, waste category, and disposal method.
Date of Government Version: 12/31/2012
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/16/2013
Source: California Environmental Protection Agency
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/26/2013
Number of Days to Update: 41
Telephone: 916-255-1136
Last EDR Contact: 04/18/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 07/28/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually
EMI: Emissions Inventory Data
Toxics and criteria pollutant emissions data collected by the ARB and local air pollution agencies.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2012
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/25/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/28/2014
Number of Days to Update: 34

Source: California Air Resources Board
Telephone: 916-322-2990
Last EDR Contact: 06/26/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/06/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

INDIAN RESERV: Indian Reservations
This map layer portrays Indian administered lands of the United States that have any area equal to or greater than 640 acres.
Date of Government Version: 12/31/2005
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 12/08/2006
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/11/2007
Number of Days to Update: 34
Source: USGS
Telephone: 202-208-3710
Last EDR Contact: 04/18/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 07/28/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually
SCRD DRYCLEANERS: State Coalition for Remediation of Drycleaners Listing
The State Coalition for Remediation of Drycleaners was established in 1998, with support from the U.S. EPA Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation. It is comprised of representatives of states with established drycleaner remediation programs. Currently the member states are Alabama, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin.

Date of Government Version: 03/07/2011
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/09/2011
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/02/2011
Number of Days to Update: 54

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 615-532-8599
Last EDR Contact: 04/21/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/04/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

Financial Assurance 1: Financial Assurance Information Listing
Financial Assurance information

Date of Government Version: 05/05/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/14/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/22/2014
Number of Days to Update: 8

Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control
Telephone: 916-255-3628
Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

Financial Assurance 2: Financial Assurance Information Listing
A listing of financial assurance information for solid waste facilities. Financial assurance is intended to ensure that resources are available to pay for the cost of closure, post-closure care, and corrective measures if the owner or operator of a regulated facility is unable or unwilling to pay.

Date of Government Version: 05/19/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/20/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/22/2014
Number of Days to Update: 2

Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board
Telephone: 916-341-6066
Last EDR Contact: 05/19/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/01/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

EPA WATCH LIST: EPA WATCH LIST
EPA maintains a "Watch List" to facilitate dialogue between EPA, state and local environmental agencies on enforcement matters relating to facilities with alleged violations identified as either significant or high priority. Being on the Watch List does not mean that the facility has actually violated the law only that an investigation by EPA or a state or local environmental agency has led those organizations to allege that an unproven violation has in fact occurred. Being on the Watch List does not represent a higher level of concern regarding the alleged violations that were detected, but instead indicates cases requiring additional dialogue between EPA, state and local agencies - primarily because of the length of time the alleged violation has gone unaddressed or unresolved.

Date of Government Version: 08/30/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/21/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/17/2014
Number of Days to Update: 88

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 617-520-3000
Last EDR Contact: 05/16/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/25/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

LEAD SMELTER 1: Lead Smelter Sites
A listing of former lead smelter site locations.
Date of Government Version: 01/29/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/14/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/27/2013
Number of Days to Update: 13
Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 703-603-8787
Last EDR Contact: 07/01/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/20/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies
LEAD SMELTER 2: Lead Smelter Sites
A list of several hundred sites in the U.S. where secondary lead smelting was done from 1931and 1964. These sites may pose a threat to public health through ingestion or inhalation of contaminated soil or dust

Date of Government Version: 04/05/2001
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/27/2010
Date Made Active in Reports: 12/02/2010
Number of Days to Update: 36

Source: American Journal of Public Health
Telephone: 703-305-6451
Last EDR Contact: 12/02/2009
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

PCB TRANSFORMER: PCB Transformer Registration Database
The database of PCB transformer registrations that includes all PCB registration submittals.

Date of Government Version: 02/01/2011
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/19/2011
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/10/2012
Number of Days to Update: 83

Source: Environmental Protection Agency Telephone: 202-566-0517
Last EDR Contact: 05/02/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

PRP: Potentially Responsible Parties
A listing of verified Potentially Responsible Parties
Date of Government Version: 04/15/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/03/2013
Source: EPA
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/13/2013
Number of Days to Update: 72

Telephone: 202-564-6023
Last EDR Contact: 07/01/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

2020 COR ACTION: 2020 Corrective Action Program List
The EPA has set ambitious goals for the RCRA Corrective Action program by creating the 2020 Corrective Action Universe. This RCRA cleanup baseline includes facilities expected to need corrective action. The 2020 universe contains a wide variety of sites. Some properties are heavily contaminated while others were contaminated but have since been cleaned up. Still others have not been fully investigated yet, and may require little or no remediation. Inclusion in the 2020 Universe does not necessarily imply failure on the part of a facility to meet its RCRA obligations.

Date of Government Version: 11/11/2011
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/18/2012
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/25/2012
Number of Days to Update: 7

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 703-308-4044
Last EDR Contact: 05/16/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/25/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

COAL ASH EPA: Coal Combustion Residues Surface Impoundments List
A listing of coal combustion residues surface impoundments with high hazard potential ratings.

Date of Government Version: 08/17/2010
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 01/03/2011
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/21/2011
Number of Days to Update: 77

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: 06/11/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/22/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

US FIN ASSUR: Financial Assurance Information
All owners and operators of facilities that treat, store, or dispose of hazardous waste are required to provide
proof that they will have sufficient funds to pay for the clean up, closure, and post-closure care of their facilities.
Date of Government Version: 02/25/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/27/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/09/2014
Number of Days to Update: 41
Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 202-566-1917
Last EDR Contact: 05/16/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/01/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly
US AIRS MINOR: Air Facility System Data
A listing of minor source facilities.
Date of Government Version: 10/23/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/06/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 12/06/2013
Number of Days to Update: 30
Source: EPA
Telephone: 202-564-2496
Last EDR Contact: 06/25/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually
US AIRS (AFS): Aerometric Information Retrieval System Facility Subsystem (AFS)
The database is a sub-system of Aerometric Information Retrieval System (AIRS). AFS contains compliance data on air pollution point sources regulated by the U.S. EPA and/or state and local air regulatory agencies. This information comes from source reports by various stationary sources of air pollution, such as electric power plants, steel mills, factories, and universities, and provides information about the air pollutants they produce. Action, air program, air program pollutant, and general level plant data. It is used to track emissions and compliance data from industrial plants.
Date of Government Version: 10/23/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/06/2013
Source: EPA
Date Made Active in Reports: 12/06/2013
Telephone: 202-564-2496
Number of Days to Update: 30
Last EDR Contact: 06/25/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually

WDS: Waste Discharge System
Sites which have been issued waste discharge requirements.

Date of Government Version: 06/19/2007
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/20/2007
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/29/2007
Number of Days to Update: 9

Source: State Water Resources Control Board
Telephone: 916-341-5227
Last EDR Contact: 05/22/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/08/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

HWP: EnviroStor Permitted Facilities Listing
Detailed information on permitted hazardous waste facilities and corrective action ("cleanups") tracked in EnviroStor.

Date of Government Version: 05/27/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/28/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/07/2014
Number of Days to Update: 40

Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control
Telephone: 916-323-3400
Last EDR Contact: 05/28/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/08/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

HWT: Registered Hazardous Waste Transporter Database
A listing of hazardous waste transporters. In California, unless specifically exempted, it is unlawful for any person to transport hazardous wastes unless the person holds a valid registration issued by DTSC. A hazardous waste transporter registration is valid for one year and is assigned a unique registration number.

Date of Government Version: 04/14/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/15/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/24/2014
Number of Days to Update: 9

Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control
Telephone: 916-440-7145
Last EDR Contact: 07/15/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/27/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

COAL ASH DOE: Sleam-Electric Plan Operation Data
A listing of power plants that store ash in surface ponds.
Date of Government Version: 12/31/2005
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/07/2009
Source: Department of Energy
Telephone: 202-586-8719
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/22/2009
Last EDR Contact: 04/18/2014
Number of Days to Update: 76
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 07/28/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies
MWMP: Medical Waste Management Program Listing
The Medical Waste Management Program (MWMP) ensures the proper handling and disposal of medical waste by permitting and inspecting medical waste Offsite Treatment Facilities (PDF) and Transfer Stations (PDF) throughout the state. MWMP also oversees all Medical Waste Transporters.

Date of Government Version: 05/23/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/13/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/09/2014
Number of Days to Update: 26

Source: Department of Public Health
Telephone: 916-558-1784
Last EDR Contact: 06/09/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/22/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

FEDLAND: Federal and Indian Lands
Federally and Indian administrated lands of the United States. Lands included are administrated by: Army Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, National Wild and Scenic River, National Wildlife Refuge, Public Domain Land, Wilderness, Wilderness Study Area, Wildlife Management Area, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of Justice, Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2005
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/06/2006
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/11/2007
Number of Days to Update: 339

Source: U.S. Geological Survey
Telephone: 888-275-8747
Last EDR Contact: 04/18/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 07/28/2014
Data Release Frequency: N/A

Source: Department of Conservation
Telephone: 916-323-3836
Last EDR Contact: 06/17/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/29/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

## EDR HIGH RISK HISTORICAL RECORDS

## EDR Exclusive Records

EDR MGP: EDR Proprietary Manufactured Gas Plants
The EDR Proprietary Manufactured Gas Plant Database includes records of coal gas plants (manufactured gas plants) compiled by EDR's researchers. Manufactured gas sites were used in the United States from the 1800's to 1950's to produce a gas that could be distributed and used as fuel. These plants used whale oil, rosin, coal, or a mixture of coal, oil, and water that also produced a significant amount of waste. Many of the byproducts of the gas production, such as coal tar (oily waste containing volatile and non-volatile chemicals), sludges, oils and other compounds are potentially hazardous to human health and the environment. The byproduct from this process was frequently disposed of directly at the plant site and can remain or spread slowly, serving as a continuous source of soil and groundwater contamination.

Date of Government Version: N/A
Date Data Arrived at EDR: N/A
Date Made Active in Reports: N/A
Number of Days to Update: N/A

Source: EDR, Inc.
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: N/A
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

EDR US Hist Auto Stat: EDR Exclusive Historic Gas Stations
EDR has searched selected national collections of business directories and has collected listings of potential gas station/filling station/service station sites that were available to EDR researchers. EDR's review was limited to those categories of sources that might, in EDR's opinion, include gas station/filling station/service station establishments. The categories reviewed included, but were not limited to gas, gas station, gasoline station, filling station, auto, automobile repair, auto service station, service station, etc. This database falls within a category of information EDR classifies as "High Risk Historical Records", or HRHR. EDR's HRHR effort presents unique and sometimes proprietary data about past sites and operations that typically create environmental concerns, but may not show up in current government records searches.

Date of Government Version: N/A
Date Data Arrived at EDR: N/A
Date Made Active in Reports: N/A
Number of Days to Update: N/A

Source: EDR, Inc.
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: N/A
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: Varies

EDR US Hist Cleaners: EDR Exclusive Historic Dry Cleaners
EDR has searched selected national collections of business directories and has collected listings of potential dry cleaner sites that were available to EDR researchers. EDR's review was limited to those categories of sources that might, in EDR's opinion, include dry cleaning establishments. The categories reviewed included, but were not limited to dry cleaners, cleaners, laundry, laundromat, cleaning/laundry, wash \& dry etc. This database falls within a category of information EDR classifies as "High Risk Historical Records", or HRHR. EDR's HRHR effort presents unique and sometimes proprietary data about past sites and operations that typically create environmental concerns, but may not show up in current government records searches.

Date of Government Version: N/A Date Data Arrived at EDR: N/A Date Made Active in Reports: N/A
Number of Days to Update: N/A
EDR RECOVERED GOVERNMENT ARCHIVES

Source: EDR, Inc.
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: N/A
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## Exclusive Recovered Govt. Archives

RGA LF: Recovered Government Archive Solid Waste Facilities List
The EDR Recovered Government Archive Landfill database provides a list of landfills derived from historical databases and includes many records that no longer appear in current government lists. Compiled from Records formerly available from the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery in California.

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

Date of Government Version: N/A
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/01/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/13/2014
Number of Days to Update: 196

Source: Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: 06/01/2012
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: Varies

RGA LUST: Recovered Government Archive Leaking Underground Storage Tank
The EDR Recovered Government Archive Leaking Underground Storage Tank database provides a list of LUST incidents derived from historical databases and includes many records that no longer appear in current government lists. Compiled from Records formerly available from the State Water Resources Control Board in California.

Date of Government Version: N/A
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/01/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 12/30/2013
Number of Days to Update: 182

Source: State Water Resources Control Board
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: 06/01/2012
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## COUNTY RECORDS

## ALAMEDA COUNTY:

Contaminated Sites
A listing of contaminated sites overseen by the Toxic Release Program (oil and groundwater contamination from chemical releases and spills) and the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program (soil and ground water contamination from leaking petroleum USTs).

Date of Government Version: 04/22/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/24/2014
Source: Alameda County Environmental Health Services
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/09/2014
Number of Days to Update: 15
Telephone: 510-567-6700
Last EDR Contact: 06/30/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually
Underground Tanks
Underground storage tank sites located in Alameda county.

Date of Government Version: 04/22/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/24/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/12/2014
Number of Days to Update: 18

Source: Alameda County Environmental Health Services Telephone: 510-567-6700
Last EDR Contact: 06/30/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

AMADOR COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
Cupa Facility List
Date of Government Version: 03/24/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/24/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/30/2014
Number of Days to Update: 37
Source: Amador County Environmental Health
Telephone: 209-223-6439
Last EDR Contact: 06/19/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/22/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## BUTTE COUNTY:

CUPA Facility Listing
Cupa facility list.

Date of Government Version: 08/01/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/02/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/22/2013
Number of Days to Update: 20

Source: Public Health Department
Telephone: 530-538-7149
Last EDR Contact: 07/08/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/27/2014
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

## CALVERAS COUNTY:

CUPA Facility Listing
Cupa Facility Listing
Date of Government Version: 04/01/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/03/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/29/2014
Number of Days to Update: 26
Source: Calveras County Environmental Health Telephone: 209-754-6399 Last EDR Contact: 06/26/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

COLUSA COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
Cupa facility list.
Date of Government Version: 06/11/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/13/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/07/2014
Number of Days to Update: 24

Source: Health \& Human Services<br>Telephone: 530-458-0396<br>Last EDR Contact: 05/30/2014<br>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/25/2014<br>Data Release Frequency: Varies

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY:
Site List
List includes sites from the underground tank, hazardous waste generator and business plan/2185 programs.

Date of Government Version: 02/24/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/25/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/18/2014
Number of Days to Update: 21

Source: Contra Costa Health Services Department Telephone: 925-646-2286
Last EDR Contact: 05/05/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/18/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

DEL NORTE COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
Cupa Facility list
Date of Government Version: 05/05/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/06/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/13/2014
Number of Days to Update: 7

Source: Del Norte County Environmental Health Division Telephone: 707-465-0426
Last EDR Contact: 05/05/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/18/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

EL DORADO COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
CUPA facility list.

Date of Government Version: 05/29/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/30/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/07/2014
Number of Days to Update: 38

Source: El Dorado County Environmental Management Department Telephone: 530-621-6623
Last EDR Contact: 05/05/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/18/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## FRESNO COUNTY:

## CUPA Resources List

Certified Unified Program Agency. CUPA's are responsible for implementing a unified hazardous materials and hazardous waste management regulatory program. The agency provides oversight of businesses that deal with hazardous materials, operate underground storage tanks or aboveground storage tanks.

Date of Government Version: 03/31/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/15/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/01/2014
Number of Days to Update: 16

Source: Dept. of Community Health
Telephone: 559-445-3271
Last EDR Contact: 07/11/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/27/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

## HUMBOLDT COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
CUPA facility list.
Date of Government Version: 06/09/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/11/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/07/2014
Number of Days to Update: 26
Source: Humboldt County Environmental Health
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: 05/22/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/08/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## IMPERIAL COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
Cupa facility list.
Date of Government Version: 04/28/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/30/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/13/2014
Number of Days to Update: 13
Source: San Diego Border Field Office
Telephone: 760-339-2777
Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

INYO COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
Cupa facility list.
Date of Government Version: 09/10/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/11/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/14/2013
Number of Days to Update: 33

KERN COUNTY:

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

Underground Storage Tank Sites \& Tank Listing
Kern County Sites and Tanks Listing.
Date of Government Version: 08/31/2010
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/01/2010
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/30/2010
Number of Days to Update: 29

## KINGS COUNTY

## CUPA Facility List

A listing of sites included in the county's Certified Unified Program Agency database. California's Secretary for Environmental Protection established the unified hazardous materials and hazardous waste regulatory program as required by chapter 6.11 of the California Health and Safety Code. The Unified Program consolidates the administration, permits, inspections, and enforcement activities.

Date of Government Version: 05/28/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/30/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/20/2014
Number of Days to Update: 21

Source: Kings County Department of Public Health
Telephone: 559-584-1411
Last EDR Contact: 05/27/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/08/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## LAKE COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
Cupa facility list
Date of Government Version: 04/22/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/24/2014
Source: Lake County Environmental Health
Telephone: 707-263-1164
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/13/2014
Number of Days to Update: 19
Last EDR Contact: 04/21/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/04/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## LOS ANGELES COUNTY

San Gabriel Valley Areas of Concern
San Gabriel Valley areas where VOC contamination is at or above the MCL as designated by region 9 EPA office.

Date of Government Version: 03/30/2009
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/31/2009
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/23/2009
Number of Days to Update: 206

Source: EPA Region 9
Telephone: 415-972-3178
Last EDR Contact: 06/19/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/06/2014
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

HMS: Street Number List
Industrial Waste and Underground Storage Tank Sites.

Date of Government Version: 03/31/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/06/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/17/2014
Number of Days to Update: 41

Source: Department of Public Works
Telephone: 626-458-3517
Last EDR Contact: 07/10/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/27/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

Solid Waste Facilities in Los Angeles County.

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

Date of Government Version: 04/21/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/22/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/19/2014
Number of Days to Update: 27

Source: La County Department of Public Works
Telephone: 818-458-5185
Last EDR Contact: 04/22/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/04/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

City of Los Angeles Landfills
Landfills owned and maintained by the City of Los Angeles.
Date of Government Version: 03/05/2009 Source: Engineering \& Construction Division
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/10/2009 Telephone: 213-473-7869
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/08/2009 Last EDR Contact: 04/17/2014
Number of Days to Update: 29
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/04/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies
Site Mitigation List
Industrial sites that have had some sort of spill or complaint.

Date of Government Version: 01/07/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/25/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/25/2014
Number of Days to Update: 28

Source: Community Health Services
Telephone: 323-890-7806
Last EDR Contact: 07/16/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/03/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually

City of El Segundo Underground Storage Tank Underground storage tank sites located in El Segundo city.
Date of Government Version: 04/23/2014 Source: City of El Segundo Fire Department
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/25/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/22/2014
Number of Days to Update: 27
Telephone: 310-524-2236
Last EDR Contact: 04/21/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/04/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually
City of Long Beach Underground Storage Tank
Underground storage tank sites located in the city of Long Beach.
Date of Government Version: 02/25/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/27/2014
Source: City of Long Beach Fire Department Telephone: 562-570-2563
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/14/2014
Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014
Number of Days to Update: 46
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually
City of Torrance Underground Storage Tank
Underground storage tank sites located in the city of Torrance.
Date of Government Version: 01/13/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/27/2014
Source: City of Torrance Fire Department
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/28/2014
Telephone: 310-618-2973
Last EDR Contact: 07/11/2014
Number of Days to Update: 32
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/27/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

## MADERA COUNTY:

## CUPA Facility List

A listing of sites included in the county's Certified Unified Program Agency database. California's Secretary for Environmental Protection established the unified hazardous materials and hazardous waste regulatory program as required by chapter 6.11 of the California Health and Safety Code. The Unified Program consolidates the administration, permits, inspections, and enforcement activities.

Date of Government Version: 06/09/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/11/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/27/2014
Number of Days to Update: 16

Source: Madera County Environmental Health
Telephone: 559-675-7823
Last EDR Contact: 05/02/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/08/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## MARIN COUNTY:

Underground Storage Tank Sites
Currently permitted USTs in Marin County.
Date of Government Version: 01/03/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 01/09/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/12/2014
Number of Days to Update: 34

Source: Public Works Department Waste Management Telephone: 415-499-6647
Last EDR Contact: 07/02/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/20/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

MERCED COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
CUPA facility list.
Date of Government Version: 05/27/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/29/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/24/2014
Number of Days to Update: 26

Source: Merced County Environmental Health Telephone: 209-381-1094<br>Last EDR Contact: 05/27/2014<br>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/08/2014<br>Data Release Frequency: Varies

MONO COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
CUPA Facility List
Date of Government Version: 06/09/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/13/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/27/2014
Number of Days to Update: 14

Source: Mono County Health Department
Telephone: 760-932-5580
Last EDR Contact: 06/02/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/15/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## MONTEREY COUNTY:

CUPA Facility Listing
CUPA Program listing from the Environmental Health Division.

Date of Government Version: 06/09/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/11/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/09/2014
Number of Days to Update: 28

Source: Monterey County Health Department Telephone: 831-796-1297
Last EDR Contact: 05/22/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/08/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

NAPA COUNTY:
Sites With Reported Contamination
A listing of leaking underground storage tank sites located in Napa county.

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

Date of Government Version: 12/05/2011
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 12/06/2011
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/07/2012
Number of Days to Update: 63

Source: Napa County Department of Environmental Management Telephone: 707-253-4269
Last EDR Contact: 05/30/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/15/2014
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

Closed and Operating Underground Storage Tank Sites
Underground storage tank sites located in Napa county.
Date of Government Version: 01/15/2008 Source: Napa County Department of Environmental Management
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 01/16/2008 Telephone: 707-253-4269
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/08/2008
Number of Days to Update: 23
Last EDR Contact: 05/30/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/15/2014
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

## NEVADA COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
CUPA facility list.
Date of Government Version: 11/06/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/07/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 12/04/2013
Number of Days to Update: 27
Source: Community Development Agency
Telephone: 530-265-1467
Last EDR Contact: 05/13/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/18/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## ORANGE COUNTY:

List of Industrial Site Cleanups
Petroleum and non-petroleum spills.
Date of Government Version: 05/01/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/15/2014
Source: Health Care Agency
Telephone: 714-834-3446
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/22/2014
Last EDR Contact: 05/07/2014
Number of Days to Update: 7
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/28/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually
List of Underground Storage Tank Cleanups
Orange County Underground Storage Tank Cleanups (LUST).
Date of Government Version: 05/01/2014 Source: Health Care Agency
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/15/2014
Telephone: 714-834-3446
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/28/2014
Last EDR Contact: 05/07/2014
Number of Days to Update: 13
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/25/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly
List of Underground Storage Tank Facilities
Orange County Underground Storage Tank Facilities (UST).

Date of Government Version: 05/01/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/14/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/21/2014
Number of Days to Update: 7

Source: Health Care Agency
Telephone: 714-834-3446
Last EDR Contact: 05/07/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/25/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

Master List of Facilities
List includes aboveground tanks, underground tanks and cleanup sites.

Date of Government Version: 06/09/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/10/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/09/2014
Number of Days to Update: 29

Source: Placer County Health and Human Services
Telephone: 530-745-2363
Last EDR Contact: 06/09/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/22/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

## RIVERSIDE COUNTY:

Listing of Underground Tank Cleanup Sites
Riverside County Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Sites (LUST).

Date of Government Version: 04/15/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/17/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/24/2014
Number of Days to Update: 7

Source: Department of Environmental Health Telephone: 951-358-5055
Last EDR Contact: 06/23/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/06/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Underground Storage Tank Tank List
Underground storage tank sites located in Riverside county.

Date of Government Version: 04/15/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/17/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/09/2014
Number of Days to Update: 22

Source: Department of Environmental Health
Telephone: 951-358-5055
Last EDR Contact: 06/23/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/06/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## SACRAMENTO COUNTY:

Toxic Site Clean-Up List
List of sites where unauthorized releases of potentially hazardous materials have occurred.

Date of Government Version: 02/06/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/08/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/29/2014
Number of Days to Update: 21

Source: Sacramento County Environmental Management Telephone: 916-875-8406
Last EDR Contact: 07/11/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/20/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Master Hazardous Materials Facility List
Any business that has hazardous materials on site - hazardous material storage sites, underground storage tanks, waste generators.

Date of Government Version: 02/06/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/08/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/29/2014
Number of Days to Update: 21

Source: Sacramento County Environmental Management
Telephone: 916-875-8406
Last EDR Contact: 07/08/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/20/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY:

Hazardous Material Permits
This listing includes underground storage tanks, medical waste handlers/generators, hazardous materials handlers, hazardous waste generators, and waste oil generators/handlers.

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

Date of Government Version: 05/30/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/30/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/07/2014
Number of Days to Update: 38

Source: San Bernardino County Fire Department Hazardous Materials Division
Telephone: 909-387-3041
Last EDR Contact: 05/12/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/25/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## SAN DIEGO COUNTY:

Hazardous Materials Management Division Database
The database includes: HE58 - This report contains the business name, site address, business phone number, establishment
' H ' permit number, type of permit, and the business status. HE17-In addition to providing the same information provided in the HE58 listing, HE17 provides inspection dates, violations received by the establishment, hazardous waste generated, the quantity, method of storage, treatment/disposal of waste and the hauler, and information on underground storage tanks. Unauthorized Release List - Includes a summary of environmental contamination cases in San Diego County (underground tank cases, non-tank cases, groundwater contamination, and soil contamination are included.)

Date of Government Version: 09/23/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/24/2013
Source: Hazardous Materials Management Division
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/17/2013
Number of Days to Update: 23
Telephone: 619-338-2268
Last EDR Contact: 06/09/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/22/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## Solid Waste Facilities

San Diego County Solid Waste Facilities.
Date of Government Version: 10/31/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/19/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 12/31/2013
Number of Days to Update: 42

Source: Department of Health Services
Telephone: 619-338-2209
Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

Environmental Case Listing
The listing contains all underground tank release cases and projects pertaining to properties contaminated with hazardous substances that are actively under review by the Site Assessment and Mitigation Program.

Date of Government Version: 03/23/2010
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/15/2010
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/09/2010
Number of Days to Update: 24

Source: San Diego County Department of Environmental Health Telephone: 619-338-2371
Last EDR Contact: 06/04/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/22/2014
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

## SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY:

## Local Oversite Facilities

A listing of leaking underground storage tank sites located in San Francisco county.

Date of Government Version: 09/19/2008
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/19/2008
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/29/2008
Number of Days to Update: 10

Source: Department Of Public Health San Francisco County
Telephone: 415-252-3920
Last EDR Contact: 05/09/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/25/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Underground Storage Tank Information
Underground storage tank sites located in San Francisco county.

Date of Government Version: 11/29/2010
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/10/2011
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/15/2011
Number of Days to Update: 5

Source: Department of Public Health
Telephone: 415-252-3920
Last EDR Contact: 05/09/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/25/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

San Joaquin Co. UST
A listing of underground storage tank locations in San Joaquin county.

Date of Government Version: 06/20/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/23/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/11/2014
Number of Days to Update: 18

Source: Environmental Health Department
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: 06/19/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/06/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

## SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
Cupa Facility List.
Date of Government Version: 06/11/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/13/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/09/2014
Source: San Luis Obispo County Public Health Department Telephone: 805-781-5596

Number of Days to Update: 26

Last EDR Contact: 06/09/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/08/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## SAN MATEO COUNTY:

Business Inventory
List includes Hazardous Materials Business Plan, hazardous waste generators, and underground storage tanks.
Date of Government Version: 04/03/2014 Source: San Mateo County Environmental Health Services Division
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/04/2014 Telephone: 650-363-1921
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/01/2014 Last EDR Contact: 06/16/2014
Number of Days to Update: 27
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/29/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually
Fuel Leak List
A listing of leaking underground storage tank sites located in San Mateo county.

Date of Government Version: 06/16/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/19/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/10/2014
Number of Days to Update: 21

Source: San Mateo County Environmental Health Services Division Telephone: 650-363-1921
Last EDR Contact: 06/13/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/29/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY:
CUPA Facility Listing
CUPA Program Listing from the Environmental Health Services division.

Date of Government Version: 09/08/2011
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/09/2011
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/07/2011
Number of Days to Update: 28

Source: Santa Barbara County Public Health Department
Telephone: 805-686-8167
Last EDR Contact: 05/22/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/08/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

SANTA CLARA COUNTY:
Cupa Facility List
Cupa facility list

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

Date of Government Version: 06/02/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/03/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/23/2014
Number of Days to Update: 20

Source: Department of Environmental Health
Telephone: 408-918-1973
Last EDR Contact: 06/02/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/15/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

HIST LUST - Fuel Leak Site Activity Report
A listing of open and closed leaking underground storage tanks. This listing is no longer updated by the county. Leaking underground storage tanks are now handled by the Department of Environmental Health.

Date of Government Version: 03/29/2005
Source: Santa Clara Valley Water District
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/30/2005
Telephone: 408-265-2600
Last EDR Contact: 03/23/2009
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 06/22/2009
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned
LOP Listing
A listing of leaking underground storage tanks located in Santa Clara county.

Date of Government Version: 03/03/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/05/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/18/2014
Number of Days to Update: 13

Source: Department of Environmental Health Telephone: 408-918-3417
Last EDR Contact: 06/02/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/15/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually

Hazardous Material Facilities
Hazardous material facilities, including underground storage tank sites.

Date of Government Version: 05/12/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/19/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/28/2014
Number of Days to Update: 9

Source: City of San Jose Fire Department Telephone: 408-535-7694
Last EDR Contact: 05/12/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/25/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
CUPA facility listing.
Date of Government Version: 05/27/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/28/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/20/2014
Number of Days to Update: 23
Source: Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Telephone: 831-464-2761
Last EDR Contact: 05/27/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/08/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## SHASTA COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
Cupa Facility List.
Date of Government Version: 06/10/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/12/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/20/2014
Number of Days to Update: 8

Source: Shasta County Department of Resource Management Telephone: 530-225-5789
Last EDR Contact: 05/22/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/08/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

Leaking Underground Storage Tanks
A listing of leaking underground storage tank sites located in Solano county.

Date of Government Version: 04/25/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/01/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/28/2014
Number of Days to Update: 27

Source: Solano County Department of Environmental Management Telephone: 707-784-6770
Last EDR Contact: 06/13/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/29/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Underground Storage Tanks
Underground storage tank sites located in Solano county.
Date of Government Version: 03/25/2014 Source: Solano County Department of Environmental Management
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/01/2014 Telephone: 707-784-6770
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/05/2014
Last EDR Contact: 06/13/2014
Number of Days to Update: 34
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/29/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## sONOMA COUNTY:

Cupa Facility List
Cupa Facility list
Date of Government Version: 12/31/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 01/02/2014
Source: County of Sonoma Fire \& Emergency Services Department
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/11/2014
Number of Days to Update: 40
Telephone: 707-565-1174
Last EDR Contact: 06/26/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Sites
A listing of leaking underground storage tank sites located in Sonoma county.

| Date of Government Version: 04/01/2014 | Source: Department of Health Services |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Data Arrived at EDR: $04 / 03 / 2014$ | Telephone: 707-565-6565 |
| Date Made Active in Reports: $04 / 28 / 2014$ | Last EDR Contact: 06/26/2014 |
| Number of Days to Update: 25 | Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014 |
|  | Data Release Frequency: Quarterly |

## SUTTER COUNTY:

Underground Storage Tanks
Underground storage tank sites located in Sutter county.

Date of Government Version: 06/09/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/11/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/17/2014
Number of Days to Update: 36

Source: Sutter County Department of Agriculture
Telephone: 530-822-7500
Last EDR Contact: 06/09/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/22/2014
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

## TUOLUMNE COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
Cupa facility list
Date of Government Version: 05/16/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/16/2014
Source: Divison of Environmental Health
Telephone: 209-533-5633
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/13/2014
Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014
Number of Days to Update: 28
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Varies

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

Business Plan, Hazardous Waste Producers, and Operating Underground Tanks
The BWT list indicates by site address whether the Environmental Health Division has Business Plan (B), Waste
Producer (W), and/or Underground Tank (T) information.
Date of Government Version: 04/28/2014 Source: Ventura County Environmental Health Division
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/20/2014
Telephone: 805-654-2813
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/27/2014
Last EDR Contact: 05/16/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/01/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly
Inventory of Illegal Abandoned and Inactive Sites
Ventura County Inventory of Closed, Illegal Abandoned, and Inactive Sites.

Date of Government Version: 12/01/2011
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 12/01/2011
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/19/2012
Number of Days to Update: 49

Source: Environmental Health Division
Telephone: 805-654-2813
Last EDR Contact: 07/01/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually
Listing of Underground Tank Cleanup Sites
Ventura County Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Sites (LUST).

Date of Government Version: 05/29/2008
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/24/2008
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/31/2008
Number of Days to Update: 37

Source: Environmental Health Division
Telephone: 805-654-2813
Last EDR Contact: 05/16/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/01/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Medical Waste Program List
To protect public health and safety and the environment from potential exposure to disease causing agents, the Environmental Health Division Medical Waste Program regulates the generation, handling, storage, treatment and disposal of medical waste throughout the County.
Date of Government Version: 04/28/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/30/2014
Source: Ventura County Resource Management Agency
Telephone: 805-654-2813
Made Active in Repors. 05/19/2014
Number of Days to Update: 19
Last EDR Contact: 04/28/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/11/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly
Underground Tank Closed Sites List
Ventura County Operating Underground Storage Tank Sites (UST)/Underground Tank Closed Sites List.

Date of Government Version: 05/27/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/17/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/11/2014
Number of Days to Update: 24

Source: Environmental Health Division
Telephone: 805-654-2813
Last EDR Contact: 06/16/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/29/2014
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

## YOLO COUNTY:

Underground Storage Tank Comprehensive Facility Report
Underground storage tank sites located in Yolo county.
Date of Government Version: 04/01/2014 Source: Yolo County Department of Health
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/08/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/05/2014
Number of Days to Update: 27

Telephone: 530-666-8646
Last EDR Contact: 06/19/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/06/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually

YUBA COUNTY:

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

CUPA Facility List
CUPA facility listing for Yuba County.
Date of Government Version: 05/19/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/22/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/19/2014
Number of Days to Update: 28

Source: Yuba County Environmental Health Department<br>Telephone: 530-749-7523<br>Last EDR Contact: 05/19/2014<br>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/18/2014<br>Data Release Frequency: Varies

## OTHER DATABASE(S)

Depending on the geographic area covered by this report, the data provided in these specialty databases may or may not be complete. For example, the existence of wetlands information data in a specific report does not mean that all wetlands in the area covered by the report are included. Moreover, the absence of any reported wetlands information does not necessarily mean that wetlands do not exist in the area covered by the report.

CT MANIFEST: Hazardous Waste Manifest Data
Facility and manifest data. Manifest is a document that lists and tracks hazardous waste from the generator through transporters to a tsd facility.

Date of Government Version: 07/30/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/19/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/03/2013
Number of Days to Update: 45

Source: Department of Energy \& Environmental Protection<br>Telephone: 860-424-3375<br>Last EDR Contact: 05/23/2014<br>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/01/2014<br>Data Release Frequency: Annually

NJ MANIFEST: Manifest Information
Hazardous waste manifest information.
Date of Government Version: 12/31/2011
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/19/2012
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/28/2012
Source: Department of Environmental Protection
Telephone: N/A

Number of Days to Update: 40
Last EDR Contact: 07/17/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/27/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually

NY MANIFEST: Facility and Manifest Data
Manifest is a document that lists and tracks hazardous waste from the generator through transporters to a TSD facility.

Date of Government Version: 05/01/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/07/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/10/2014
Number of Days to Update: 34
Source: Department of Environmental Conservation
Telephone: 518-402-8651
Last EDR Contact: 05/07/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/18/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually

PA MANIFEST: Manifest Information
Hazardous waste manifest information.
Date of Government Version: 12/31/2012
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/24/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/19/2013
Number of Days to Update: 26
Source: Department of Environmental Protection
Telephone: 717-783-8990
Last EDR Contact: 04/21/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/04/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually

RI MANIFEST: Manifest information
Hazardous waste manifest information
Date of Government Version: 12/31/2012
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/21/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/05/2013
Number of Days to Update: 45
Source: Department of Environmental Management
Telephone: 401-222-2797
Last EDR Contact: 05/27/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/08/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

WI MANIFEST: Manifest Information
Hazardous waste manifest information.
Date of Government Version: 12/31/2012
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/09/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/27/2013
Number of Days to Update: 49

Source: Department of Natural Resources
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: 06/16/2014
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/29/2014
Data Release Frequency: Annually

Oil/Gas Pipelines: This data was obtained by EDR from the USGS in 1994. It is referred to by USGS as GeoData Digital Line Graphs from 1:100,000-Scale Maps. It was extracted from the transportation category including some oil, but primarily gas pipelines.

Electric Power Transmission Line Data
Source: Rextag Strategies Corp.
Telephone: (281) 769-2247
U.S. Electric Transmission and Power Plants Systems Digital GIS Data

Sensitive Receptors: There are individuals deemed sensitive receptors due to their fragile immune systems and special sensitivity to environmental discharges. These sensitive receptors typically include the elderly, the sick, and children. While the location of all sensitive receptors cannot be determined, EDR indicates those buildings and facilities - schools, daycares, hospitals, medical centers, and nursing homes - where individuals who are sensitive receptors are likely to be located.

AHA Hospitals:
Source: American Hospital Association, Inc.
Telephone: 312-280-5991
The database includes a listing of hospitals based on the American Hospital Association's annual survey of hospitals.
Medical Centers: Provider of Services Listing
Source: Centers for Medicare \& Medicaid Services
Telephone: 410-786-3000
A listing of hospitals with Medicare provider number, produced by Centers of Medicare \& Medicaid Services, a federal agency within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
Nursing Homes
Source: National Institutes of Health
Telephone: 301-594-6248
Information on Medicare and Medicaid certified nursing homes in the United States.
Public Schools
Source: National Center for Education Statistics
Telephone: 202-502-7300
The National Center for Education Statistics' primary database on elementary
and secondary public education in the United States. It is a comprehensive, annual, national statistical database of all public elementary and secondary schools and school districts, which contains data that are comparable across all states.
Private Schools
Source: National Center for Education Statistics
Telephone: 202-502-7300
The National Center for Education Statistics' primary database on private school locations in the United States.
Daycare Centers: Licensed Facilities
Source: Department of Social Services
Telephone: 916-657-4041

Flood Zone Data: This data, available in select counties across the country, was obtained by EDR in 2003 \& 2011 from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Data depicts 100 -year and 500 -year flood zones as defined by FEMA.

NWI: National Wetlands Inventory. This data, available in select counties across the country, was obtained by EDR in 2002, 2005 and 2010 from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Scanned Digital USGS 7.5' Topographic Map (DRG)
Source: United States Geologic Survey
A digital raster graphic (DRG) is a scanned image of a U.S. Geological Survey topographic map. The map images
are made by scanning published paper maps on high-resolution scanners. The raster image
is georeferenced and fit to the Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) projection.

## GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

## STREET AND ADDRESS INFORMATION

© 2010 Tele Atlas North America, Inc. All rights reserved. This material is proprietary and the subject of copyright protection and other intellectual property rights owned by or licensed to Tele Atlas North America, Inc. The use of this material is subject to the terms of a license agreement. You will be held liable for any unauthorized copying or disclosure of this material.

## GEOCHECK ${ }^{\circledR}$ - PHYSICAL SETTING SOURCE ADDENDUM

## TARGET PROPERTY ADDRESS

SR 65 HOV
SR 65 AND LINCOLN BOULEVARD LINCOLN, CA 95648

## TARGET PROPERTY COORDINATES

Latitude (North): $\quad 38.8421-38^{\circ} 50^{\prime} 31.56^{\prime \prime}$
Longitude (West): $\quad 121.2996-121^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 58.56^{\prime \prime}$
Universal Tranverse Mercator: Zone 10
UTM X (Meters): 647575.8
UTM Y (Meters): 4300420.5
Elevation:
142 ft . above sea level

## USGS TOPOGRAPHIC MAP

| Target Property Map: | 38121-G3 ROSEVILLE, CA |
| :--- | :--- |
| Most Recent Revision: | 1992 |

EDR's GeoCheck Physical Setting Source Addendum is provided to assist the environmental professional in forming an opinion about the impact of potential contaminant migration.

Assessment of the impact of contaminant migration generally has two principal investigative components:

1. Groundwater flow direction, and
2. Groundwater flow velocity.

Groundwater flow direction may be impacted by surface topography, hydrology, hydrogeology, characteristics of the soil, and nearby wells. Groundwater flow velocity is generally impacted by the nature of the geologic strata.

## GEOCHECK $^{\circledR}$ - PHYSICAL SETTING SOURCE SUMMARY

## GROUNDWATER FLOW DIRECTION INFORMATION

Groundwater flow direction for a particular site is best determined by a qualified environmental professional using site-specific well data. If such data is not reasonably ascertainable, it may be necessary to rely on other sources of information, such as surface topographic information, hydrologic information, hydrogeologic data collected on nearby properties, and regional groundwater flow information (from deep aquifers).

## TOPOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Surface topography may be indicative of the direction of surficial groundwater flow. This information can be used to assist the environmental professional in forming an opinion about the impact of nearby contaminated properties or, should contamination exist on the target property, what downgradient sites might be impacted.

## TARGET PROPERTY TOPOGRAPHY

General Topographic Gradient: General NNW

## SURROUNDING TOPOGRAPHY: ELEVATION PROFILES



Source: Topography has been determined from the USGS 7.5' Digital Elevation Model and should be evaluated on a relative (not an absolute) basis. Relative elevation information between sites of close proximity should be field verified.

## GEOCHECK ${ }^{\circledR}$ - PHYSICAL SETTING SOURCE SUMMARY

## HYDROLOGIC INFORMATION

Surface water can act as a hydrologic barrier to groundwater flow. Such hydrologic information can be used to assist the environmental professional in forming an opinion about the impact of nearby contaminated properties or, should contamination exist on the target property, what downgradient sites might be impacted.

Refer to the Physical Setting Source Map following this summary for hydrologic information (major waterways and bodies of water).

FEMA FLOOD ZONE

## Target Property County <br> PLACER, CA

Flood Plain Panel at Target Property:
Additional Panels in search area:

## NATIONAL WETLAND INVENTORY

NWI Quad at Target Property
ROSEVILLE

FEMA Flood
Electronic Data
YES - refer to the Overview Map and Detail Map
0602390411C - FEMA Q3 Flood data
Not Reported

NWI Electronic
Data Coverage
YES - refer to the Overview Map and Detail Map

## HYDROGEOLOGIC INFORMATION

Hydrogeologic information obtained by installation of wells on a specific site can often be an indicator of groundwater flow direction in the immediate area. Such hydrogeologic information can be used to assist the environmental professional in forming an opinion about the impact of nearby contaminated properties or, should contamination exist on the target property, what downgradient sites might be impacted.

Site-Specific Hydrogeological Data*:
Search Radius: $\quad 1.25$ miles
Status: Not found

## AQUIFLOW®

Search Radius: 1.000 Mile.
EDR has developed the AQUIFLOW Information System to provide data on the general direction of groundwater flow at specific points. EDR has reviewed reports submitted by environmental professionals to regulatory authorities at select sites and has extracted the date of the report, groundwater flow direction as determined hydrogeologically, and the depth to water table.

|  | LOCATION | GENERAL DIRECTION |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MAP ID | FROM TP | GROUNDWATER FLOW |

Not Reported

## GEOCHECK ${ }^{\circledR}$ - PHYSICAL SETTING SOURCE SUMMARY

## GROUNDWATER FLOW VELOCITY INFORMATION

Groundwater flow velocity information for a particular site is best determined by a qualified environmental professional using site specific geologic and soil strata data. If such data are not reasonably ascertainable, it may be necessary to rely on other sources of information, including geologic age identification, rock stratigraphic unit and soil characteristics data collected on nearby properties and regional soil information. In general, contaminant plumes move more quickly through sandy-gravelly types of soils than silty-clayey types of soils.

## GEOLOGIC INFORMATION IN GENERAL AREA OF TARGET PROPERTY

Geologic information can be used by the environmental professional in forming an opinion about the relative speed at which contaminant migration may be occurring.

ROCK STRATIGRAPHIC UNIT
GEOLOGIC AGE IDENTIFICATION
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Era: } & \text { Cenozoic } & \text { Category: Continental Deposits } \\ \text { System: } & \text { Tertiary } & \\ \text { Series: } & \text { Pliocene } & \\ \text { Code: } & \text { Tpc (decoded above as Era, System \& Series) } & \end{array}$
Geologic Age and Rock Stratigraphic Unit Source: P.G. Schruben, R.E. Arndt and W.J. Bawiec, Geology of the Conterminous U.S. at 1:2,500,000 Scale - a digital representation of the 1974 P.B. King and H.M. Beikman Map, USGS Digital Data Series DDS - 11 (1994).


## GEOCHECK ${ }^{\circledR}$ - PHYSICAL SETTING SOURCE SUMMARY

## DOMINANT SOIL COMPOSITION IN GENERAL AREA OF TARGET PROPERTY

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Soil Conservation Service (SCS) leads the National Cooperative Soil Survey (NCSS) and is responsible for collecting, storing, maintaining and distributing soil survey information for privately owned lands in the United States. A soil map in a soil survey is a representation of soil patterns in a landscape. The following information is based on Soil Conservation Service SSURGO data.

## Soil Map ID: 1

Soil Component Name:
Soil Surface Texture:
Hydrologic Group:

Soil Drainage Class:
Hydric Status: Partially hydric

Depth to Bedrock Min: $>28$ inches
Depth to Watertable Min: $>0$ inches

| Soil Layer Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Boundary |  |  | Classification |  | Saturated <br> hydraulic <br> conductivity <br> micro $\mathbf{m / s e c}$ | Soil <br> (pH) |
| Layer | Upper | Lower | Soil Texture Class | AASHTO Group | Unified Soil |  |  |
| 1 | 0 inches | 11 inches | very stony loam | Silt-Clay <br> Materials (more <br> than 35 pct. <br> passing No. <br> 200), Silty <br> Soils. | FINE-GRAINED <br> SOILS, Silts and <br> Clays (liquid <br> limit less than <br> $50 \%), ~ s i l t . ~$ | Max: 14 <br> Min: 4 | Max: 6.5 <br> Min: 5.6 |
| 2 | 11 inches | 14 inches | unweathered <br> bedrock | Not reported | Not reported | Max: 141 <br> Min: 0.07 | Max: Min: |

## Soil Map ID: 2

| Soil Component Name: | ALAMO |
| :--- | :--- |
| Soil Surface Texture: | clay |
| Hydrologic Group: | Class D - Very slow infiltration rates. Soils are clayey, have a high <br> water table, or are shallow to an impervious layer. |
| Soil Drainage Class: | Poorly drained |

## GEOCHECK ${ }^{\circledR}$ - PHYSICAL SETTING SOURCE SUMMARY

Hydric Status: Partially hydric

| Corrosion Potential - Uncoated Steel: | High |
| :--- | :--- |
| Depth to Bedrock Min: | $>0$ inches |
| Depth to Watertable Min: | $>0$ inches |


| Soil Layer Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boundary |  | Soil Texture Class | Classification |  | Saturated hydraulic conductivity micro m/sec | Soil Reaction (pH) |
| Layer | Upper | Lower |  | AASHTO Group | Unified Soil |  |  |
| 1 | 0 inches | 9 inches | clay | Silt-Clay Materials (more than 35 pct. passing No. 200), Clayey Soils. | FINE-GRAINED SOILS, Silts and Clays (liquid limit 50\% or more), Fat Clay. | Max: 1.4 <br> Min: 0.42 | Max: 7.8 <br> Min: 6.1 |
| 2 | 9 inches | 37 inches | clay | Silt-Clay Materials (more than 35 pct. passing No. 200), Clayey Soils. | FINE-GRAINED SOILS, Silts and Clays (liquid limit 50\% or more), Fat Clay. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Max: } 0.42 \\ & \text { Min: } 0.01 \end{aligned}$ | Max: 8.4 Min: 6.1 |
| 3 | 37 inches | 40 inches | indurated | Not reported | Not reported | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Max: } 0.01 \\ & \text { Min: } 0 \end{aligned}$ | Max: Min: |

## LOCAL / REGIONAL WATER AGENCY RECORDS

EDR Local/Regional Water Agency records provide water well information to assist the environmental professional in assessing sources that may impact ground water flow direction, and in forming an opinion about the impact of contaminant migration on nearby drinking water wells.

## WELL SEARCH DISTANCE INFORMATION

| DATABASE | SEARCH DISTANCE (miles) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Federal USGS | 1.000 |
| Federal FRDS PWS | Nearest PWS within 1 mile |
| State Database | 1.000 |

FEDERAL USGS WELL INFORMATION

MAP ID
WELL ID
No Wells Found

LOCATION
FROM TP

## GEOCHECK ${ }^{\circledR}$ - PHYSICAL SETTING SOURCE SUMMARY

FEDERAL FRDS PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM INFORMATION

| MAP ID |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| WELL ID | LOCATION <br> FROM TP |

No PWS System Found
Note: PWS System location is not always the same as well location.

## STATE DATABASE WELL INFORMATION

|  |  | LOCATION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAP ID | WELL ID | FROM TP |
| A1 | CADW50000032588 | $\overline{\text { 1/2-1 Mile ENE }}$ |
| A2 | CADW50000032589 | 1/2-1 Mile ENE |

PHYSICAL SETTING SOURCE MAP - 4009322.1s


| SITE NAME: | SR 65 HOV |
| :--- | :--- |
| ADDRESS: | SR 65 and Lincoln Boulevard |
| LAT/LONG: | Lincoln CA 95648 |
| L8.8421/121.2996 | CLIENT: |

## GEOCHECK® ${ }^{\circledR}$ - PHYSICAL SETTING SOURCE MAP FINDINGS

Map ID
Direction
Distance

| Elevation |  | Database | EDR ID Number |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A1 |  |  | CA WELLS |
| ENE | CADW500000032588 |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 / 2 - 1}$ Mile |  |  |  |
| Higher | 38.847609 |  |  |
| Latitude : | 121.287189 |  |  |
| Longitude : | $388476 N 1212872$ Wot Reported | Casgem sta: | Observation |
| Site code: | WPMW-3A | Casgem s 1: |  |
| Local well: | 31 |  | North American |
| County id: | $5-21.64$ | CADW50000032588 |  |
| Basin cd: | North Central Region Office | Site id: |  |
| Org unit $\mathrm{n}:$ |  |  |  |

## A2

ENE $1 / 2$ Mile
Higher
Latitude :
Longitude :
Site code:
Local well:
County id:
Basin cd:
38.847609
121.287187

388476N1212872W002 Casgem sta: Not Reported
WPMW-3B
31
5-21.64 Basin desc: North American
North Central Region Office Site id: CADW50000032589

## GEOCHECK® - PHYSICAL SETTING SOURCE MAP FINDINGS

RADON

## AREA RADON INFORMATION

State Database: CA Radon
Radon Test Results

| Zipcode | Num Tests | $>4 \mathrm{pCi} / \mathrm{L}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | 14 |

Federal EPA Radon Zone for PLACER County: 2
Note: Zone 1 indoor average level $>4 \mathrm{pCi} / \mathrm{L}$.
: Zone 2 indoor average level $>=2 \mathrm{pCi} / \mathrm{L}$ and $<=4 \mathrm{pCi} / \mathrm{L}$.
: Zone 3 indoor average level < $2 \mathrm{pCi} / \mathrm{L}$.

Federal Area Radon Information for Zip Code: 95648
Number of sites tested: 1

| Area | Average Activity | \% < $4 \mathrm{pCi} / \mathrm{L}$ | \% 4-20 pCi/L | \% > $20 \mathrm{pCi} / \mathrm{L}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Living Area - 1st Floor | $0.000 \mathrm{pCi} / \mathrm{L}$ | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Living Area - 2nd Floor | Not Reported | Not Reported | Not Reported | Not Reported |
| Basement | Not Reported | Not Reported | Not Reported | Not Reported |

## PHYSICAL SETTING SOURCE RECORDS SEARCHED

## TOPOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

USGS 7.5' Digital Elevation Model (DEM)
Source: United States Geologic Survey
EDR acquired the USGS 7.5' Digital Elevation Model in 2002 and updated it in 2006. The 7.5 minute DEM corresponds to the USGS 1:24,000- and 1:25,000-scale topographic quadrangle maps. The DEM provides elevation data with consistent elevation units and projection.

Scanned Digital USGS 7.5' Topographic Map (DRG)
Source: United States Geologic Survey
A digital raster graphic (DRG) is a scanned image of a U.S. Geological Survey topographic map. The map images are made by scanning published paper maps on high-resolution scanners. The raster image
is georeferenced and fit to the Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) projection.

## HYDROLOGIC INFORMATION

Flood Zone Data: This data, available in select counties across the country, was obtained by EDR in 2003 \& 2011 from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Data depicts 100 -year and 500 -year flood zones as defined by FEMA.

NWI: National Wetlands Inventory. This data, available in select counties across the country, was obtained by EDR in 2002, 2005 and 2010 from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

## HYDROGEOLOGIC INFORMATION

AQUIFLOW ${ }^{R}$ Information System
Source: EDR proprietary database of groundwater flow information
EDR has developed the AQUIFLOW Information System (AIS) to provide data on the general direction of groundwater flow at specific points. EDR has reviewed reports submitted to regulatory authorities at select sites and has extracted the date of the report, hydrogeologically determined groundwater flow direction and depth to water table information.

## GEOLOGIC INFORMATION

Geologic Age and Rock Stratigraphic Unit
Source: P.G. Schruben, R.E. Arndt and W.J. Bawiec, Geology of the Conterminous U.S. at 1:2,500,000 Scale - A digital representation of the 1974 P.B. King and H.M. Beikman Map, USGS Digital Data Series DDS - 11 (1994).

STATSGO: State Soil Geographic Database
Source: Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Services
The U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) leads the national Conservation Soil Survey (NCSS) and is responsible for collecting, storing, maintaining and distributing soil survey information for privately owned lands in the United States. A soil map in a soil survey is a representation of soil patterns in a landscape. Soil maps for STATSGO are compiled by generalizing more detailed (SSURGO) soil survey maps.

SSURGO: Soil Survey Geographic Database
Source: Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Services (NRCS)
Telephone: 800-672-5559
SSURGO is the most detailed level of mapping done by the Natural Resources Conservation Services, mapping scales generally range from 1:12,000 to 1:63,360. Field mapping methods using national standards are used to construct the soil maps in the Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) database. SSURGO digitizing duplicates the original soil survey maps. This level of mapping is designed for use by landowners, townships and county natural resource planning and management.

## PHYSICAL SETTING SOURCE RECORDS SEARCHED

## LOCAL / REGIONAL WATER AGENCY RECORDS

## FEDERAL WATER WELLS

PWS: Public Water Systems
Source: EPA/Office of Drinking Water
Telephone: 202-564-3750
Public Water System data from the Federal Reporting Data System. A PWS is any water system which provides water to at least 25 people for at least 60 days annually. PWSs provide water from wells, rivers and other sources.

PWS ENF: Public Water Systems Violation and Enforcement Data
Source: EPA/Office of Drinking Water
Telephone: 202-564-3750
Violation and Enforcement data for Public Water Systems from the Safe Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS) after August 1995. Prior to August 1995, the data came from the Federal Reporting Data System (FRDS).

USGS Water Wells: USGS National Water Inventory System (NWIS)
This database contains descriptive information on sites where the USGS collects or has collected data on surface water and/or groundwater. The groundwater data includes information on wells, springs, and other sources of groundwater.

## STATE RECORDS

Water Well Database
Source: Department of Water Resources
Telephone: 916-651-9648
California Drinking Water Quality Database
Source: Department of Public Health
Telephone: 916-324-2319
The database includes all drinking water compliance and special studies monitoring for the state of California since 1984. It consists of over 3,200,000 individual analyses along with well and water system information.

## OTHER STATE DATABASE INFORMATION

California Oil and Gas Well Locations
Source: Department of Conservation
Telephone: 916-323-1779
Oil and Gas well locations in the state.

## RADON

## State Database: CA Radon

Source: Department of Health Services
Telephone: 916-324-2208
Radon Database for California

## Area Radon Information

Source: USGS
Telephone: 703-356-4020
The National Radon Database has been developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(USEPA) and is a compilation of the EPA/State Residential Radon Survey and the National Residential Radon Survey.
The study covers the years 1986-1992. Where necessary data has been supplemented by information collected at private sources such as universities and research institutions.

Source: EPA
Telephone: 703-356-4020
Sections 307 \& 309 of IRAA directed EPA to list and identify areas of U.S. with the potential for elevated indoor radon levels.

## PHYSICAL SETTING SOURCE RECORDS SEARCHED

OTHER
Airport Landing Facilities: Private and public use landing facilities
Source: Federal Aviation Administration, 800-457-6656
Epicenters: World earthquake epicenters, Richter 5 or greater
Source: Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
California Earthquake Fault Lines: The fault lines displayed on EDR's Topographic map are digitized quaternary fault lines, prepared in 1975 by the United State Geological Survey. Additional information (also from 1975) regarding activity at specific fault lines comes from California's Preliminary Fault Activity Map prepared by the California Division of Mines and Geology.

## STREET AND ADDRESS INFORMATION

© 2010 Tele Atlas North America, Inc. All rights reserved. This material is proprietary and the subject of copyright protection and other intellectual property rights owned by or licensed to Tele Atlas North America, Inc. The use of this material is subject to the terms of a license agreement. You will be held liable for any unauthorized copying or disclosure of this material.

## APPENDIX D

## Site Photographs

consulting


Photo 1 SR65 at Pleasant Grove Blvd.


Photo 2 SR65 north of Pleasant Grove Blvd


Photo 3 SR65 at Pleasant Grove Blvd.


Photo 4 Sound wall south of Pleasant Grove Blvd


Photo 5 East side of SR65 at Pleasant Grove (Walmart)


Photo 6 Park and Ride south of Lincoln Blvd.


Photo 7 South of Lincoln Blvd.


Photo 8 East of SR65 at Twelve Bridges


Photo 9 SR65 at Lincoln Blvd


Photo 10 East of SR65 south of Twelve Bridges


Photo 11 on-ramp at Twelve Bridges


Photo 12 Creek between Twelve Bridges and Sunset


Photo 13 Creek between Twelve Bridges and Sunset


Photo 14 Utility yard south of Sunset


Photo 15 Sunset Boulevard off-ramp


Photo16 Cyber Way south of Sunset


Photo 17 Cyber Way south of Sunset Blvd


Photo 18 between Sunset and Blue Oaks Blvds


Photo 19 Arizona Tile north of Blue Oaks Blvd


Photo 20 between Sunset and Blue Oaks Blvds


Photo 21 Railroad car at HB Fuller


Photo 22 Looking east towards HB Fuller


Photo 23 North of SB SR65 Blue Rock exit


Photo 24 North of SB SR65 Blue Oaks exit


Photo 25 East side of HB Fuller


Photo 26 HB Fuller


Photo 27 West side of Gap Inc.


Photo 28 Open space between Gap, Inc. and SR65


Photo 29 Drainage behind Gap, Inc.
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## Hazardous Materials Survey Report (Entek 2014)

consulting

# HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SURVEY <br> FINAL REPORT 

## CLIENT

Blackburn Consulting<br>2491 Boatman Avenue West Sacramento, CA 95691

## CONTACT

Ms. Laura Long Environmental Engineer

## SURVEY ADDRESS

## SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Project Pleasant Grove Creek Bridges Bridge \#19-0136L \& 19-0136R (Northbound \& Southbound Bridges)

## PREPARED BY

Cory Sanders
Project Manager
CAC \#03-3332
Entek Consulting Group, Inc.
4200 Rocklin Road; Suite 7
Rocklin, CA 95677
Entek Project \#14-3202
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## Executive Summary

The United States Environmental Protection Agency, National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (US EPA NESHAP), 40 CFR Part 61 - Nov. 20, 1990, requires an owner or operator of a demolition or renovation project to thoroughly inspect the affected facility or part of the facility where the demolition or renovation operation will occur for the presence of asbestos-containing materials (ACM) prior to the commencement of that project.

This survey report was requested by Ms. Laura Long, Environmental Engineer with Blackburn Consulting.

The purpose of the survey was to comply with US EPA NESHAP requirements to determine if asbestos containing materials are present which may be impacted during the SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements Project, which includes the Pleasant Grove Creek Bridges (northbound \& southbound).

This is a summary of the report. The report must be read in its entirety, and the reader must review all the detailed information provided in the body of the report prior to making any interpretations, or conclusions pertaining to the information. Any conclusions made by the reader about the information provided in the body of this report which are contradictory or not included in this report are the responsibility of the reader.

## Asbestos

On July 30 and September 17, 2014, Entek Consulting Group, Inc. (Entek) conducted an asbestos survey of the Pleasant Grove Creek Bridges which are constructed entirely of concrete with metal railings which are supported by pressure treated wood posts and concrete.

The results of testing for asbestos during this survey indicate asbestos is not present in the concrete which comprises the bridge decks nor the supporting columns beneath the bridges. The metal railings, pressure treated wood posts and the metal hardware used to fasten the railings to the posts are not considered suspect for containing asbestos.

## Lead

Entek did not observe existing paints or coatings associated with the Pleasant Grove Creek Bridges that would require sampling. It is my understanding based on our conversation in the field on July 30, 2014, Cal/Trans already presumes the road striping to contain lead in their project documents. Therefore, Entek did not perform sampling for lead during this survey.

## Introduction

This report presents results of an asbestos and lead survey performed by Entek which included the Northbound and Southbound Pleasant Grove Creek Bridges, as part of the SR65 Capacity and Operational Improvements Projects.

I conducted this survey on July 30 and September 17, 2014. I am a US EPA Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act (AHERA)-Accredited Building Inspector, a Cal/OSHA Certified Asbestos Consultant (CAC) and a California Department of Public Health (CDPH)Accredited Lead Inspector/Assessor.

This report was prepared for Ms. Laura Long, Environmental Engineer with Blackburn Consulting.

## Structure Description

The Pleasant Grove Creek Bridges are concrete structures which are supported by several cylindrical concrete support columns. There are metal railings on the west and east sides of the bridge which are fastened to concrete with various hardware. The railings are fastened to pressure treated wood posts approaching the bridges.

## Asbestos Inspection and Sample Collection Protocols

Entek included all specific designated bridge components which are going to be impacted as part of the upcoming improvements project.

Entek did not use any demolition methods to look within the bridge decks during this investigation. Entek did include all observable suspect materials associated with the bridges.

Bulk samples of the concrete components were collected with a hammer and chisel.
Approximate locations of all samples collected during this inspection are indicated on the photographs attached to this report.

Miscellaneous materials were collected from each homogenous area in a manner sufficient to determine whether the material is or is not ACM as required in 40 CFR Part 763, Asbestos-Containing Materials in Schools; Final Rule and Notice, published October 30, 1987.

## Asbestos Bulk Sample Results

Concrete was the only material observed which is considered "suspect" under US EPA guidelines. Under current US EPA guidelines for conducting building inspections for ACM, all "suspect" materials must be assumed to contain asbestos until otherwise determined by laboratory testing.

The samples of concrete suspected of containing asbestos were submitted to Asbestech, a laboratory located in Carmichael, California. These samples were subsequently analyzed by polarized light microscopy (PLM) with dispersion staining. Asbestech is accredited by the National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program (NVLAP) for this analysis.

US EPA NESHAP uses the terms RACM, CAT-I, \& CAT-II when identifying materials which contain asbestos in amounts greater than 1\%. Cal/OSHA uses the term ACCM which indicates a manufactured construction material contains greater than $0.1 \%$ asbestos by weight by the PLM method. This definition can be found in Title 8, 1529.

A total of eight bulk samples of concrete were collected during this survey. None of the samples were determined to contain asbestos. Results of the analyses are listed in the following table:

| Suspect Materials Found NOT TO Contain Asbestos Pleasant Grove Creek Bridge Bridge \#19-0136L \& 19-0136R (northbound \& southbound) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample ID\# | Suspect Material | Asbestos Content | Location |
| ECG-14-3202-01A | Concrete | None Detected | Southbound; Collected from underside of bridge deck at east side |
| ECG-14-3202-02A | Concrete | None Detected | Southbound; Collected from edge of bridge deck at west side |
| ECG-14-3202-03A | Concrete | None Detected | Southbound; Collected from bumper that railing rests on at west side |
| ECG-14-3202-04A | Concrete | None Detected | Southbound; Collected from northwest most support column beneath bridge |
| ECG-14-3202-05A | Concrete | None Detected | Northbound; Collected from underside of bridge deck at east side |
| ECG-14-3202-06A | Concrete | None Detected | Northbound; Collected from edge of bridge deck at east side |
| ECG-14-3202-07A | Concrete | None Detected | Northbound; Collected from edge of bridge deck at west side |
| ECG-14-3202-08A | Concrete | None Detected | Northbound; Collected from southeast most support column beneath bridge |

Any building materials which are considered "suspect" for containing asbestos which have not been identified in this report must be assumed to contain asbestos in amounts $>1 \%$ until properly investigated and/or tested.

Materials commonly excluded from being suspected for containing asbestos include, but are not limited to: unwrapped pink and yellow fiberglass insulating materials or products, foam insulation, wood, metal, plastic, and glass. All other types of building materials or coatings on the materials listed above are commonly listed as "suspect" and must be tested prior to impact by a Contractor. Work impacting these untested or newly discovered materials must cease until an investigation can be completed.

## Asbestos Regulatory Requirements

## US EPA

The property included in this survey report is located in Placer County. The US EPA NESHAP asbestos regulation is jointly enforced by US EPA Region IX and CARB in this county.

A demolition is the wrecking, taking out, or burning of any load supporting structural member. A renovation is everything else. 10 day written notification to the California Air Resources Board (CARB), is required prior to the performance of any demolition project regardless of asbestos being present or not. This notification would also apply to any renovation project which involves the wrecking, taking out, or burning of any load bearing structural member.

Although no asbestos was found during this survey, written notification to CARB may be required 10 business days in advance of the project, if the project meets the definition of demolition as described above.

## Cal/OSHA

Disturbance of any ACM or ACCM could generate airborne asbestos fibers and would be regulated by Cal/OSHA. Cal/OSHA worker health and safety regulations apply during any disturbance of ACM or ACCM by a person while in the employ of another. This is true regardless of friability or quantity disturbed.

Since the materials to be impacted as part of this project do not contain asbestos, $\mathrm{Cal} / \mathrm{OSHA}$ asbestos regulations do not apply.

## Limitations

Entek did not perform any destructive sampling to look within the bridge decks. As a result, it may be possible for materials to be hidden in these areas which are not included in this report. If any new materials not listed as having been sampled, or listed as assumed for containing asbestos in this report are discovered, the new material must be assumed to contain asbestos until properly inspected and tested for asbestos content.

## Entek

Entek's policy is to retain a full copy of these written documents for three (3) years once the file is closed and final billed. At the end of the three (3) year period the written files will be destroyed without further notice. It is suggested copies of the file(s) are maintained as per Blackburn Consulting policy.

In an effort to help our environment, Entek has adopted a "green" policy and will be providing only this electronic copy of the report and its attachments for your use. However, if you would like a hard copy of this report, Entek will be happy to mail one upon request.

Thank you for choosing Entek for your environmental needs. Please contact me at (916) 632-6800 or by email to csanders@entekgroup.com if you have any questions regarding this report.

Prepared by:



Cory Sanders
Project Manager
CAC \#03332
CDPH \#15131

## Appendices:

A. Asbestos Related Documents
B. Laboratory and Personnel Certifications
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Underside of bridge deck and support columns
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West edge of bridge
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Bridge railing support along bridge

## Pleasant Grove Creek Bridge

Bridge Number 19-0136L \& 19-0136R
SR65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Project
Date Photos Taken: July 30, 2014


Railing support along roadway

## APPENDIX A

## ASBESTOS RELATED DOCUMENTS

- Bulk Asbestos Analysis Reports From Asbestech
- Bulk Asbestos Material Analysis Request Forms for Entek
- Asbestos Bulk Sample Locations

ASBESTECH
6825 Fair Oaks Blvd., Suite 103
Carmichael, California 95608
Tel.(916) 481-8902 Fax (916) 481-3975

| Client: | Job: |
| :--- | :--- |
| Entek Consulting Group, Inc. | 14-3202 Blackburn Consulting |
| 4200 Rocklin Rd., Suite 7 | Pleasant Grove Creek Bridge |
| Rocklin, CA 95677 | SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Project |
|  | BCI\# 2602.2 |

## BULK ASBESTOS ANALYSIS REPORT

LAB JOB \# 60834
Date/Time Collected: 7/30/14
Date Received: 7/31/14

NVLAP Lab Code 101442-0
DOHS \# 1153
Date Analyzed: 8/1/14

| Sample No. | Color/Description | \% Type Asbestos | Other Materials |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ECG-14-3202- <br> 01A | Gray concrete, underneath side of <br> bridge at east side | NONE DETECTED | Granular Mins. |
| 02A | Gray concrete, edge of <br> bridge at west side | NONE DETECTED | Granular Mins. |
| 03A | Gray concrete, bumper that railing <br> sits on, west side at north end | NONE DETECTED | Granular Mins. |
| 04A | Gray concrete, NW most support <br> pillar beneath bridge | NONE DETECTED | Granular Mins. |

## BULK ASBESTOS MATERIAL Analysis Request Form for Entek Consulting Group, Inc.

4200 ROCKLIN ROAD, STE. 7
ROCKLIN, CA 95677
(916) 632-6800

FAX (916) 632-6812

Date of Sampling: July 30, 2014
Job Number: 14-3202
Client Name: Placer County
Site Address: Pleasant Grove Creek Bridge SR 65 Capacity \& Operational Improvements Project, BCI \#2602.2

Lab: Asbestech
Turnaround Time: 8/1/14 at 2:00 pm
Collected by: Cory Sanders
ANALYSIS REQUESTED: Asbestos by PLM with Dispersion Staining

Special Instruction: Stop Analysis upon first positive result ( $>1 \%$ ) for sample in a series. Please email results to the office and to csanders@entekgroup.com

| SAMPLE $\#$ | MATERIAL DESCRIPTION/LOCATION |
| :--- | :--- |
| ECG-14-3202-01A | Concrete, Underneath Side of Bridge at East Side |
| ECG-14-3202-02A | Concrete, Edge of Bridge at West Side |
| ECG-14-3202-03A | Concrete, Bumper that Railing Sits On, West Side at North End |
| ECG-14-3202-04A | Concrete, Northwest Most Support Pillar, Beneath Bridge |

C:IEntek\Clients\Blackburn Consulting\14-3202\Asb Bulk Req Pleasant Grove Bridge 7-30-14.wpd


ASBESTECH
6825 Fair Oaks Blvd., Suite 103
Carmichael, California 95608
Tel.(916) 481-8902 Fax (916) 481-3975

| Client: | Job: |
| :--- | :--- |
| Entek Consulting Group, Inc. | 14-3202 Blackburn Consulting |
| 4200 Rocklin Rd., Suite 7 | Pleasant Grove Bridge |
| Rocklin, CA 95677 | Roseville, Ca |

## BULK ASBESTOS ANALYSIS REPORT

LAB JOB \# 61037
NVLAP Lab Code 101442-0
Date/Time Collected: 9/17/14
Date Received: 9/17/14

DOHS \# 1153
Date Analyzed: 9/18/14

| Sample No. | Color/Description | \% Type Asbestos | Other Materials |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ECG-14-3202- } \\ & 05 \mathrm{~A} \end{aligned}$ | Gray concrete, north bound bridge underneath | NONE DETECTED | Granular Mins. |
| 06A | Gray concrete, north bound bridge E edge | NONE DETECTED | Granular Mins. |
| 07A | Gray concrete, north bound bridge W edge | NONE DETECTED | Granular Mins. |
| 08A | Gray concrete, north bound bridge SE pillar | NONE DETECTED | Granular Mins. |

[^38]BULK SAMPLE - ANALYSIS REQUEST
61037
PTO. NUMBER
ASBESTECH
6825 FAIR OAKS BLVD.,STE 103
CARMICHAEL, CA 95608
TEL. (916) 481-8902

FAX (916) 481-3975

$\square$

| SAMPLE <br> NUMBER | SAMPLE description | SAMPLe location |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 05 A | Concrete | North Bound Bridge, underneath |
| 06A | Concrete | North Bound Bridge, E. Edge |
| 07 A | Concrete | North Bound Bridge, W. Edge |
| orA | Concrete | North Bound Bridge, S.E. Pillar |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
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## APPENDIX B

## BACK UP DOCUMENTATION

- Inspector Accreditations and Certifications
- Laboratory and Personnel Certifications


United States Department of Commerce National Institute of Standards and Technology


## Certificate of Accreditation to ISO/IEC 17025:2005

NVLAP LAB CODE: 101442-0
ASBESTECH
Carmichael, CA
is accredited by the National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program for specific services, listed on the Scope of Accreditation, for:

## BULK ASBESTOS FIBER ANALYSIS

This laboratory is accredited in accordance with the recognized International Standard ISO/IEC 17025:2005 This accreditation demonstrates technical competence for a defined scope and the operation of a laboratory quality management system (refer to joint ISO-ILAC-IAF Communique dated January 2009).

2014-07-01 through 2015-06-30



SCOPE OF ACCREDITATION TO ISO/IEC 17025:2005
ASBESTECH
6825 Fair Oaks Blvd., Suite 103
Carmichael, CA 95608
Mr. Tommy Conlon
Phone: 916-481-8902 Fax: 916-481-3975
E-Mail: asbestech@sbcglobal.net
URL: http://www.asbestechlab.com
BULK ASBESTOS FIBER ANALYSIS (PLM)
NVLAP LAB CODE 101442-0

NVLAP Code Designation/Description
18/A01 EPA 600/M4-82-020: Interim Method for the Determination of Asbestos in Bulk Insulation Samples

18/A03
EPA 600/R-93/116: Method for the Determination of Asbestos in Bulk Building Materials

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ACCREDITATION PROGRAM

## Accredited Fields of Testing

## Asbestech

6825 Fair Oaks Boulevard, Suite 103
Certificate No.: 1153
Carmichael, CA 95608
Renew Date: 3/31/2016
Phone: (916) 481-8902

| Field of Testing: |  |  | 114 - Inorganic Chemistry of Hazardous Waste |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 114.130 | 001 | Lead | EPA 7420 |
| Field of Testing: | 115 - Extraction Test of Hazardous Waste |  |  |
| 115.021 | 001 | TCLP Inorganics | EPA 1311 |
| 115.030 | 001 | Waste Extraction Test (WET) | CCR Chapter11, Article 5, Appendix II |

Field of Testing: 121 - Bulk Asbestos Analysis of Hazardous Waste

| 121.010 | 001 | Bulk Asbestos | EPA 600/M4-82-020 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

# Attachment K <br> Transportation Management Plan Checklist and Data Sheet 

To be added with Final Project Report

## Attachment L <br> Landscape Architecture Assessment Sheet (DRAFT)

| TO：Jeff Pietrzak <br> FROM：Lauren Proctor／CH2M <br> Telephone number：（916）286－0332 <br> Unit／Senior TE Name：N／A <br> Project Manager：Rodney Murphy |  | Send Request to the following Landscape or Engineering Services Branch in your city： <br> －Eureka－Engineering Services（Ron Flory） <br> －Redding－Engineering Services（Ron Flory） <br> －Marysville－Landscape Architecture（Jeff Pietrzak） |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Milestones： $\square$ PID <br> PAED <br> PS\＆E | Other | What is the \＄53．5M | imate project cost | ange?(+l-) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Funding Source } \\ & \square \text { Minor A } \quad \square \text { STIP } \boxtimes \text { Other } \\ & \square \text { SHOPP } \boxtimes \text { Local } \end{aligned}$ | CO／RTE／KP／PM PLA／65／R6．2－R12．8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EA } \\ & 03-1 F 1700 \end{aligned}$ | Date Requested 8/31/2016 | Date Needed 10/1/2016 |

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION：

The California Department of Transportation（Caltrans），in cooperation with the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency（PCTPA），Placer County，and the Cities of Roseville，Rocklin，and Lincoln，proposes to widen State Route（SR） 65 from north of Galleria Boulevard／Stanford Ranch Road to Lincoln Boulevard．The project is needed to relieve traffic operation and safety issues stemming from recurring morning and evening peak－period demand that exceeds the current design capacity along SR 65．The additional mainline capacity will accommodate future growth along the corridor．

| Does the project involve any of the following？Mark all boxes that best apply． |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \ Vegetation removal |  | Soil disturbance |  | Bike routes |  | Construction easements |
| $\square$ Irrigation removal |  | Gore paving |  | Bus stops | 区 | Access gates／fencing |
| $\square$ Stream channel work |  | Median barriers |  | Structures work |  | Roadway widening |
| \ New planting |  | Retaining walls |  | Park and ride |  | Excavating／embankment work |
| $\square$ Weed／litter pockets |  | Sound walls | $\square$ Ir | Irrig．water availability | 区 | Contractor staging area |
| $\square$ Maintenance safety |  | Rock slope protection | 区 | Electrical availability |  | Off－pavement detour |
| 区 Contour grading |  | Drainage／culverts |  | Reclaimed water |  | Construction access roads |
| $\square$ Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Will the project affect or be influenced by any of the following？ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\square$ Main street |  | Pedestrian circulation |  | 】 Interagency invol | ment | \ Structures |
| $\square$ Historic importance |  | City／county compliance |  | 区 Cooperative agree |  | ® Overhead utility |
| $\square$ Parks \＆Rec．areas |  | Community stakeholders |  | Public use areas |  | $\square$ Billboard adjacency |
| $\square$ Scenic vistas |  | Neighboring sensitivity |  | Tree removal |  | 区 Aesthetic treatments |
| $\square$ Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE：Director＇s policy \＃22 CONTEXT SENSITIVE SOLUTIONS，11－29－01 ensures that all projects incorporate solutions using innovative approaches that integrate and balance community，aesthetic， historic and environmental values with transportation safety，maintenance and performance goal |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ATTACH THE FOLLOWING AVAILABLE DOCUMENTS： |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preliminary Plans－ Location Map | outs | Typical Cross Sec Photos | ions | Photos／Video |  | $\square$ Aerials with limits of RW |

For assistance in filling out this form contact your local Landscape Architecture or Engineering Services Branch Chief．

## Attachment M

 Risk RegisterProject Risk Register


Project Risk Register


Project Risk Register



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Subsequent to the traffic analysis, the PDT determined that the initial phase of the Carpool Lane Alternative would not construct the southbound HOV lane to traffic until the I-80/SR 65 Interchange's ultimate phase was completed. Give the low HOV lane demand under construction year conditions, the analysis results without the HOV lane would be similar to the results presented in this report.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ This configuration is based on one of the alternatives developed for the I-80/Rocklin Road Interchange PSR. In the meantime, the City of Rocklin has moved ahead with plans to construct a roundabout at Rocklin Road/Granite Drive by the construction year of 2020. Since this occurred after the start of this project, the planned roundabout is not included.
    ${ }^{3}$ Funding for this project was secured after the forecasts were prepared, so the project is only included in the Vissim operational models.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ This project was originally part of the SR 65 Capacity and Operational Improvements project. The project was assumed to be a general purpose lane to be consistent with the initial operations analysis, which had a general purpose lane for most of the project length.

[^3]:    ${ }^{5}$ The SACMET model used for this project was released in May 2011 and was developed to be consistent with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy 2035.

[^4]:    ${ }^{6}$ As noted in Chapter 2, the project alternative lane configurations for the forecast model differ from the final project alternatives since the alternatives were refined after the initial analysis results were prepared.

[^5]:    ${ }^{7}$ As noted previously, the build alternatives originally included mainline widening north of Blue Oaks Boulevard. The construction year forecast models include this widening, which results in volumes that are higher than would be expected. The construction year volumes for the No Build Alternative are not affected.

[^6]:    Legend:

    Interchange $\quad$| AM Peak Hour LOS / Density |
    | :--- |
    | $<>$ HOV Lane |
    | Facility Type (Basic, Merge, Diverge, or Weave) | POS / Density

[^7]:    Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
    2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

[^8]:    Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
    2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

[^9]:    2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.
[^10]:    Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
    2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

[^11]:    2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.
[^12]:    Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
    2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

[^13]:    Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
    2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

[^14]:    Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour.
    2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

[^15]:    Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour
    2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

[^16]:    Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour
    2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

[^17]:    Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.

[^18]:    Notes: Average density reported for the analysis area only: for example, within the ramp influence area and not including the HOV lane.

[^19]:    Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour
    2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

[^20]:    Notes: 1. Volume is measured for the entire peak hour
    2. Delay is measured for the peak 15 minutes in the peak hour.

[^21]:    * Freeway VHD is measured only for freeway mainline links with an average speed less than 35 mph .

[^22]:    * Freeway VHD is measured only for freeway mainline links with an average speed less than 35 mph

[^23]:    Caltrans Storm Water Quality Handbooks
    Project Planning and Design Guide

[^24]:    Caltrans Storm Water Quality Handbooks
    Project Planning and Design Guide
    May 2012

[^25]:    ${ }^{2}$ See pages 39 and 40 of the Fact Sheets for the CGP. http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/docs/constpermits/wqo_2009_0009 factsheet.pdf

[^26]:    ${ }^{1}$ Assess the combined infiltration of the WQV by both biofiltration and infiltration BMPs. As site

[^27]:    Approved by Project

[^28]:    *Applies to all SWPPPs and those WPCPs with sediment control or soil stabilization BMPs.
    **Applies to both SWPPPs and WPCP projects.
    *** Applies only to project with SWPPPs.

[^29]:    *Applies to all SWPPPs and those WPCPs with sediment control or soil stabilization BMPs.
    **Applies to both SWPPPs and WPCP projects.
    *** Applies only to project with SWPPPs.

[^30]:    Estimate Prepared By

[^31]:    * Accidents per Million Vehicle Miles
    ** Fatal Plus Injury
    Source: Caltrans District 3 TASAS Table B Data

[^32]:    Wendy Hsiao
    Project Manager
    SunStar Laboratories, Inc
    25712 Commercentre Drive, Lake Forest, CA 92630
    Office: (949) 297-5020
    E-mail: wendy@sunstarlabs.com

[^33]:    John Somers, Lab Director

[^34]:    * Complete Non-Conformance Receiving Sheet if checked

    Cooler/Sample Review - Initials and date $B C \quad 8.8 .14$

[^35]:    ${ }^{1}$ BCI uses the term Recognized Environmental Condition (REC) in general but not strict compliance with ASTM E1527-13, which defines the meaning as "the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products on a property under conditions that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of a release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products on the property or into the ground, ground water, or surface water of the property. The term includes hazardous substances or petroleum products even under conditions in compliance with laws. The term is not intended to include de minimus conditions that generally do not present a threat to human health or the environment and generally would not be the subject of an enforcement action if brought to the attention of the appropriate regulatory agencies. Conditions determined to be de minimus are not recognized environmental conditions." BCI includes this definition to clarify conditions addressed in this ISA but it does not imply that this ISA is compliant with ASTM E 1527 - 13.

[^36]:    ${ }^{2}$ BCI uses the term Recognized Environmental Condition (REC) in general but not strict compliance with ASTM E1527-13, which defines the meaning as "the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products on a property under conditions that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of a release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products on the property or into the ground, ground water, or surface water of the property. The term includes hazardous substances or petroleum products even under conditions in compliance with laws. The term is not intended to include de minimus conditions that generally do not present a threat to human health or the environment and generally would not be the subject of an enforcement action if brought to the attention of the appropriate regulatory agencies. Conditions determined to be de minimus are not recognized environmental conditions." BCI includes this definition to clarify conditions addressed in this ISA but it does not imply that this ISA is compliant with ASTM E 1527 - 05.

[^37]:    Disclaimer - Copyright and Trademark Notice
    This Report contains certain information obtained from a variety of public and other sources reasonably available to Environmental Data Resources, Inc. It cannot be concluded from this Report that coverage information for the target and surrounding properties does not exist from other sources. NO WARRANTY EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, IS MADE WHATSOEVER IN CONNECTION WITH THIS REPORT. ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. SPECIFICALLY DISCLAIMS THE MAKING OF ANY SUCH WARRANTIES, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR USE OR PURPOSE. ALL RISK IS ASSUMED BY THE USER. IN NO EVENT SHALL ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. BE LIABLE TO ANYONE, WHETHER ARISING OUT OF ERRORS OR OMISSIONS, NEGLIGENCE, ACCIDENT OR ANY OTHER CAUSE, FOR ANY LOSS OF DAMAGE, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, SPECIAL, INCIDENTAL,
    CONSEQUENTIAL, OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES. ANY LIABILITY ON THE PART OF ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. IS STRICTLY LIMITED TO A REFUND OF THE AMOUNT PAID FOR THIS REPORT. Purchaser accepts this Report "AS IS". Any analyses, estimates, ratings, environmental risk levels or risk codes provided in this Report are provided for illustrative purposes only, and are not intended to provide, nor should they be interpreted as providing any facts regarding, or prediction or forecast of, any environmental risk for any property. Only a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment performed by an environmental professional can provide information regarding the environmental risk for any property. Additionally, the information provided in this Report is not to be construed as legal advice.
    Copyright 2014 by Environmental Data Resources, Inc. All rights reserved. Reproduction in any media or format, in whole or in part, of any report or map of Environmental Data Resources, Inc., or its affiliates, is prohibited without prior written permission. EDR and its logos (including Sanborn and Sanborn Map) are trademarks of Environmental Data Resources, Inc. or its affiliates. All other trademarks used herein are the property of their respective owners.

[^38]:    THE ANALYSIS USES POLARIZED LIGHT MICROSCOPY AND DISPERSION STAINING FOLLOWING E.P.A. METHOD 600/R-93/116. NON-FRIABLE MATERIALS WERE ANALYZED APPLYING THE SAME METHOD. THE LOWER DETECTION LIMIT IS $<1 \%$ WITH THE PROVISO THAT PLM MAY NOT DETECT FIBERS <0. 25 MICRONS IN DIAMETER THAT MAY BE PRESENT IN SAMPLES SUCH AS FLOOR TILES. IN ACCORDANCE WITH TITLE 22, CCR, SECTION 66261.24(a)(2)(A),THE MCL IS $1 \%$. SAMPLES WERE NOT COLLECTED BY ASBESTECH. THIS REPORT MUST NOT BE REPRODUCED EXCEPT IN FULL WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF ASBESTECH. THIS REPORT RELATES ONLY TO THE ITEMS TESTED. THIS REPORT MUST NOT BE USED TO CLAIM PRODUCT ENDORSEMENT BY N.V.L.A.P. OR ANY AGENCY OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT. ASBESTECH ACCEPTS TECHNICAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS REPORT AND DATE OF ISSUE

