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## Project Requests

This project request is for a Tentative Map Application for:
A) 32 Single Family Residential lots on 35.85 acres.

Golden Mesa South is located north of Golden Valley Road and east off Estates Drive on one parcel. The project site is accessed from Estates Drive which connects to Golden Valley Road. The project's site parcel number is APN 552-100-01, as shown in Figure 1 (below).


Figure 1 - Vicinity Map

## Project History

R\&K Homes requested and obtained approval for a Tentative Map, case number TM05-017 to develop a 59-lot single family common open space development on 55.37 acres. (APN 552-100-01 and 552-092-20). This submittal was subsequent to a Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CP04-011) that re-designated the parcels from LDS and GR to a mix of LDS and MDS. The previous request was for a common open space development with a minimum lot size of 0.50 acres. The common open space development allowed for reduced lot sizes while maintaining maximum allowed density. TM05-017 was approved on November $1^{\text {st }}, 2005$. The entitlement has since expired.

## Project Description

The proposed project is for a 32 unit single family residential development with lot sizes ranging from 35,000 square feet to 47,285 square feet. The average lot size is 36,843 square feet. The project will include 5.02 acres of open space, 3.57 acres of public right of way, and 27.20 acres of residential lots.

Proposed net density is 1.18 dwelling units per acre and the proposed gross density is 0.89 dwelling units per acre. The proposed layout is shown below:


Figure 2 - Site Plan

## Tentative Map Findings

When considering a Tentative Subdivision Map, the Washoe County development code requires that the Planning Commission determine if the proposal is in compliance with the required findings. The considered findings are as follows:

1) Plan Consistency - Determine that the proposed map is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the North Valleys Area Plan.

Response: The proposed map is in conformance with all of the goals and policies of the North Valleys Area Plan. Proposed densities and subdivision design meet Plan requirements. There are no specific plans associated with this request.
2) Design or Improvement - Determine that the design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is consistent with the Master Plan and any specific plan.

Response: The subdivision design complies with the policies of the North Valleys Area Plan and all the elements of the Washoe County Master Plan.
3) Type of Development - Determine that the project site is physically suited for the type of development proposed.

Response: The proposed subdivision is located in an area with residential subdivisions to the east, west and north. Property to the south contains Golden Valley Road and further south is North Valleys High School. The proposed project is a suitable fit.
4) Availability of Service - That the subdivision will meet the requirements of article 702, Adequate Public Facilities Management System.

Response: Adequate facilities exist to accommodate the proposed development. Any determined deficiencies and/or required infrastructure to connect to existing facilities will be borne by the developer.
5) Fish or Wildlife - Determine that neither the design of the subdivision nor any proposed improvements is likely to cause substantial environmental damage, or substantial and avoidable injury to any endangered plant, wildlife or their habitat.

Response: There are no identified endangered plants or wildlife on the subject property.
6) Public Health - Determine that the design of the subdivision or type of improvement is not likely to cause significant public health problems.

Response: The proposed subdivision is similar to other residential subdivisions in the surrounding area and the design is not likely to cause significant health problems.
7) Easements - Determine that the design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements acquired by the public at large for access through, or use of property within, the proposed subdivision.

Response: The design of the subdivision considers all existing easements and will perpetuate access to existing residences if applicable.
8) Access - Determine that the design of the subdivision provides any necessary access to surrounding, adjacent lands and provides appropriate secondary access for emergency vehicles.

Response: The proposed subdivision provides necessary access to surrounding, adjacent lands. Access points will be perpetuated and/or provided via new public roads.
9) Dedications - Determine that any land or improvements to be dedicated to Washoe County is consistent with the Master Plan.

Response: All lands to be dedicated to Washoe County are consistent with the Master Plan.
10) Energy - Determine that the design of the subdivision provides, to the extent feasible, for future passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities in the subdivision.

Response: Adequate opportunities shall be provided for future passive or natural heating or cooling to the extent feasible.

## APPENDIX "A"

## DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION



## Washoe County Development Application

Your entire application is a public record. If you have a concern about releasing personal information, please contact Planning and Development staff at 775.328.3600.

| Project Information |  | Staff Assigned Case No.: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  |  |  |
| Golden Mesa South |  |  |  |
| ProjectDescription: $\quad 32$ lot single family residential subdivision |  |  |  |
| Project Address: East of Estates Road, North Golden Valley Road |  |  |  |
| Project Area (acres or square feet): 35.85 acres |  |  |  |
| Project Location (with point of reference to major cross streets AND area locator): Golden Valley. The parcel is north of Golden Valley Road \& east of Estates Drive. |  |  |  |
| Assessor's Parcel No.(s): | Parcel Acreage: | Assessor's Parcel No(s): | Parcel Acreage: |
| 552-100-01 | 35.846 |  |  |
| Section(s)/Township/Range: Section 11 T. 20 E, R. 19 E. |  |  |  |
| Indicate any previous Washoe County approvals associated with this application: Case No.(s). CP04-011, TM05-015, SW05-016, WSUP16-0002 |  |  |  |
| Applicant Information (attach additional sheets if necessary) |  |  |  |
| Property Owner: |  | Professional Consultant: |  |
| Name: Moonlight Hills Estates, LLC |  | Name: Axion Engineering |  |
| Address: 5390 Bellazza Court |  | Address: 681 Edison Way |  |
| Reno, NV | Zip: 89519 | Reno, NV | Zip: 89503 |
| Phone: | Fax: | Phone: 775-771-5554 | Fax:775-856-3951 |
| Email: |  | Email: gary@axionengineering.net |  |
| Cell: | Other: | Cell: | Other: |
| Contact Person: Richard Nevis |  | Contact Person: Gary Guzelis |  |
| Applicant/Developer: |  | Other Persons to be Contacted: |  |
| Name: Same |  | Name: Mark Herrmann |  |
| Address: |  | Address: P.O. Box 8817 |  |
| Zip: |  | Reno, NV | Zip: 89511 |
| Phone: | Fax: | Phone: | Fax: |
| Email: |  | Email: mvonherrman@sbcglobal.net |  |
| Cell: Other: |  | Cell: 775-720-8973 | Other: |
| Contact Person: |  | Contact Person: |  |
| For Office Use Only |  |  |  |
| Date Received: | Initial: | Planning Area: |  |
| County Commission District: |  | Master Plan Designation(s): |  |
| CAB(s): |  | Regulatory Zoning(s): |  |

## Property Owner Affidavit

## Applicant Name: Moonlight Hills Estates, LLC

The receipt of this application at the time of submittal does not guarantee the application complies with all requirements of the Washoe County Development Code, the Washoe County Master Plan or the applicable area plan, the applicable regulatory zoning, or that the application is deemed complete and will be processed.

STATE OF NEVADA )
COUNTY OF WASHOE )

I, Moonlight Hills Estates, LLC
(please print name)
being duly sworn, depose and say that I am the owner* of the property or properties involved in this application as listed below and that the foregoing statements and answers herein contained and the information herewith submitted are in all respects complete, true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. I understand that no assurance or guarantee can be given by members of Planning and Development.
(A separate Affidavit must be provided by each property owner named in the title report.)

Assessor Parcel Numbers): 552-100-01


Address $\qquad$

Reno, NV 89519

Subscribed and sworn to before me this


Notary Public in and for said county and state
(Notary Stamp)

*Owner refers to the following: (Please mark appropriate box.)
Owner
$\square$ Corporate Officer/Partner (Provide copy of recorded document indicating authority to sign.)

- Power of Attorney (Provide copy of Power of Attorney.)
- Owner Agent (Provide notarized letter from property owner giving legal authority to agent.)
- Property Agent (Provide copy of record document indicating authority to sign.)
$\square$ Letter from Government Agency with Stewardship


## Tentative Subdivision Map Application Supplemental Information

(All required information may be separately attached)

Chapter 110 of the Washoe County Code is commonly known as the Development Code. Specific references to tentative subdivision maps may be found in Article 608, Tentative Subdivision Maps.

1. What is the location (address or distance and direction from nearest intersection)?

The 35.85 acre property is located east of Estates Road and north Golden Valley Road.

A legal description for the property is included in the Preliminary Title Report which is part of this application.
2. What is the subdivision name (proposed name must not duplicate the name of any existing subdivision)?

## Golden Mesa South

3. Density and lot design:

| a. Acreage of project site | 35.85 acres |
| :--- | :--- |
| b. Total number of lots | 32 |
| c. Dwelling units per acre | 0.89 |
| d. Minimum and maximum area of proposed lots | $35,000-47,285$ |
| e. Minimum width of proposed lots | 120 feet |
| f. Average lot size | 36,843 square feet |

4. Utilities:

| a. Sewer Service | Washoe County Utilities |
| :--- | :--- |
| b. Electrical Service | NV Energy |
| c. Telephone Service | AT\&T |
| d. LPG or Natural Gas Service | NV Energy |
| e. Solid Waste Disposal Service | Waste Management of Nevada |
| f. Cable Television Service | Charter |
| g. Water Service | TMWA |

5. For common open space subdivisions (Article 408), please answer the following:
a. Acreage of common open space:
5.02 acres
b. Development constraints within common open space (slope, wetlands, faults, springs, ridgelines):

None
c. Range of lot sizes (include minimum and maximum lot size):

35,000 sf min; 47,285 sf max.
d. Average lot size:

36,843 square feet
e. Proposed yard setbacks if different from standard:

Proposed setbacks shall conform to zoning requirements
f. Justification for setback reduction or increase, if requested:

N/A
g. Identify all proposed non-residential uses:

None
h. Improvements proposed for the common open space:

Open space improvements will included detention pond facilities/drainage channels and landscaping. The ponds will be maintained by a proposed maintenance association.
i. Describe or show on the tentative map any public or private trail systems within common open space of the development:

None
j. Describe the connectivity of the proposed trail system with existing trails or open space adjacent to or near the property:

No trails are proposed with this development. Street side sidewalks will be constructed throughout the project.
k. If there are ridgelines on the property, how are they protected from development?

Not applicable.
I. Will fencing be allowed on lot lines or restricted? If so, how?

Fencing is anticipated to follow typical single family residential guidelines and Washoe County code.
m . Identify the party responsible for maintenance of the common open space:
A maintenance association will be created to take care of the common open space. Fees will be supported by homeowner dues.
6. Is the project adjacent to public lands or impacted by "Presumed Public Roads" as shown on the adopted April 27, 1999 Presumed Public Roads (see Washoe County Engineering website at http://www.washoecounty.us/pubworks/engineering.htm). If so, how is access to those features provided?

No
7. Is the parcel within the Truckee Meadows Service Area?

| $\square$ Yes | $\square$ No |
| :--- | :--- |

8. Is the parcel within the Cooperative Planning Area as defined by the Regional Plan?

| $\square$ Yes | $\square$ No | If yes, within what city? Reno |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

9. Will a special use permit be required for utility improvement? If so, what special use permits are required and are they submitted with the application package?

A Special Use Permit is required for a sewage lift station. The Special Use Permit has been approved. (WSUP16-0002)
10. Has an archeological survey been reviewed and approved by SHPO on the property? If yes, what were the findings?

An archaeological survey has not been performed on the subject property.
11. Indicate the type and quantity of water rights the application has or proposes to have available:

| a. Permit \# |  | acre-feet per year |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| b. Certificate \# |  | acre-feet per year |  |
| c. Surface Claim \# |  | acre-feet per year |  |
| d. Other \# |  | acre-feet per year |  |

e. Title of those rights (as filed with the State Engineer in the Division of Water Resources of the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

Water rights will be purchased and dedicated prior to final map recordation.
12. Describe the aspects of the tentative subdivision that contribute to energy conservation:

Energy conservation is typically improved by use of energy efficient building materials including windows, doors, insulation and structure wraps per current ICC's IECC energy codes. Energy efficient appliances and water efficient faucets, shower heads and toilets will be used.

Large lot sizes are conducive for ground water recharge.
13. Is the subject property in an area identified by Planning and Development as
potentially containing rare or endangered plants and/or animals, critical breeding habitat, migration routes or winter range? If so, please list the species and describe what mitigation measures will be taken to prevent adverse impacts to the species:

The property is not identified by Washoe County Community Services Department as containing rare or endangered plants/animals, critical breeding habitat or migratory routes.
14. If private roads are proposed, will the community be gated? If so, is a public trail system easement provided through the subdivision?

Not applicable.
15. Is the subject property located adjacent to an existing residential subdivision? If so, describe how the tentative map complies with each additional adopted policy and code requirement of Article 434, Regional Development Standards within Cooperative Planning Areas and all of Washoe County, in particular, grading within 50 and 200 feet of the adjacent developed properties under 5 acres and parcel matching criteria:

The proposed development is located adjacent to residential homes. The design of the project complies with applicable policies.
16. Are there any applicable policies of the adopted area plan in which the project is located that require compliance? If so, which policies and how does the project comply?

No
17. Are there any applicable area plan modifiers in the Development Code in which the project is located that require compliance? If so, which modifiers and how does the project comply?

No, there are no plan modifiers for this area.
18. Will the project be completed in one phase or is phasing planned? If so, please provide that phasing plan:

At this time phasing is unknown and will depend on the developer. Phasing will be determined at the improvement plan preparation stage and discussed with Washoe County. It is anticipated that the project would be constructed in one phase.
19. Is the project subject to Article 424, Hillside Development? If yes, please address all requirements of the Hillside Ordinance in a separate set of attachments and maps.

| $\square$ Yes | $\square$ No | If yes, include a separate set of attachments and maps. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

20. Is the project subject to Article 418, Significant Hydrologic Resources? If yes, please address Special Review Considerations within Section 110.418 .30 in a separate attachment.

| $\square$ Yes | $\square$ | No | If yes, include separate attachments. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Grading

Please complete the following additional questions if the project anticipates grading that involves:
(1) Disturbed area exceeding twenty-five thousand $(25,000)$ square feet not covered by streets, buildings and landscaping; (2) More than one thousand (1,000) cubic yards of earth to be imported and placed as fill in a special flood hazard area; (3) More than five thousand $(5,000)$ cubic yards of earth to be imported and placed as fill; (4) More than one thousand $(1,000)$ cubic yards to be excavated, whether or not the earth will be exported from the property; or (5) If a permanent earthen structure will be established over four and one-half (4.5) feet high:
21. How many cubic yards of material are you proposing to excavate on site?
96,695 CY
22. How many cubic yards of material are you exporting or importing? If exporting of material is anticipated, where will the material be sent? If the disposal site is within unincorporated Washoe County, what measures will be taken for erosion control and revegetation at the site? If none, how are you balancing the work on-site?

Earthwork is designed to be balance between the Golden Mesa North and Golden Mesa South projects. Approximately 33,000 cubic yards of import is needed from the Golden Mesa North project.
23. Can the disturbed area be seen from off-site? If yes, from which directions, and which properties or roadways? What measures will be taken to mitigate their impacts?

Disturbed areas are likely visible from all directions. Erosion control of disturbed areas will established per Best Management practices. Cut and fill slopes will be revegetated with approved seed mixes.
24. What is the slope (Horizontal:Vertical) of the cut and fill areas proposed to be? What methods will be used to prevent erosion until the revegetation is established?

Slopes not to exceed 3:1 are proposed for cut and fill slopes. Slopes will be revegetated with an approved seed mix.
25. Are you planning any berms and, if so, how tall is the berm at its highest? How will it be stabilized and/or revegetated?

No berms are proposed.
26. Are retaining walls going to be required? If so, how high will the walls be, will there be multiple walls with intervening terracing, and what is the wall construction (i.e. rockery, concrete, timber, manufactured block)? How will the visual impacts be mitigated?

No retaining walls are proposed.
27. Will the grading proposed require removal of any trees? If so, what species, how many, and of what size?

Tree removal is not anticipated.
28. What type of revegetation seed mix are you planning to use and how many pounds per acre do you intend to broadcast? Will you use mulch and, if so, what type?

The revegetation seed blend will be a native/naturalized blend applied at rate of 31 pounds per acre. A wood fiber mulch will be included in the hydroseed slurry.
29. How are you providing temporary irrigation to the disturbed area?

Temporary irrigation will be provided through connection to installed water meters.
30. Have you reviewed the revegetation plan with the Washoe Storey Conservation District? If yes, have you incorporated their suggestions?

No


## PROPERTY TAX INFORMATION



## WASHOE COUNTY TREASURER

Received By:

Session:
smartell
Treasurer's Office
SMartell-0-09132017

Receipt Number:
Receipt Year:
Date Received:

## PAYMENT RECEIPT

| Type | Description | Balance | Net Tax | Interest | Fees Penalties | Current Due | Current Paid | Balance Remaining |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Real | Bill Number: 2017122053 | 2,319.51 | 1,148.28 | 0.00 | 22.97 | 1,171.25 | 597.11 | 1,722.40 |
|  | Bill Year: 2017 <br> PIN: 55210001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Primary Owner: MOONLIGHT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | HILLS ESTATES LLC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Property Addr: E GOLDEN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | VALLEY RD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Property Desc: Section 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Township 20 Range 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | SubdivisionName _UNSPECIFIED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | Totals: | $2,319.51$ | $1,148.28$ | 0.00 | 22.97 | $1,171.25$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Tender Information: |  |  | Charge Summary: |  |  |  |
| Check \#7/1134 |  | 597.11 | Real |  |  |  |
| Total Tendered | 597.11 | Total Charges | $1,171.25$ |  |  |  |

## WASHOE COUNTY TREASURER PO BOX 30039 RENO, NV 89520-3039

By Whom Paid:

MOONLIGHT HILLS ESTATES LLC 5390 BELLAZZA CT RENO NV 89519


SEP 122017
W. C. T. O. 27

| BALANCE REMAINING | $1,722.40$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| CHARGES | $1,171.25$ |
| PAID | 597.11 |
| CHANGE | 0.00 |

## ASSESSOR'S MAP





## APPENDIX "B"

## REPORTS and PLAN SETS



# TMWA DISCOVERY and WATER SERVICE ACKNOWLEDGEMENT 

# 1355 Capital Blvd. © P.O. Box 30013 • Reno, NV 89520-3013 <br> (D) 775.834.8080 - (D) 775.834.8003 

| TO: | Karen Meyer | DATE: | July 6, 2016 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| THRU: | Scott Estes SoE |  |  |
| FROM: | Brooke Long BL |  |  |

## RE: Golden Valley Mesa Annexation/Discovery, TMWA WO\# 16-4979

## SUMMARY:

The Applicant has proposed a development consisting of 148 single family residential units on approximately 154.9 acres. TMWA can provide water service to the project, however, the project lies outside TMWA's service territory and will require annexation prior to a water service agreement. As part of this discovery, the off-site facility improvements have been identified. The cost opinion of the major off-site improvements for the project is $\$ 3,094,173$.

Review of conceptual site plans or tentative maps by TMWA and/or agents of TMWA shall not constitute an application for service, nor implies a commitment by TMWA for planning, design or construction of the water facilities necessary for service. The extent of required off-site and onsite water infrastructure improvements will be determined by TMWA upon receiving a specific development proposal or complete application for service and upon review and approval of a water facilities plan by the local Health Authority. Because the NAC 445A Water System regulations are subject to interpretation, TMWA and/or agents of TMWA cannot guarantee that a subsequent water facility plan will be approved by the Health Authority or that a timely review and approval of the Project will be made. The Applicant should carefully consider the financial risk associated with committing resources to their Project prior to receiving all required approvals. After submittal of a complete Application for Service, the required facilities, the cost of these facilities, which could be significant, and associated fees will be estimated and will be included as part of the Water Service Agreement necessary for the Project. All fees must be paid to TMWA prior to water being delivered to the Project.

## PURPOSE:

The purpose of this Discovery is to identify a planning level water service plan and an opinion of cost for the off-site facilities required to serve the proposed development in Lemmon Valley, Nevada.

## ASSUMPTIONS:

1. The applicant shall be responsible for all application, review, inspection, storage, treatment, permits, easements, and other fees pertinent to the Project as adopted by the TMVA at the time of execution of a water service agreement.
2. The cost opinions contained herein do not include new business fees, cost of water rights and related fees, or contribution to the water meter retrofit fund.
3. Demand calculations, and fees based on demands, are estimates; actual fees will be determined at the time of application for service.
4. Project pressure criteria are:
a. Maximum day pressure of at least 45 pounds per square inch (psi) at the ground surface elevation at the service connection with tank level at top of fire storage,
b. Peak hour pressure of at least 40 psi at building pad elevation with tank level at top of emergency storage,
c. Maximum day plus fire flow pressure of at least 20 psi at center of street elevation with tank level at bottom of fire storage, and
d. TMWA does not calculate pressures for multi-story buildings. Confirmation that pressure will be adequate for upper stories is the responsibility of the Applicant.
5. Elevations used for this discovery were derived from existing site topographic information (not a grading plan).
6. Facility requirements for the Project are based on the assumed elevations, maximum day demand, and fire flow requirements. Changes in these parameters may affect the facility requirements.
7. Easements, permits and all pertinent Agency approvals are obtained for the design and construction of the water infrastructure necessary to serve the proposed Project.
8. All cost opinions are preliminary and subject to change. The costs presented in this study are planning level estimates based on the information available. Actual costs will be determined at the time of application for service. Cost opinions do not include on-site improvements made by the applicant.
9. This discovery is based on the current status of TMWA's system. Future development may alter the conclusions of this discovery. Capacity in TMWA's system is available on a first-come, first-served basis, and commitment to provide service is not established until a contract for service is executed and all fees are paid.
10. No water demands were included for the open space areas, public facilities or parks.
11. Project maximum day demands are calculated using the following equations:

Single-Family Units: Domestic Maximum Day Usage
$Y=0.009 * \sqrt{x}$
$\mathrm{Y}=$ maximum day demand in gpm $x=$ lot size in square feet

Add irrigation for common areas as needed
Multi-Family Units: Domestic Maximum Day Usage
0.15 gpm per unit

Add irrigation for common areas as needed
Commercial/Industrial: Domestic Maximum Day Usage
Multiply water rights demand (in acre-feet) by 1.17
Add irrigation for common areas as needed
Potable Irrigation: Maximum Day Usage
Multiply water rights demand (in acre-feet) by 0.38
Note: TMWA plans to reevaluate the above maximum day demand equations for all customer usage types within the next 12 months, as part of a Water Facility Plan Update.

## DISCUSSION:

The proposed Project is located in Golden Valley, NV and consists of 148 single family residential units with an average lot size of 38,000 square feet, on approximately 154.9 acres (see Figure 1).

Table 1. Project Parcel APNs and Acreage.

| APN | ACREAGE |
| :---: | :---: |
| $552-050-01$ | 99.5 |
| $552-092-19$ | 20.2 |
| $552-100-01$ | 35.2 |
| Total | 154.9 |

The project can be served from TMWA's North Virginia water system. However, the project is not located within the Truckee Meadows Water Authority's (TMWA) retail service territory and will require annexation by TMWA.

## Demands:

Applying TMWA's current maximum day demand formula, the demand for an average lot size of $38,000 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ lot is 1.7 gpm . The total estimated project maximum day demand for the proposed 148 lots is 251.6 gpm .

## Supply Capacity

TMWA's system currently has the available capacity to supply the Project's estimated max day demand.

## Storage Capacity

TMWA's distribution system currently has adequate storage to accommodate the Project.

| Tank Supply | Max <br> Day <br> Demand | Operating <br> Storage (15\% of <br> MDD) | Emergency <br> Storage <br> (1 ADD) | Total <br> Storage <br> (gallons) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Raleigh Heights | 251.6 | 54,346 | 138,814 | 193,159 |

## Project Pressures:

Service pressures will range from 49 psi to 115 psi . Where pressures exceed 80 psi , TMWA will require that all service connections have privately owned pressure regulators.

- Service elevations from 5090 to 5240.
- Project supply from the Raleigh Heights pressure zone.


## Off-Site Improvements

Off-site improvements to serve the project for both developments are detailed below.
The project can be supplied from the existing 12" main in Golden Valley Rd. Planned off-site improvements are as follows:

- Two hot taps to the $12^{\prime \prime}$ main in Golden Valley Rd (see Figure 1 for locations).
- 4,850 LF of 8 " pipe in Estates Rd from Golden Valley Rd to Hillview Dr.
- 500 LF connecting the north and south areas.


## Dead Ends and Looping:

Nevada Administrative Code section 445A. 6712 requires systems to be designed, to the extent possible, to eliminate dead ends. As planned, looping is achieved.

## Project Fire Flows

Project Fire flow is assumed to be $1,500 \mathrm{gpm}$ for a duration of 2 hours while maintaining a minimum residual service pressure of 20 psi .

## Major Water System Improvements and Cost Opinion

The major water system improvements to serve the project and a planning level cost opinion are listed in Table 2 and shown in Figure 1.

Table 2. Major Water System Improvements and Associated Costs

| Description | Quantity | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 8 Facility Charge | 251.6 | MDD, <br> gpm | $\$ 4,142$ | $\$ 1,042,127$ |  |  |  |
| Area 8 Storage Charge | 251.6 | MDD, <br> gpm | $\$ 772$ | $\$ 194,235$ |  |  |  |
| Area 8 Supply and Treatment Charge | 251.6 | MDD, <br> gpm | $\$ 4,163$ | $\$ 1,047,411$ |  |  |  |
| subtotal |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 2,283,773$ |  |
| Hot Tap | 2 | L.S. | $\$ 20,000$ | $\$ 40,000$ |  |  |  |
| 8" main in Estates | 4850 | L.S. | $\$ 144$ | $\$ 698,400$ |  |  |  |
| 8" main connecting the N and S <br> Properties | 500 | L.F. | $\$ 144$ | $\$ 72,000$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | subtotal | $\$ 810,400$ |

MDD $=$ Maximum Day Demand, L.F. $=$ Linear Feet, L.S. $=$ Lump Sum


1355 Capital Blvd. © P.O. Box 30013 • Reno, NV 89520-3013<br>(1) 775.834 .8080 • (Di) 775.834.8003

Date: May 17, 2016
To: Karen Meyer
From: David Nelson
RE: $\quad 16-4979$, Golden Valley Mesa North and South, +/- 148 SFR Lots (APN 552-050-01, 552-09219 \& 552-100-01)

The New Business/Water Resource team will answer the following assumptions on each new discovery:

- Is the property within Truckee Meadows Water Authority's water service territory?
- Does the property have Truckee River water rights appurtenant to the property, groundwater or resource credits associated with the property?
- If yes, what is the status of the water right: Agricultural or Municipal and Domestic use?
- Estimated water demand for residential and or commercial projects.
- Any special conditions, or issues, that are a concern to TMWA or the customer.

The following information is provided to complete the Discovery as requested:

- These subject parcels (APN 552-050-01, 552-092-19 \& 552-100-01) are within Truckee Meadows Water Authority's (TMWA's) service territory. An annexation is not required.
- There are no resource credits or Truckee River decreed water rights appurtenant to this property. The developer will be required to follow TMWA's current rules, specifically Rule 7, and pay all fees for water rights needed in order to obtain a will serve commitment letter.
- Based on the information provided by the applicant this project "Golden Valley Mesa North and South, +/- 148 SFR Lots" is estimated to require a domestic demand of $\mathbf{1 0 6 . 5 6}$ acre feet (AF). Landscaping plans were not provided to TMWA; therefore, a demand could not be determined. Please see the attached demand calculation sheet for the estimated demand and water resource fees. Once final plans are submitted a more accurate demand will be calculated. Note: Water rights held or banked by the applicant must be dedicated to a project before any rule 7 water rights are purchased from TMWA. TMWA resources are first come, first serve and are limited. If applicant dedicates surface water for this project additional fees and dedications will apply.
- Any existing right of ways and public easements would need to be reviewed, and if needed the property owner will need to grant TMWA the proper easements and/or land dedications to provide water service to the subject properties. Property owner will be required, at its sole expense, to provide TMWA with a current preliminary title report for all subject properties. Owner will represent and warrant such property offered for dedication or easements to TMWA shall be free and clear of all liens and encumbrances. Owner is solely responsible for obtaining all appropriate permits, licenses, construction easements, subordination agreements, consents from lenders, and other necessary rights from all necessary parties to dedicate property or easements with title acceptable to TMWA.



## WATER RIGHTS AND METER FUND CONTRIBUTION CALCULATION WORKSHEET FOR MULTI-TENANT/COMMERCIAL APPLICATIONS

|  |  |  |  |  | Demand (Acre Feet) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing demand (current usage) at | Property |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| 2 | No. of Lots: Average 35,000sf |  | x . 72 AF per Lot | 106.56 |  |  |  |
| 3 | Retail floor space: |  | $x 0.0004$ per sq.ft. | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| 4 | Fixture units: |  | x 15x $365 \times 3.07 / 1 \mathrm{mil}$ | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| 5 | Landscaping: | - | sq ftx $3.41 / 43,560$ | TBD |  |  |  |
| 6 | Drip |  |  | TBD |  |  |  |
| 7 | Other calculated demand |  |  | TBD |  |  |  |
| 8 | New or additional demand at Ser | erty (lin | +3+4+5+6) |  | 106.56 |  |  |
| 9 | Total Demand at Service Proper | 1+8) |  |  | 106.56 |  |  |
| 10 | Less: Prior demand commitme | vice prop |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| 11 | Less: Other resource credits |  |  | $\underline{0.00}$ |  |  |  |
| 12 | Total Credits (lines 10+11) |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| 13 | Subtotal: Required resource dedica | mitmen | nes 9-12) |  | 106.56 |  |  |
|  | Factor amount (0.11 x Line 13) |  |  |  | TBD |  |  |
| 15 | Return flow required ( [1-2.5/duty] |  |  |  | TBD |  |  |
|  | TOTAL RESOURCES REQUIR | s $13+14$ |  |  | $\underline{\underline{06.56}}$ |  |  |
| 17 | Price of Water Rights per AF | \$7,500 |  |  |  | \$ | 799,200 |
| 18 | Will Serve Commitment Letter Pre | Fee (\$1 | per letter) |  |  | \$ | 100 |
| 19 | Due Diligence Fee (\$150.00 per pa |  |  |  |  | \$ | 0 |
| 20 | Document Preparation Fees (\$100. | cument |  |  |  | \$ | 0 |
|  | Meter Contribution ( $\$ 1,830 \times 106$. | eet of de |  |  |  | \$ | TBD |
|  | TOTAL FEES DUE (lines 17+18 | 21) |  |  |  | \$ | $\underline{799,300}$ |

Project: $\quad$ Golden Valley Mesa North and South, +/-148 SFR Lots, Discovery

| Applicant: | Moonlight Hills Estates, LLC: Richard Nevis | Quote date: | $5 / 17 / 2016$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Phone: | Mark Herrmann, 720-8973 | Tech contact: | David 834-8021 <br> APN: |
|  | 552-050-01, 552-092-19, \& 552-100-01 | Project No: | $16-4979$ |

Remarks: Fees quotes are valid only within 15 calendar days of Quote Date.
The $\mathbf{1 0 6 . 5 6}$ acre feet may result in the assessment of facility fees pursuant to TMWA's Rules and Rates.
Estimate shows purchase/dedication of ground water, additional fees and dedication will apply if surface water is brought into TMWA. Resources are first come, first serve and are limited.
P.O. Box 30013

Reno, NV 89520
Phone: 775-834-8080
ENGINEERING AND RESOURCES RECIEPT
Agent: Karen Meyer
Customer: Moonlight Hills Estates, LLC
5390 Bellazza Ct. Reno, NV. 89519 Attn: Richard Nevis
, NV 89519
Project Info:


Remaining portion of Annexation fee

When Recorded, Return to:

Truckee Meadows Water Authority
Attn: Amanda Duncan, ARWP, Land Agent
P O Box 30013
Reno, NV 89520-3013
TMWA WO: 16-4979

## RETAIL WATER SERVICE AREA ANNEXATION AGREEMENT

THIS RETAIL WATER SERVICE AREA ANNEXATION AGREEMENT ("Annexation Agreement"), entered into this day of $\qquad$ , 20 ("Effective Date"), by and between TRUCKEE MEADOWS WATER AUTHORITY (the "Authority"), a Joint Powers Authority entity created pursuant to a cooperative agreement among the cities of Reno, Nevada, Sparks, Nevada and Washoe County, Nevada pursuant to N.R.S. Chapter 277, and MOONLIGHT HILLS ESTATES, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company, (referred to as "Developer" or "Owner" in this Agreement and exhibits attached hereto, and together with Authority collectively hereinafter referred to as "Parties");

## WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, Owner owns certain real property more particularly described on Exhibit "A" and depicted in Exhibit "A-1" attached hereto incorporated herein by this reference ("Property", or "Owner's Project"), located outside of Authority's current retail water service area.

WHEREAS, Owner desires the Authority to expand its retail water service area to provide water service to the Property.

WHEREAS, on December 31, 2014, Authority acquired the water utility system of the Washoe County Department of Water Resources and the South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District, and as a result, new customers may be eligible to annex into the Authority service area based upon their proximity to existing Authority facilities, availability of water resources, or cost-effectiveness.

WHEREAS, based upon these criteria, Authority has determined it is appropriate that Authority provide service to Owner and accordingly, Owner's property may be annexed into Authority's retain water service area.

WHEREAS, the expansion of Authority's retail water service area may require dedication of certain real property or water system facility improvements to facilitate the efficient management and operation of Authority's system to include the Property in its retail water service area.

WHEREAS, Authority is willing to expand its retail water service area to include water service to the Property and Owner agrees to the expansion of Authority's retail water service area upon the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement, subject to and on the express condition that Owner fully and completely perform the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants and conditions herein contained, the Parties agree as follows:

1. Expansion of Water Service Area. Authority agrees to expand its retail water service area as set forth in Exhibits "A" and "A-1" attached hereto to provide water service for the Property; provided, however, that such expansion of the Authority's retail water service area is specifically conditioned upon execution of this Agreement by Owner and the Authority, and the complete and satisfactory performance of the terms and conditions in Section 2 herein by Owner and its permitted successors and assigns, to the extent applicable.
2. Conditions to Annexation. The following conditions must be satisfied within the time frames stipulated below or this Agreement shall automatically terminate, and the Property shall be deemed de-annexed from the Authority retail service area.
2.1 Construction/Dedication of Facility Improvements. The Authority has determined that additions, improvements and/or modifications to its Water System Facilities are required to expand its retail water service area to include the Property. Owner is responsible for all costs related to, and except as otherwise provided herein, shall install and construct the off-site additions, improvements and modifications to the Authority's Water System Facilities as delineated in Exhibit "B" attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference. Owner shall submit a complete Application for New or Modified Water Service and enter a Water Service Agreement with Authority for the completion of the foregoing Water Facilities (or portions thereof, for phased development) no later than twenty-four (24) months from the Effective Date of this Annexation Agreement, or this Agreement shall automatically terminate, and the Property shall be deemed de-annexed from the Authority retail service area. For phased development, Owner shall continue to submit complete Applications for New or Modified Water Service and enter into Water Service Agreements for subsequent phases no later than twenty-four months from the Effective Date of the previous Water Service Agreement, or this Annexation Agreement shall automatically terminate and portions of the Property not actively receiving water service from Authority shall be deemed de-annexed from the Authority retail service area. Authority shall have no obligation to provide water service to any portion of the Property until required water system
facilities are completed to the satisfaction of Authority. Upon completion of the facilities listed in Exhibit B, Owner shall dedicate the facilities to Authority pursuant to the terms of this Annexation Agreement and Authority's Rules, and Authority will own all capacity in the system including any excess capacity.
2.2 Dedication of Real Property. The Authority has determined that the dedication of certain real property in fee, or certain easements, rights of way or other interests in real property, is required to expand its retail water service area to include the Property. Owner shall, prior to the start of construction of any facilities required under this Annexation Agreement, grant and convey to Authority, all necessary easements, conveyances, deeds, rights-of-way, or other rights required by this Annexation Agreement. Such property shall be conveyed free and clear of all liens and encumbrances, and Owner shall obtain and provide Authority prior to dedication, at Owner's expense, a preliminary title report for any property offered for dedication showing all matters of record affecting such property. Owner is solely responsible for obtaining all appropriate permits, licenses, construction easements, subordination agreements, consents from lenders, and other necessary rights from all necessary parties to dedicate property with title acceptable to Authority. If any portion of the property required for dedication is located on property other than that owned by Owner, Owner shall be responsible for obtaining, at no cost to Authority, any necessary interests therein from such owners for conveyance to Authority free and clear of all liens and encumbrances. Owner may not apply for, nor shall Authority shall have any obligation to issue or enter, a Water Service Agreement for service to any portion of the Property until such real property required hereunder is granted to Authority in such form, location, scope and condition of title satisfactory to Authority. Furthermore, unless such real property is granted to Authority no later than twenty-four (24) months from the Effective Date of this Annexation Agreement, this Annexation Agreement shall automatically terminate, and the Property shall be deemed de-annexed from the Authority retail service area. In the event Owner has not conveyed the real property within the 24 -month period, Owner may submit a written request for, and Authority in its sole discretion may grant, an extension up to one-year if Owner can show reasonable justification to Authority why the real property was not transferred.
3. Conditions of Water Service. Owner acknowledges and agrees that this Annexation Agreement merely addresses conditions required for the expansion of Authority's retail water service area, and that Owner must independently comply with all applicable requirements in Authority's Rules before the Authority has any obligation to provide water service to the Property, including without limitation (i) submitting and receiving approval from the Authority of appropriate applications for service; (ii) dedicating sufficient Water Resources to the Authority and receiving a Will Serve Commitment for service to the Property; (iii) in addition to any dedication requirements in Section 2 of this Annexation Agreement, dedicating appropriate easements and other real property required for service; (iv) in addition to any dedication requirements in Section 2 of this Annexation Agreement, installing, constructing and dedicating subdivision or on-site water system facility additions, improvements or modifications or further additions, improvements, extensions or
modifications to Authority's Water System Facilities as necessary to provide the requested new service(s) or modification of service(s) to the Property; and (v) satisfying such other terms and conditions pursuant to the Authority's Rules and any requirements of any local governmental entity with jurisdiction over the Property as necessary to obtain a Will-Serve Commitment letter from the Authority for the delivery of water to the Property. Owner shall submit such applications and execute such other documents required by Authority's Rules and procedures prior to being eligible for the delivery of water to the Property. All such conditions, dedications, additions, improvements, extensions and modifications shall be made in accordance with the Authority's Rules and regulations in effect at the time Authority and Owner enter into any agreement or agreements for the specific dedication, additions, improvements or modifications required to provide water service to the Property.

## 4. General Terms

4.1 Owner acknowledges and agrees that it is entering this Annexation Agreement voluntarily, that the expansion of Authority's service area is specifically conditioned on Owner's performance of all terms and conditions contained herein, and that if any of the provisions of this Annexation Agreement are deemed unenforceable or if Owner fails to perform any of its obligations hereunder, Authority is under no obligation to expand its service area to include any portion of the Property for which the Authority has not previously entered an agreement to provide water service. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to grant Owner a right, and Owner specifically waives any right, if any exists, to dispute any of the terms and conditions of this Annexation Agreement under Rule 8 in Authority's Rules, as such may be amended from time to time. Upon annexation of the Property, the Parties acknowledge and agree that both are bound by the terms and conditions of the rules and regulations adopted by Authority, as the rules and regulations may be amended from time to time, and as such rules may exist at the time service is applied for or requested for the Property or certain phases of the Property.
4.2. Any written notices or communications required hereunder shall be served by placing such notices in the U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, properly addressed to the following:

To: Authority
Truckee Meadows Water Authority
Attn. General Manager
P.O. Box 30013

Reno, NV 89520-3013
To: Owner
Attn: Richard Nevis
Moonlight Hills Estates, LLC
5390 Bellazza Court
Reno, NV 89519
4.3. This Annexation Agreement shall inure to and be binding upon the parties, their respective successors and assigns.
4.4. This Annexation Agreement shall not be modified except in writing, signed by all parties.
4.5. This Annexation Agreement represents the entire agreement between the Parties related to the expansion of the Authority's retail water service area and supersedes all prior representations and agreements whether written or oral with respect to the covenants and conditions provided herein; provided, however, that the obligations set forth in this Annexation Agreement shall be in addition to, and do not supersede or replace, any obligations that may be imposed upon Owner under Authority's Rules.
4.6 This Annexation Agreement and terms and conditions herein shall run with the land and be binding upon and inure to the benefit and burden of the parties to the agreement and their heirs, successors and assigns and any future owners of the Property.
4.7 Neither this Annexation Agreement nor any of the terms set forth herein shall be effective or binding on Authority until this Annexation Agreement is executed by Authority, and the Authority will be under no obligation to execute this Annexation Agreement if not executed and returned by Owners to the Authority by January 15, 2017.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have executed this Annexation Agreement effective as of the Effective Date first written above.

TRUCKEE MEADOWS WATER
AUTHORITY, a Joint Powers Authority

By:
Mark Foree, General Manager

MOONLIGHT HILLS ESTATES, LLC, A Nevada limited liability company

By: $\qquad$
Name: $\qquad$
Title: $\qquad$

NOTARY PAGE FOLLOWS

STATE OF NEVADA ) ) ss
COUNTY OF WASHOE )

This instrument was acknowledged before me on $\qquad$ by Mark Foree as General Manager, of the TRUCKEE MEADOWS WATER AUTHORITY, on behalf of said Joint Powers Authority therein named.

NOTARY PUBLIC

STATE OF $\qquad$
COUNTY OF $\qquad$
This instrument was acknowledged before me on $\qquad$ , 20 __, by $\overline{\text { of MOONLIGHT HILLS ESTATES, }}$ LLC on behalf of said Nevada limited liability, company therein named.

## NOTARY PUBLIC

## EXHIBIT "A"

All that real property situate in the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, described as follows:
PARCEL 1:
ALL THAT PORTION OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NW1/4) OF SECTION 11, TOWNSHIP 20 NORTH, RANGE 19 EAST, M.D.B.\& M., DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NW 1/4) OF SECTION 11, TOWNSHIP 20 NORTH, RANGE 19 EAST, M.D.B.\& M.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SE 1/4) THEREOF.
EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED PARCEL:
A PORTION OF THE EAST HALF (E $1 / 2$ ) OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER (NE $1 / 40$ OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NW ¼) OF SECTION 11, TOWNSHIP 20 NORTH, RANGE 19 EAST, M.D.B.\&M., WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA, BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE NORTH QUARTER CORNER OF SAID SECTION 11; THENCE SOUTH $01^{\circ} 02^{\prime} 02^{\prime \prime}$ WEST 575.07 FEET ALONG THE CENTER LINE OF SAID SECTION; THENCE SOUTH $89^{\circ} 08^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime}$ WEST 345.12 FEET ALONG THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF THE NORTH HALF ( $\mathrm{N}^{1 / 2}$ ) OF THE SOUTH HALF (S $1 / 2$ ) OF THE SOUTH HALF ( $\mathrm{S}^{1 / 2}$ ) OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER (NE $1 / 4$ ) OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER (NE $1 / 4$ ) OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NW $1 / 4$ ) OF SAID SECTION 11, THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE CONTINUING SOUTH 890 $0{ }^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime}$ WEST 316.30 FEET ALONG SAID LINE TO THE WESTERLY LINE OF THE EAST HALF (E $1 / 2$ ) OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER (NE $1 / 4$ ) OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NW $1 / 4$ ) OF SAID SECTION 11; THENCE SOUTH $01^{\circ} 02^{\prime} 52^{\prime \prime}$ WEST ALONG SAID LINE 155.13 FEET; THENCE NORTH $89^{\circ} 25^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 316.25 FEET; THENCE NORTH $01^{\circ} 02^{\prime} 52^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 156.68 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

FURTHER EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED PARCEL:
THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SE 1/4) OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER (NE ¼) OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NW $1 / 4$ ) AND THE SOUTH HALF (S $1 / 2$ ) OF THE SOUTH HALF ( $\mathrm{S}^{1 / 2}$ ) OF THE SOUTH HALF ( $\mathrm{S} 1 / 2$ ) OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER (NE $1 / 4$ ) OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER (NE $1 / 4$ ) OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NW 1⁄4) OF SECTION 11, TOWNSHIP 20 NORTH, RANGE 19 EAST, M.D.B.\&M.

FURTHER EXCEPTING THEREFROM ANY PORTION LYING WITH THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SE $1 / 4$ ) OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER (NE $1 / 4$ ) OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER (NW $1 / 4$ ) OF SECTION 11, TOWNSHIP 20 NORTH, RANGE 19 EAST, M.D.B.\&M.

FURTHER EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED PARCEL:
COMMENCE AT THE WEST QUARTER CORNER OF SECTION 11, TOWNSHIP 20 NORTH, RANGE 19 EAST, M.D.B.\& M., WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA, AND PROCEED NORTH $89^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 612.41 FEET ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF SAID SECTION; THENCE NORTH $1^{\circ} 05^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 286.25 FEET; THENCE NORTH 89ํ $55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 171.01 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE CONTINUE NORTH $89^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 170.00 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $1^{\circ} 03^{\prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ WEST 256.25 FEET OT A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF INDIAN LANE (60.00 FEET WIDE); THENCE ALONG SAID NORTH LINE SOUTH $89^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ WEST 170.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH $1^{\circ} 03$ ' 42 " EAST 256.25 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

FURTHER EXCEPTING THEREFROM:
COMMENCING AT THE WEST QUARTER CORNER OF SAID SECTION 11 AND PROCEEDING THENCE NORTH $89^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF SAID SECTION 11, A DISTANCE OF 612.41 FEET; THENCE NORTH $01^{\circ} 05^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 50.41 FEET TO POINT OF BEGINNING, SAID POINT BEING ON THE EAST LINE OF A PROPOSED 60.00 FOOT WIDE ROADWAY; THENCE NORTH $01^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 235.84 FEET ALONG SAID EAST LINE; THENCE NORTH 8955'22" EAST 171.01 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $01^{\circ} 03^{\prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ WEST 256.25 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF INDIAN LANE (60.00 FEET WIDE); THENCE ALONG SAID NORTH LINE SOUTH $89^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ WEST 150.58 FEET TO BEGINNING OF A 20.00 FEET RADIUS CURVE TO THE RIGHT; THENCE ALONG SAID CURVE THROUGH AN ANGLE OF $91^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$, AND AN ARC LENGTH OF 31.82 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

FURTHER EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED PARCEL:
COMMENCING AT THE WEST QUARTER CORNER OF SAID SECTION 11; THENCE NORTH $01^{\circ} 05^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 50.41 FEET ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID SECTION 11 TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE CONTINUING NORTH $01^{\circ} 05^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 216.19 FEET; THENCE NORTH $89^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 184.13 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $01^{\circ} 05^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ WEST 236.60 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF INDIAN LANE (60.00 FEET WIDE); THENCE ALONG SAID NORTH LINE SOUTH 8955'22" WEST 163.72 FEET TO THE BEGINNING OF A 20.00 FEET RADIUS CURVE TO THE RIGHT; THENCE ALONG SAID CURVE THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF $91^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$, AND AN ARC LENGTH OF 31.82 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

FURTHER EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED PARCEL:

COMMENCING AT THE WEST QUARTER CORNER OF SAID SECTION 11; THENCE NORTH $89^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 612.41 FEET ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF SAID SECTION 11; THENCE NORTH $01^{\circ} 05^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 286.25 FEET; THENCE NORTH $89^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 511.01 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE CONTINUING NORTH $89^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 170.00 FEET TO A POINT ON THE WEST LINE OF RAIN DANCE WAY EXTENDED; THENCE ALONG SAID WEST LINE SOUTH $01^{\circ} 03^{\prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ WEST 236.65 FEET TO THE BEGINNING OF A 20.00 FEET RADIUS CURVE TO THE RIGHT; THENCE ALONG SAID CURVE THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF $88^{\circ} 51^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ FOR AN ARC LENGTH OF 31.02 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF INDIAN LANE (60.00 FEET WIDE); THENCE ALONG SAID NORTH LINE SOUTH 8955'22" WEST 150.40 FEET; THENCE NORTH $01^{\circ} 03^{\prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 256.25 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

FURTHER EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED PARCEL:
COMMENCING AT THE WEST QUARTER CORNER OF SAID SECTION 11; THENCE NORTH $89^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 612.41 FEET ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF SAID SECTION 11; THENCE NORTH $01^{\circ} 05^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 286.25 FEET THENCE NORTH $89^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 341.01 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE CONTINUING NORTH $89^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 170.00 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $01^{\circ} 03^{\prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ WEST 256.25 FEET TO THE POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF INDIAN LANE (60.00 FEET WIDE); THENCE ALONG SAID NORTH LINE SOUTH $89^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ WEST 170.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH $01^{\circ} 03^{\prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 256.25 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

FURTHER EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED PARCEL:
COMMENCE AT THE WEST QUARTER CORNER OF SECTION 11, TOWNSHIP 20 NORTH, RANGE 19 EAST, M.D.B.\&M., WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA, AND PROCEED NORTH $1^{\circ} 05^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 266.60 FEET ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID SECTION 11; THENCE NORTH $89^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 184.13 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE CONTINUE NORTH 8955'22" EAST 184.13 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 105'22" WEST 236.60 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF INDIAN LANE (60.00 FEET WIDE); THENCE SOUTH $89^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ WEST 184.13 FEET ALONG SAID LINE; THENCE NORTH $1^{\circ} 05^{\prime} 22$ " EAST 236.60 FET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

FURTHER EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED PARCEL:
COMMENCE AT THE WEST QUARTER CORNER OF SECTION 11, TOWNSHIP 20 NORTH, RANGE 19 EAST, M.D.B.\&M., WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA, AND PROCEED NORTH $1^{\circ} 05^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 266.60 FEET ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID

SECTION 11; THENCE NORTH $89^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 368.26 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE CONTINUE NORTH $89^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 184.14 FEET TO A POINT ON THE WEST LINE OF A PROPOSED 60.00 FEET WIDE ROADWAY; THENCE SOUTH $1^{\circ} 05^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ WEST 217.00 FEET ALONG THE SAID WEST LINE TO THE BEGINNING OF A 20.00 FEET RADIUS CURVE TO THE RIGHT; THENCE ALONG SAID CURVE THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF $88^{\circ} 50^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ AND AN ARC LENGTH OF 31.01 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF INDIAN LANE ( 60.00 FEET WIDE); THENCE ALONG SAID NORTH LINE SOUTH $89^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ WEST 164.54 FEET; THENCE NORTH $1^{\circ} 05^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 236.60 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING. EXCEPTING THEREFROM ANY PORTION THEREOF CONVEYED TO THE COUNTY OF WASHOE, STATE OF NEVADA, FOR ROAD AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES.

PARCEL 1A:
AN EASEMENT 25.00 FEET IN WIDTH FOR ROADWAY AND UTILITY PURPOSES, SAID EASEMENT BEING THE WEST 25.0 FEET OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SE $1 / 4$ ) OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER (NE $1 / 4$ ) OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NW $1 / 4$ ) AND THE SOUTH HALF ( $\mathrm{S}^{1} 1 / 2$ ) OF THE SOUTH HALF (S $1 / 2$ ) OF THE SOUTH HALF ( $\mathrm{S} 1 / 2$ ) OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER (NE $1 / 4$ ) OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER (NE 1/4) OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NW 1/4) OF SAID SECTION 11, AS RECORDED APRIL 28, 1978 IN BOOK 1233, PAGE 442 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 528857 AND RECORDED JULY 2, 1996 IN BOOK 4613, PAGE 716 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2009093 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA.

PARCEL 1B:
A NON-EXCLUSIVE EASEMENT FOR ROAD AND UTILITY PURPOSES 60 FEET IN WIDTH, THE CENTERLINE OF WHICH IS THE EAST LINE OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NW ¼) OF SAID SECTION 11, TOWNSHIP 20 NORTH, RANGE 19 EAST, M.D.B.\&M, RECORDED JULY 2, 1996 IN BOOK 4613, PAGE 716 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2009093, OF OFFICIAL RECORDS WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA.

NOTE: THE ABOVE METES AND BOUNDS DESCRIPTION APPEARED PREVIOUSLY IN THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT RECORDED JULY 2, 1996 IN BOOK 4613, PAGE 716 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2009093, OF OFFICIAL RECORDS WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA.

APN: 552-050-01
[Legal Description was referenced from that certain GRANT BARGAIN and SALE DEED, recorded as Document No. 4339670 on March 31, 2014, in the office of the County Recorder of Washoe County, State of Nevada.]

All that real property situate in the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, described as follows:
THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 11, TOWNSHIP 20 NORTH, RANGE 19 EAST, M.B.D.\& M.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM THOSE PORTIONS THAT MAY LIE WITHIN THE
FOLLOWING STREETS; RAIN DANCE WAY, DEER FOOT LANE, GOLDEN VALLEY ROAD AND ESTATES ROAD, AS IT MAY NOW EXIST.

NOTE; THE ABOVE SECTIONAL DESCRIPTION APPEARED PREVIOUSLY IN THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT RECORDED JANUARY 13, 1997, IN BOOK 4764, PAGE 0132, AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2063449.

APN: 552-100-01
[Legal Description was referenced from that certain GRANT BARGAIN and SALE DEED, recorded as Document No. 4339697 on March 31, 2014, in the office of the County Recorder of Washoe County, State of Nevada.]



## EXHIBIT B

GOLDEN VALLEY MESA
SUMMARY OF OFFSITE FACILITY REQUIREMENTS AND APPROXIMATE COSTS TO BE PAID BY DEVELOPER

Estimated Major Water Facility Costs

| Description | Quantity | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 8 Facility Charge | 251.6 | MDD, gpm | \$4,142 | \$1,042,127 |
| Area 8 Storage Charge | 251.6 | MDD, gpm | \$772 | \$194,235 |
| Area 8 Supply and Treatment Charge | 251.6 | MDD, gpm | \$4,163 | \$1,047,411 |
| subtotal \$2,283,773 |  |  |  |  |
| Hot Tap | 2 | L.S. | \$20,000 | \$40,000 |
| 8" main in Estates | 4850 | L.S. | \$144 | \$698,400 |
| 8" main connecting the N and S Properties | 500 | L.F. | \$144 | \$72,000 |
| subtotal \$810,400 |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$3,094,173 |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Water System Facility Charges are determined based on the maximum day demand (MDD) of the development. The above MDD is estimated and will be determined at the time final development plans are submitted with a formal application for water service. All facility requirements listed above are preliminary and are subject to change during the final planning and design process.
2. Review of conceptual plans or tentative maps by TMWA does not constitute an application for service, nor implies a commitment by TMWA for planning, design or construction of the water facilities necessary for service. The extent of required off-site and on-site water infrastructure improvements will be determined by TMWA upon receiving a specific development proposal or complete application for service and upon review and approval of a water facilities plan by the local health authority. Because the NAC 445A Water System regulations are subject to interpretation, TMWA cannot guarantee that a subsequent water facility plan will be approved by the health authority or that a timely review and approval of the Project will be made. The Applicant should carefully consider the financial risk associated with committing resources to their project prior to receiving all required approvals. After submittal of a complete Application for Service, the required facilities, the cost of these facilities and associated fees will be estimated and will be included as part of the Water Service Agreement necessary for the Project. All fees must be paid to TMWA prior to water delivery to the Project.

December 12, 2016
Mr. Richard Nevis
5390 Bellazza Ct
Reno, NV 89519

## RE: Golden Mesa North <br> Acknowledgement of Water Service <br> TMWA Work Order 16-5294

Dear Mr. Nevis:
I have reviewed the plans for the above referenced development ("Project") as submitted to the Truckee Meadows Water Authority and have determined the Project is within the Truckee Meadows Water Authority's retail water service area. This letter constitutes an Acknowledgment of Water Service pursuant to NAC 445A.6666, and the Truckee Meadows Water Authority hereby acknowledges that Truckee Meadows Water Authority is agreeable to supplying water service to the Project, subject to applicant satisfying certain conditions precedent, including, without limitation, the dedication of water resources, approval of the water supply plan by the local health authority, the execution of a Water Service Agreement, payment of fees, and the construction and dedication of infrastructure in accordance with our rules and tariffs. This Acknowledgement does not constitute a legal obligation by Truckee Meadows Water Authority to supply water service to the Project, and is made subject to all applicable Truckee Meadows Water Authority Rules.

Review of conceptual site plans or tentative maps by Truckee Meadows Water Authority does not constitute an application for service, nor implies a commitment by Truckee Meadows Water Authority for planning, design or construction of the water facilities necessary for service. The extent of required off-site and on-site water infrastructure improvements will be determined by Truckee Meadows Water Authority upon receiving a specific development proposal or complete application for service and upon review and approval of a water facilities plan by the local health authority. Because the NAC 445A Water System regulations are subject to interpretation, Truckee Meadows Water Authority cannot guarantee that a subsequent water facility plan will be approved by the health authority or that a timely review and approval of the Project will be made. The Applicant should carefully consider the financial risk associated with committing resources to their project prior to receiving all required approvals. After submittal of a complete Application for Service, the required facilities, the cost of these facilities, which could be significant, and associated fees will be estimated and will be included as part of the Water Service Agreement necessary for the Project. All fees must be paid to Truckee Meadows Water Authority prior to water being delivered to the Project.

Please call me at 834-8104 at your convenience if you have any questions.
Sincerely,
Truckee Meadows Water Authority


Brooke Long, P.E.
Senior Engineer
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# TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY FOR GOLDEN MESA 

June 27, 2016


TRAFFIC WORKS, LLC
5482 Longley Lane, Suite B, Reno, NV 89511
www.Traffic-Works.com

## YOUR QUESTIONS ANSWERED QUICKLY

## Why did you perform this study?

This Traffic Impact Study evaluates the potential traffic impacts associated with construction of the proposed Golden Mesa residential development.

## What does the project consist of?

The proposed project consists of up to 158 single-family housing units.

## How much traffic will the project generate?

The proposed project is anticipated to generate a total of 1,600 daily trips, 120 AM peak hour trips, and 159 PM peak hour trips.

## Are there any traffic impacts?

The Golden Valley Road/North Hills Boulevard intersection and the southbound left-turn movement at the Golden Valley Road/Estates Road intersection currently operate below policy LOS standards (at LOS " E " or " F "). The additional project traffic worsens traffic operations at these locations causing increased delay compared to conditions without the project.

## Are any traffic related improvements proposed?

The following two improvements are recommend to mitigate current deficiencies and project impacts:

- Golden Valley Road/N. Hills Boulevard - Optimize traffic signal timings.
- Golden Valley Road/Estates Road - Provide a receiving lane on Golden Valley Road enabling twostage left-turn movements for southbound left-turning vehicles.

These improvements will accommodate 10-year horizon traffic volumes and the project traffic while maintaining policy LOS standards. No other mitigations are proposed at any other study intersections since the analysis showed the anticipated project traffic does not cause any other significant impacts. The project's contribution of Regional Road Impact Fees will mitigate the minor project effects on the overall roadway network.
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## INTRODUCTION

This report presents the findings of a Traffic Impact Study completed to assess the potential traffic impacts on local intersections associated with construction of the Golden Mesa residential project. This traffic impact study has been prepared to document existing traffic conditions, quantify traffic volumes generated by the proposed project, identify potential impacts, document findings, and make recommendations to mitigate impacts, if any are found.

## Study Area and Evaluated Scenarios

The project site is located east of Estates Road and north of Golden Valley Road in Washoe County, NV. The study intersections were identified based on scoping conversations with Washoe County staff. The project site location and the study intersections are shown in Figure 1. The following intersections are included in this study:

- Golden Valley Road/North Hills Boulevard
- Golden Valley Road/Estates Road
- Estates Road/Indian Lane
- Estates Road/Access 1
- Estates Road/Access 2
- Indian Lane/Access 3
- Estates Road/Access 4
- Golden Valley Road/Access 5

This study includes analysis of the both the weekday AM and PM peak hours as these are the periods of time in which peak traffic is anticipated to occur. The evaluated development scenarios are:

- Existing Conditions (no project)
- Existing Plus Project Conditions
- 10 year horizon Baseline Conditions (including growth per Washoe County's travel demand model)
- 10 year horizon Plus Project Conditions


## Analysis Methodology

Level of service (LOS) is a term commonly used by transportation practitioners to measure and describe the operational characteristics of intersections, roadway segments, and other facilities. This term equates seconds of delay per vehicle at intersections to letter grades " $A$ " through " $F$ " with " $A$ " representing optimum conditions and "F" representing breakdown or over capacity flows. The complete methodology is established in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), 2010, published by the Transportation Research Board. Table 1 presents the delay thresholds for each level of service grade at un-signalized and signalized intersections.

Table 1: Level of Service Definition for Intersections

| Level of Service | Brief Description | Un-signalized Intersections (average delay/vehicle in seconds) | Signalized Intersections (average delay/vehicle in seconds) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Free flow conditions. | < 10 | < 10 |
| B | Stable conditions with some affect from other vehicles. | 10 to 15 | 10 to 20 |
| C | Stable conditions with significant affect from other vehicles. | 15 to 25 | 20 to 35 |
| D | High density traffic conditions still with stable flow. | 25 to 35 | 35 to 55 |
| E | At or near capacity flows. | 35 to 50 | 55 to 80 |
| F | Over capacity conditions. | > 50 | > 80 |

Source: Highway Capacity Manual (2010), Chapters 16 and 17
Level of service calculations were performed for the study intersections using the Synchro 9 software suite, with analysis and results reported in accordance with HCM 2010 methodology.

## Level of Service Policy

The 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (2035 RTP) establishes level of service criteria for regional roadway facilities within Washoe County, the City of Reno, and the City of Sparks. The current Level of Service policy is:

- "All regional roadway facilities projected to carry less than 27,000 ADT at the latest RTP horizon LOS D or better."
- "All regional roadway facilities projected to carry 27,000 ADT or more at the latest RTP horizon LOS E or better."
- "All intersections shall be designed to provide a level of service consistent with maintaining the policy level of service of the intersecting roadways".

According to the Nevada Department of Transportation's 2014 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) data and Washoe County RTC's 2035 travel demand model data, the average daily volumes on the study roadways are anticipated to be less than 27,000 ADT. Hence, the level of service threshold specific to the study roadways and intersections is LOS " D ".

## EXISTING TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

## Roadway Facilities

A brief description of the key roadways in the study area is provided below:

Golden Valley Road within the study area is a four-lane roadway with two lanes in each direction and turn lanes at major intersections. It is classified as a "Medium Access Control Arterial" in the 2035 RTP. The posted speed limit is 40 mph in the study area.

Estates Road and Indian Lane are two-lane roadways with one lane in each direction. They are local roadways not classified in the 2035 RTP.

North Hills Boulevard is a three-lane roadway serving local commercial centers with one lane in each direction and a two-way left turn lane.

## Alternate Travel Modes

There are currently sidewalks along the south side of Golden Valley Road throughout the study area. Sidewalks are also present on the north side of Golden Valley Road west of Estates Road, on the north side of North Hills Boulevard, and on the south side of North Hills Boulevard west of Golden Valley Road. Dedicated bike lanes exist in both directions on Golden Valley Road and North Hills Boulevard.

The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) operates public transit service on Golden Valley Road and North Hills Boulevard (Route 7) as shown in Exhibit 1. While public transit is not operated on roadways immediately adjacent to the project site, Route 7 is within reasonable cycling distance from the project.


Exhibit 1. RTC Transit Routes

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

## Traffic Volumes

Existing traffic volumes were determined by conducting new video counts at the study intersections. The counts were conducted on an average mid-week day on May $17^{\text {th }}, 2016$ with schools in session. The existing AM and PM peak hour intersection traffic volumes in Figure 2, attached.

## Intersection Level of Service

Level of service calculations were performed using the existing traffic volumes, lane configurations, and traffic controls. Current signal timing plans for the Golden Valley Road/North Hills Boulevard intersection was requested and obtained from the City of Reno and was incorporated into the model. The results are presented in Table 2 and the calculation sheets are provided in Appendix A, attached.

Table 2: Existing Conditions Intersection Level of Service Summary

| Intersection | Control | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Golden Valley Rd/North Hills Blvd | Signal | D | 46.8 | E | 60.2 |
| Golden Valley Rd/Estates Rd | TWSC |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound Approach |  | C | 17.8 | B | 11.57 |
| Southbound Left |  | E | 47.86 | C | 22.03 |
| Southbound Right |  | B | 13.04 | B | 10.1 |
| Estates Rd/Indian Ln | TWSC |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound Approach |  | A | 9.16 | A | 9.11 |
| Westbound Left |  | A | 9.2 | A | 9.11 |
| Westbound Right |  | A | 8.62 | A | 8.76 |

As shown in Table 2, the Golden Valley Road/North Hills Boulevard intersection is operating at LOS "C" and LOS " $E$ " during the existing AM and PM peak hours respectively. The southbound left-turn movement at the Golden Valley Road/Estates Road intersection is operating at LOS " $E$ " during the AM peak hour. The overall intersection and all other movements at this intersection operate at acceptable levels of service. All movements at the Estates Road/Indian Lane intersection operate at acceptable levels of service during both the AM and PM peak hours.

## PROJECT GENERATED TRAFFIC

## Project Description

The project site is generally located in the northeast quadrant of the Golden Valley Road/Estates Road intersection as shown in Figure 1. The proposed project consists of up to 158 single-family housing units. The site plan is shown in Figure 3.

## Trip Generation

Trip generation rates for Golden Mesa were obtained from the Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. Table $\mathbf{3}$ provides the Daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour trip generation calculation details for the proposed project.

Table 3: Trip Generation Estimates

| ITE Land Use | Size | Daily | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out |  |
| 210 - Single-Family <br> Detached Housing | 158 Dwelling <br> Units | 1,600 | 120 | 30 | 90 | 159 | 100 | 59 |

As shown in Table 3, the proposed project is anticipated to generate up to 1,600 daily trips, 120 AM peak hour trips, and 159 PM peak hour trips.

## Project Access

Access to the project site will be provided via multiple access points located on Estates Road, Indian Lane, and Golden Valley Road. All the access points are shown in the site plan in Figure 3. The access on Golden Valley Road (Access 5) is proposed as Right-In/Right-Out access only with STOP control on the driveway. All other access points will be full access stop-controlled driveways.

## Trip Distribution and Assignment

Traffic generated by the project was distributed to the road network based on the location of the project site, the relative location of major activity centers, and access connection points to roadway network.

The following trip distribution percentages were used for distributing the project traffic:

- $80 \%$ to/from the west (accessing US 395)
- $10 \%$ to/from the north via North Hills Boulevard
- $10 \%$ to/from the east via Golden Valley Road

Project generated trips were assigned to the adjacent roadway system based on the distributions outlined above. The project trip assignment is shown on Figure 4, attached.

## EXISTING PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS

## Traffic Volumes

Plus project traffic volumes were developed by adding the project generated trips (Figure 4) to the existing traffic volumes (Figure 2) and are shown on Figure 5, attached. The "Plus Project" condition Peak Hour Factors (PHF) and travel patterns were assumed to remain the same as were observed under existing conditions.

## Intersection Level of Service Analysis

Table 9 presents the level of service analysis summary for the "Plus Project" scenario assuming the existing intersection configurations. Detailed calculation sheets are provided in Appendix B, attached.

As shown in Table 9, under the Plus Project conditions, the Golden Valley Road/North Hills Boulevard intersection continues to operate at acceptable LOS during the AM peak hour and continues to operate at LOS "E" during the PM peak hour. It should be noted that this intersection operates at LOS "E" even under existing conditions (without the addition of project traffic).

Table 9: Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Summary

| Intersection | Control | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Golden Valley Rd/North Hills Blvd | Signal | D | 46.79 | E | 58.36 |
| Golden Valley Rd/Estates Rd | TWSC |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound Approach |  | C | 22.46 | B | 13.22 |
| Southbound Left |  | F | 70.8 | D | 33.01 |
| Southbound Right |  | C | 15.26 | B | 10.46 |
| Estates Rd/Indian Ln | TWSC |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound Approach |  | A | 9.84 | A | 9.7 |
| Westbound Left |  | A | 9.88 | A | 9.7 |
| Westbound Right |  | A | 8.96 | A | 9.16 |
| Golden Valley Rd/Access 5 | TWSC | B | 11.62 | A | 9.82 |
| Estates Rd/Access 4 | TWSC |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound Approach |  | B | 10.39 | B | 10.34 |
| Westbound Left |  | B | 10.39 | B | 10.34 |
| Westbound Right |  | A | 8.9 | A | 9.45 |
| Indian Ln/Access 3 | TWSC |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound Approach |  | A | 8.59 | A | 8.44 |
| Northbound Approach |  | A | 9.17 | A | 9.15 |
| Estates Rd/Access 2 | TWSC |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound Approach |  | A | 9.2 | A | 9.22 |
| Westbound Left |  | A | 9.22 | A | 9.22 |
| Westbound Right |  | A | 8.57 | A | 8.8 |
| Estates Rd/Access 1 | TWSC |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound Approach |  | A | 9.01 | A | 9.02 |
| Westbound Left |  | A | 9.01 | A | 9.02 |
| Westbound Right |  | A | 8.5 | A | 8.68 |

During the AM peak hour, the southbound left-turn movement at the Golden Valley Road/Estates Road intersection deteriorates from LOS " E " under existing conditions to LOS " F " under Plus Project conditions. However, it should be noted that the overall southbound approach operates at LOS " C " during the same peak hour. It should also be noted that during the AM peak hour, the southbound left-turn volume is only 23 vehicles, which equates to less than one vehicle every two minutes. The intersection operates at acceptable LOS during the PM peak hour.

All other study intersections and approaches operate acceptably under Plus Project conditions, during both the AM and PM peak hours.

## Trafflic
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## 10-YEAR HORIZON BASELINE CONDITIONS

## Traffic Volumes

Traffic volumes in the study area are anticipated to increase in the future as more development occurs in the North Valleys region. Traffic growth rates were obtained from Washoe County RTC's travel demand model. The latest iteration of the travel demand model, which included all the development incorporated in the North Valleys Region Multi-Modal Transportation Study (including this project) was used to determine future growth rates. The growth rates were then applied to the existing AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes to obtain future peak hour traffic volumes. The 10-Year horizon baseline peak hour traffic volumes are shown in Figure 6.

Growth rates were calculated based on the traffic volume increases at multiple points along Golden Valley Road. Other roadways in the study area, being minor roads, were not included in the RTC's travel demand model. Hence, a uniform growth rate obtained from the Golden Valley Road volume increase was applied to all the study intersections. The travel demand model outputs are attached in Appendix C. The growth rate calculations are shown in Table 10.

Table 10: Growth Rate Calculations

| Golden Valley Road |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 | 3,800 | 6,775 | 9,723 | 15,509 |
| 2025 | 4,867 | 7,806 | 11,459 | 16,091 |
| Difference | 1,067 | 1,031 | 1,736 | 582 |
| 10 Years \% Change | $28 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Annual Growth Rate | $2.8 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Adjusted 10 year Growth Factor | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.0 |
| Average Growth Factor | $\mathbf{1 . 1 6}$ |  |  |  |

10-Year Baseline traffic volumes were calculated by applying the growth rate factor of 1.16 from Table 10 to existing volumes.

## Intersection Level of Service Analysis

Table 11 presents the level of service analysis summary for the " $10-Y e a r$ Horizon Baseline" scenario assuming the existing intersection configurations. Detailed calculation sheets are provided in Appendix D, attached.

Table 11: 10-Year Horizon Baseline Level of Service Summary

| Intersection | Control | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Golden Valley Rd/N Hills Blvd | Signal | D | 49.58 | F | 88.9 |
| Golden Valley Rd/Estates Rd | TWSC |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound Approach |  | C | 19.83 | B | 12.57 |
| Southbound Left |  | F | 59.19 | C | 27.56 |
| Southbound Right |  | B | 13.73 | B | 10.39 |
| Estates Rd/Indian Ln | TWSC |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound Approach |  | A | 9.19 | A | 9.19 |
| Westbound Left |  | A | 9.23 | A | 9.19 |
| Westbound Right |  | A | 8.63 | A | 8.82 |

As shown in Table 11, the Golden Valley Road/North Hills Boulevard intersection and the southbound leftturn movement at the Golden Valley Road/Estates Road intersection operate at LOS "F" in the 10-year background conditions. All other intersections and movements operate at acceptable LOS conditions.

## 10-YEAR HORIZON PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS

## Traffic Volumes

10 year Horizon Plus Project traffic volumes were developed by adding the project generated trips (Figure 4) to the 10-Year Horizon Baseline traffic volumes (Figure 6) and are shown on Figure 7, attached.

## Intersection Level of Service Analysis

Table 12 presents the level of service analysis summary for the "10-Year Horizon Plus Project" scenario. Detailed calculation sheets are provided in Appendix E, attached.

As shown in Table 12, with the addition of project traffic, the Golden Valley Road/North Hills Boulevard intersection and the southbound left-turn movement at Golden Valley Road/Estates Road intersection operate at LOS " $F$ ", with a slight increase in delay compared to 10-year horizon baseline conditions. It should be noted that these two intersections operate at LOS " $F$ " in the 10-Year Horizon Background conditions (without addition of the project traffic). All other intersections and movements operate at acceptable levels of service.

Table 12: 10-Year Horizon Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Summary


## POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES

## Golden Valley Road/North Hills Boulevard

The Golden Valley Road/North Hills Boulevard intersection currently operates at LOS"E" during the PM peak hour even without addition of the project traffic. This intersection would continue to operate at LOS "E" with the addition of project traffic. It operates at LOS " F " during the $10-\mathrm{Year}$ Horizon conditions. Operations at this intersection can be improved by optimizing the traffic signal timings. Table 13 shows the LOS results with optimized signal timing.

Table 13: Golden Valley Rd/N. Hills Blvd Mitigated LOS Summary

| Intersection | Scenario | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Golden Valley Rd/N Hills Blvd | Existing | D | 46.8 | E | 60.2 |
|  | Existing Plus Prj Mitigated | C | 33.36 | D | 44.67 |
|  | Existing Plus Project | D | 46.79 | E | 58.36 |
|  | $10-$ Year Baseline | D | 49.58 | F | 88.9 |
|  | $10-Y r$ Plus Project | D | 49.68 | F | 85.97 |
|  | $10-Y r$ Plus Prj Mitigated | C | 33.72 | E | 63.93 |

As shown in Table 13, during the Existing Plus Project PM peak hour conditions, optimizing signal timings would improve the level of service from LOS "E" to LOS "D". During the 10 -year plus project conditions, optimizing signal timings would mitigate the project impacts and the intersection would operate at better than 10-year baseline (without the project) conditions. During the AM peak hour, the intersection would operate at acceptable LOS conditions with the project, both under existing and 10-year plus project conditions. Optimizing the signal timings would further improve traffic operations during the AM peak hour. Hence, optimizing the signal timings would mitigate the impacts of the project for both the existing and 10 -year horizon conditions.

## Golden Valley Road/Estates Road

The Golden Valley Road/Estates Road intersection is a two-way stop controlled intersection. The overall intersection LOS at a two-way stop control intersection is defined by the LOS of the worst approach/movement, which is typically a STOP-controlled movement. The southbound left-turn movement at this intersection currently operates at LOS "E" under existing AM peak hour conditions (without any project traffic). With the addition of project traffic, the southbound left-turn movement would deteriorate to LOS "F". All the other movements at this intersection operate at acceptable LOS conditions in the existing PM peak hour conditions (without and with project traffic).

In the 10-year horizon AM peak hour conditions, the southbound left-turn movement is expected to operate at LOS "F" with or without the project. During the 10 -year horizon PM peak hour conditions, adding the project traffic would worsen the southbound left-turn level of service to LOS " E " (with project)

## Trafflic

from LOS "C" (without project). However, it should be noted that the overall southbound approach (combination of southbound left and right turn movements) operates at acceptable LOS conditions during both the existing and 10-year horizon conditions, even with the addition of project traffic.

It is important to recognize that LOS "F" conditions for only the left-turn movement from a side-street, during the peak hour, do not necessarily indicate an intersection failure or need for mitigation. Context of the volumes and intersection location are important in these cases. The subject southbound left-turn volume is only 14 vehicles per hour and there are other locations (i.e. Spearhead Way/Golden Valley Road intersection) where the desired traffic movement can more easily be made. This condition (side-street LOS " $F$ " for a left-turn movement) commonly exists throughout the urban area and is acceptable in most cases so long as the project does not add significant traffic to the LOS "F" movement. Golden Mesa is expected to add about 9 peak hour trips to the southbound left-turn movement which is a small amount.

If mitigation were to be required, to most logical solution would be providing a two-stage left-turn receiving lane for southbound left-turning vehicles as shown in Exhibit A.


Providing a storage lane for two-stage left-turns would significantly reduce the delay on the Estates Road approach. Table 14 summarizes the LOS results. As shown in Table 14, with a staging lane in place, all the southbound movements are anticipated to operate at acceptable LOS conditions during both the existing and 10-year horizon plus project conditions.

Trafflic
W"RKS

Table 14: Golden Valley Rd/Estates Rd Mitigated LOS Summary

| Intersection |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Golden Valley Rd/Estates Rd |  |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound Approach | Existing | C | 17.8 | B | 11.57 |
| Southbound Left |  | E | 47.86 | C | 22.03 |
| Southbound Right |  | B | 13.04 | B | 10.1 |
| Southbound Approach | Existing Plus Project | C | 22.46 | B | 13.22 |
| Southbound Left |  | F | 70.8 | D | 33.01 |
| Southbound Right |  | C | 15.26 | B | 10.46 |
| Southbound Approach | Existing Plus Prj Mitigated | C | 16.69 | B | 11.67 |
| Southbound Left |  | D | 26.29 | C | 20.38 |
| Southbound Right |  | C | 15.26 | B | 10.46 |
| Southbound Approach | 10-Year Baseline | C | 19.83 | B | 12.57 |
| Southbound Left |  | F | 59.19 | C | 27.56 |
| Southbound Right |  | B | 13.73 | B | 10.39 |
| Southbound Approach | 10-Yr Plus Project | D | 25.69 | B | 14.87 |
| Southbound Left |  | F | 90.49 | E | 43.59 |
| Southbound Right |  | C | 16.13 | B | 10.89 |
| Southbound Approach | 10-Yr Plus Prj Mitigated | C | 17.75 | B | 12.42 |
| Southbound Left |  | D | 28.76 | C | 23.48 |
| Southbound Right |  | C | 16.13 | B | 10.89 |

## CONCLUSIONS \& RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a list of our key findings and recommendations to best manage the traffic generated by the proposed project:

Project Trips: The proposed project is anticipated to generate a total of 1,600 daily trips, 120 AM peak hour trips, and 159 PM peak hour trips.

Project Access: Access to the project site will be provided via multiple access points located on Estates Road, Indian Lane, and Golden Valley Road. The access on Golden Valley Road (Access 5) will be Right-In/Right-Out access only with STOP control on the driveway. All other access points will be full access STOP-controlled driveways.

Existing Level of Service: The Golden Valley Road/North Hills Boulevard intersection operates LOS " F " during the PM peak hour. The southbound left-turn movement at the Golden Valley Road/Estates Road intersection operates at LOS " E " during the AM peak hour. All other movements and intersections operate at acceptable level of service during both the AM and PM peak hours.

## Trafflic

Plus Project Level of Service: With the addition of the project traffic, the Golden Valley Road/North Hills Boulevard intersection continues to operate at LOS "F" during the PM peak hour. The southbound leftturn movement at Golden Valley Road/Estates Road intersection would worsen from LOS "E" in existing conditions to LOS " $F$ " during the AM peak hour, with the addition of project traffic. All other intersections and movements operate at acceptable LOS conditions.

10-Year Horizon Baseline Level of Service: 10-Year Horizon Baseline traffic volumes were calculated by applying the growth rates obtained from Washoe County RTC's travel demand model. The Golden Valley Road/North Hills Boulevard intersection and the southbound left-turn movement at the Golden Valley Road/Estates Road intersection operate at LOS " $F$ ". All other intersections and movements operate at acceptable LOS conditions.

10-Year Horizon Plus Project Level of Service: With the addition of project traffic, the Golden Valley Road/North Hills Boulevard intersection and the southbound left-turn movement at Golden Valley Road/Estates Road intersection will operate at LOS "E/F", with a slight increase in delay compared to 10year horizon baseline conditions. All other intersections and movements operate at acceptable level of service.

Mitigation Measures: The following improvements are recommend to mitigate the project impacts:

- Golden Valley Road/North Hills Boulevard - Optimize traffic signal timings.
- Golden Valley Road/Estates Road - Consider a two-stage left-turn receiving lane for southbound left-turning vehicles, as shown below


Trafflic
W, RKS

These mitigations can accommodate 10-year horizon traffic volumes while maintaining policy LOS standards. No other mitigations are proposed at any other study intersections since the analysis showed that the anticipated project traffic does not cause any other significant impacts requiring mitigation.

Regional Road Impact Fees: The project's contribution of standard Regional Road Impact Fees in the amount of approximately $\$ 609,000$ will mitigate any other minor project effects on the overall roadway network.


|  |
| :---: |
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## Appendix A

## Existing Conditions LOS Calculations

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 1: Golden Valley Rd/N Hills Blvd

Control Type:
Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:

Signalized
HCM 2010
15 minutes
Delay (sec / veh):
46.8
Level Of Service:
Volume to Capacity (v/c):
0.678

Intersection Setup

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northeastbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $7 \\|$ |  |  | $7 \\|$ |  |  | $75$ |  |  | $7 \boldsymbol{F}$ |  |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 150.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 150.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 125.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 147 | 486 | 31 | 12 | 513 | 100 | 76 | 9 | 5 | 328 | 25 | 168 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Right-Turn on Red Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 147 | 486 | 31 | 12 | 513 | 100 | 76 | 9 | 5 | 328 | 25 | 168 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 46 | 152 | 10 | 4 | 160 | 31 | 24 | 3 | 2 | 103 | 8 | 53 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 184 | 608 | 39 | 15 | 641 | 125 | 95 | 11 | 6 | 410 | 31 | 210 |
| Presence of On-Street Parking | No |  | No | No |  | No | No |  | No | No |  | No |
| On-Street Parking Maneuver Rate [/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Bus Stopping Rate [/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Bicycle Volume [bicycles/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |

## Traffll

Winres

## Generated with PTV VISTRO

Version 4.00-03
Intersection Settings

| Located in CBD | Yes |
| :---: | :---: |
| Signal Coordination Group | - |
| Cycle Length [s] | 114 |
| Coordination Type | Time of Day Pattern Coordinated |
| Actuation Type | Semi-actuated |
| Offset [s] | 0.0 |
| Offset Reference | LeadGreen |
| Permissive Mode | SingleBand |
| Lost time [s] | 0.00 |

## Phasing \& Timing

| Control Type | Protecte | Permiss | Permiss | Protecte | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signal group | 3 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Auxiliary Signal Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead / Lag | Lead | - | - | Lead | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Green [s] | 4 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Maximum Green [s] | 35 | 35 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 |
| Amber [s] | 4.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |
| All red [s] | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| Split [s] | 40 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| Vehicle Extension [s] | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
| Walk [s] | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Clearance [s] | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| I1, Start-Up Lost Time [s] | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 |
| I2, Clearance Lost Time [s] | 2.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 |
| Minimum Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Maximum Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Pedestrian Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Detector Location [ft] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector Length [ft] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| I, Upstream Filtering Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

## Exclusive Pedestrian Phase

| Pedestrian Signal Group | 0 |
| :---: | :--- |
| Pedestrian Walk [s] | 0 |
| Pedestrian Clearance [s] | 0 |

## Traffll <br> W-Mrs

## Generated with PTV VISTRO

## Version 4.00-03

## Lane Group Calculations

| Lane Group | L | C | C | L | C | C | L | C | L | C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L, Total Lost Time per Cycle [s] | 4.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 4.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 |
| I1_p, Permitted Start-Up Lost Time [s] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 |
| I2, Clearance Lost Time [s] | 2.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| g_i, Effective Green Time [s] | 15 | 68 | 68 | 2 | 55 | 55 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| g / C, Green / Cycle | 0.13 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.02 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| (v/s)_i Volume / Saturation Flow Rate | 0.12 | 0.19 | 0.20 | 0.01 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.09 | 0.01 | 0.33 | 0.17 |
| s, saturation flow rate [veh/h] | 1597 | 1676 | 1641 | 1597 | 1676 | 1583 | 1021 | 1578 | 1251 | 1453 |
| c, Capacity [veh/h] | 213 | 1000 | 979 | 28 | 806 | 760 | 159 | 408 | 355 | 376 |
| d1, Uniform Delay [s] | 48.36 | 11.54 | 11.54 | 55.52 | 20.10 | 20.12 | 51.59 | 31.66 | 46.07 | 37.54 |
| k, delay calibration | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.18 |
| I, Upstream Filtering Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| d2, Incremental Delay [s] | 9.89 | 0.87 | 0.89 | 14.48 | 2.12 | 2.25 | 3.55 | 0.04 | 97.04 | 3.01 |
| d3, Initial Queue Delay [s] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Rp, platoon ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| PF, progression factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Lane Group Results

| X, volume / capacity | 0.86 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.53 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.60 | 0.04 | 1.16 | 0.64 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d, Delay for Lane Group [s/veh] | 58.25 | 12.41 | 12.43 | 70.00 | 22.22 | 22.37 | 55.15 | 31.70 | 143.11 | 40.55 |
| Lane Group LOS | E | B | B | E | C | C | E | C | F | D |
| Critical Lane Group | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| 50th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 5.69 | 4.25 | 4.17 | 0.54 | 7.45 | 7.08 | 2.86 | 0.36 | 19.78 | 6.26 |
| 50th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 142.32 | 106.36 | 104.31 | 13.54 | 186.25 | 177.01 | 71.51 | 8.96 | 494.53 | 156.56 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 9.61 | 7.64 | 7.51 | 0.97 | 11.93 | 11.44 | 5.15 | 0.65 | 29.36 | 10.37 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 240.15 | 190.93 | 187.75 | 24.37 | 298.15 | 286.10 | 128.71 | 16.13 | 733.97 | 259.16 |

Version 4.00-03
Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 58.25 | 12.42 | 12.43 | 70.00 | 22.28 | 22.37 | 55.15 | 31.70 | 31.70 | 143.11 | 40.55 | 40.55 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement LOS | E | B | B | E | C | C | E | C | C | F | D | D |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 22.57 |  |  | 23.21 |  |  | 51.59 |  |  | 105.15 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | F |  |  |
| d_l, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 46.78 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection V/C | 0.678 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Sequence

| Ring 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ring 2 | 6 | 7 | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ring 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ring 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |



|  | Intersection Level Of Service Report <br> Intersection 2: Golden Valley Rd/Estates Rd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Control Type: | Delay (sec / veh): |  |  |
| Analysis Method: | Two-way stop | Level Of Service: | 47.9 |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.185 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Southbound |  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $7 \Gamma$ |  | $711$ |  | $\\|$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Right | Left | Thru | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 180.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | Yes |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 14 | 89 | 31 | 845 | 640 | 7 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 14 | 89 | 31 | 845 | 640 | 7 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.7400 | 0.7400 | 0.7400 | 0.7400 | 0.7400 | 0.7400 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 5 | 30 | 10 | 285 | 216 | 2 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 19 | 120 | 42 | 1142 | 865 | 9 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$\mathrm{W}=$ RKS

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.19 | 0.21 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 47.86 | 13.04 | 9.96 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Movement LOS | E | B | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.64 | 0.79 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 16.05 | 19.84 | 4.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 17.80 |  | 0.35 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 1.32 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | E |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 4.00-03
Golden Mesa TIA
Existing AM LOS

|  |  | Intersection Level Of Service Report <br> Intersection 5: Estates Rd/Indian Ln |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay (sec / veh): | 9.2 |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | A |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.051 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Indian Ln |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $F$ |  | $4$ |  | $T$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | $\operatorname{Indian~Ln~}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 7 | 8 | 6 | 33 | 29 | 2 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 7 | 8 | 6 | 33 | 29 | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 3 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 12 | 1 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 11 | 13 | 10 | 52 | 46 | 3 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$\mathrm{W}=$ RKS

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.28 | 0.00 | 9.20 | 8.62 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.17 | 0.17 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.04 | 3.04 | 4.24 | 4.24 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 1.17 |  | 9.16 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 3.87 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 1: Golden Valley Rd/N Hills Blvd

Control Type:
Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:

Signalized
HCM 2010
15 minutes
Delay (sec / veh):
60.2
Level Of Service:
Volume to Capacity (v/c):

E
0.748

Intersection Setup

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northeastbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $7 \\|$ |  |  | $7 \\|$ |  |  | $75$ |  |  | $7 \boldsymbol{F}$ |  |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 150.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 150.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 125.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 512 | 581 | 23 | 2 | 308 | 103 | 54 | 19 | 14 | 176 | 13 | 393 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Right-Turn on Red Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 512 | 581 | 23 | 2 | 308 | 103 | 54 | 19 | 14 | 176 | 13 | 393 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 131 | 148 | 6 | 1 | 79 | 26 | 14 | 5 | 4 | 45 | 3 | 100 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 522 | 593 | 23 | 2 | 314 | 105 | 55 | 19 | 14 | 180 | 13 | 401 |
| Presence of On-Street Parking | No |  | No | No |  | No | No |  | No | No |  | No |
| On-Street Parking Maneuver Rate [/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Bus Stopping Rate [/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Bicycle Volume [bicycles/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |

## Generated with PTV VISTRO

Version 4.00-03
Intersection Settings

| Located in CBD | Yes |
| :---: | :---: |
| Signal Coordination Group | - |
| Cycle Length [s] | 114 |
| Coordination Type | Time of Day Pattern Coordinated |
| Actuation Type | Semi-actuated |
| Offset [s] | 0.0 |
| Offset Reference | LeadGreen |
| Permissive Mode | SingleBand |
| Lost time [s] | 0.00 |

## Phasing \& Timing

| Control Type | Protecte | Permiss | Permiss | Protecte | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signal group | 3 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Auxiliary Signal Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead / Lag | Lead | - | - | Lead | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Green [s] | 4 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Maximum Green [s] | 35 | 35 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 |
| Amber [s] | 4.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |
| All red [s] | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| Split [s] | 40 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| Vehicle Extension [s] | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
| Walk [s] | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Clearance [s] | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| I1, Start-Up Lost Time [s] | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 |
| I2, Clearance Lost Time [s] | 2.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 |
| Minimum Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Maximum Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Pedestrian Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Detector Location [ft] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector Length [ft] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| I, Upstream Filtering Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

## Exclusive Pedestrian Phase

| Pedestrian Signal Group | 0 |
| :---: | :--- |
| Pedestrian Walk [s] | 0 |
| Pedestrian Clearance [s] | 0 |

## Traffll <br> W-Mrs

## Generated with PTV VISTRO

## Version 4.00-03

## Lane Group Calculations

| Lane Group | L | C | C | L | C | C | L | C | L |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L, Total Lost Time per Cycle [s] | 4.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 4.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 |
| I1_p, Permitted Start-Up Lost Time [s] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 |
| I2, Clearance Lost Time [s] | 2.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| g_i, Effective Green Time [s] | 36 | 70 | 70 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| g / C, Green / Cycle | 0.31 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| (v/s)_i Volume / Saturation Flow Rate | 0.33 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.15 | 0.29 |
| s, saturation flow rate [veh/h] | 1597 | 1676 | 1655 | 1597 | 1676 | 1536 | 871 | 1560 | 1233 | 1432 |
| c, Capacity [veh/h] | 497 | 1023 | 1009 | 6 | 507 | 465 | 63 | 404 | 341 | 370 |
| d1, Uniform Delay [s] | 39.25 | 10.63 | 10.63 | 56.63 | 31.82 | 31.95 | 57.00 | 31.99 | 40.06 | 42.25 |
| k, delay calibration | 0.48 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.50 |
| I, Upstream Filtering Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| d2, Incremental Delay [s] | 53.47 | 0.76 | 0.77 | 27.18 | 2.60 | 2.97 | 27.85 | 0.09 | 1.45 | 82.47 |
| d3, Initial Queue Delay [s] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Rp, platoon ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| PF, progression factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Lane Group Results

| X, volume / capacity | 1.05 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.32 | 0.43 | 0.44 | 0.87 | 0.08 | 0.53 | 1.12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d, Delay for Lane Group [s/veh] | 92.72 | 11.39 | 11.40 | 83.81 | 34.41 | 34.92 | 84.85 | 32.08 | 41.51 | 124.72 |
| Lane Group LOS | F | B | B | F | C | C | F | C | D | F |
| Critical Lane Group | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes |
| 50th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 21.05 | 3.81 | 3.76 | 0.10 | 5.12 | 4.88 | 2.07 | 0.70 | 4.70 | 18.78 |
| 50th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 526.18 | 95.19 | 94.06 | 2.61 | 128.03 | 122.00 | 51.81 | 17.59 | 117.51 | 469.44 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 29.49 | 6.85 | 6.77 | 0.19 | 8.83 | 8.50 | 3.73 | 1.27 | 8.26 | 27.58 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 737.24 | 171.34 | 169.31 | 4.70 | 220.81 | 212.57 | 93.25 | 31.67 | 206.40 | 689.60 |

## Traffll

Weriss

Version 4.00-03
Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 92.72 | 11.40 | 11.40 | 83.81 | 34.57 | 34.92 | 84.85 | 32.08 | 32.08 | 41.51 | 124.72 | 124.72 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement LOS | F | B | B | F | C | C | F | C | C | D | F | F |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 48.70 |  |  | 34.89 |  |  | 65.06 |  |  | 99.50 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | D |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | F |  |  |
| d_l, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 60.21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection V/C | 0.748 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Sequence

| Ring 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ring 2 | 6 | 7 | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ring 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ring 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |



## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 2: Golden Valley Rd/Estates Rd

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay $(\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}):$ | 22.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | C |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.032 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Southbound |  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $7 \Gamma$ |  | $711$ |  | $1 \%$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Right | Left | Thru | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 180.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | Yes |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 6 | 43 | 102 | 544 | 419 | 12 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 6 | 43 | 102 | 544 | 419 | 12 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 2 | 12 | 28 | 149 | 115 | 3 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 7 | 47 | 112 | 598 | 460 | 13 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$\mathrm{W}=$ RKS

Version 4.00-03

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.10 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 22.03 | 10.01 | 8.70 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Movement LOS | C | B | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.10 | 0.20 | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 2.47 | 4.90 | 8.61 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 11.57 |  | 1.37 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 1.29 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 4.00-03
Golden Mesa TIA
Existing PM LOS

|  |  | Intersection Level Of Service Report <br> Intersection 5: Estates Rd/Indian Ln |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay (sec / veh): | 9.1 |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | A |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.026 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Indian Ln |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $F$ |  | $4$ |  | $T$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Indian Ln |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 51 | 30 | 1 | 18 | 20 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 51 | 30 | 1 | 18 | 20 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 15 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 59 | 35 | 1 | 21 | 23 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$W^{\mu}-R K S$

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.40 | 0.00 | 9.11 | 8.76 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.08 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.12 | 1.12 | 1.97 | 1.97 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.34 |  | 9.11 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 1.56 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix B

Plus Project Conditions LOS Calculations

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 1: Golden Valley Rd/N Hills Blvd

Control Type:
Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:

Signalized
HCM 2010
15 minutes

> Delay (sec / veh):
46.8
Level Of Service:
Volume to Capacity ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ):
0.712

Intersection Setup

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northeastbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $7 \\|$ |  |  | $71 F$ |  |  | $71$ |  |  | $71$ |  |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 150.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 150.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 125.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 147 | 486 | 31 | 12 | 513 | 100 | 76 | 9 | 5 | 328 | 25 | 168 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Right-Turn on Red Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 147 | 510 | 31 | 12 | 585 | 109 | 76 | 9 | 5 | 331 | 25 | 168 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 46 | 159 | 10 | 4 | 183 | 34 | 24 | 3 | 2 | 103 | 8 | 53 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 184 | 638 | 39 | 15 | 731 | 136 | 95 | 11 | 6 | 414 | 31 | 210 |
| Presence of On-Street Parking | No |  | No | No |  | No | No |  | No | No |  | No |
| On-Street Parking Maneuver Rate [/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Bus Stopping Rate [/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Bicycle Volume [bicycles/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |

## Trafflc

W:~RK

## Generated with PTV VISTRO

Plus Project AM LOS

Version 4.00-03
Intersection Settings

| Located in CBD |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Signal Coordination Group |  |
| Cycle Length [s] |  |
| Coordination Type | - |
| Actuation Type | Time of Day Pattern Coordinated |
| Offset [s] | Semi-actuated |
| Offset Reference | 0.0 |
| Permissive Mode | LeadGreen |
| Lost time [s] | SingleBand |

## Phasing \& Timing

| Control Type | Protecte | Permiss | Permiss | Protecte | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signal group | 3 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Auxiliary Signal Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead / Lag | Lead | - | - | Lead | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Green [s] | 4 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Maximum Green [s] | 35 | 35 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 |
| Amber [s] | 4.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |
| All red [s] | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| Split [s] | 40 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| Vehicle Extension [s] | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
| Walk [s] | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Clearance [s] | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| 11, Start-Up Lost Time [s] | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 |
| I2, Clearance Lost Time [s] | 2.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 |
| Minimum Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Maximum Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Pedestrian Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Detector Location [ft] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector Length [ft] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| I, Upstream Filtering Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

## Exclusive Pedestrian Phase

| Pedestrian Signal Group |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| Pedestrian Walk [s] |  |
| Pedestrian Clearance [s] |  |

## Trafflc <br> Weriss

## Generated with PTV VISTRO

## Version 4.00-03

## Lane Group Calculations

| Lane Group | L | C | C | L | C | C | L | C | L |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L, Total Lost Time per Cycle [s] | 4.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 4.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 |
| I1_p, Permitted Start-Up Lost Time [s] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 |
| I2, Clearance Lost Time [s] | 2.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| g_i, Effective Green Time [s] | 15 | 68 | 68 | 2 | 55 | 55 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| g / C, Green / Cycle | 0.13 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.02 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| (v/s)_i Volume / Saturation Flow Rate | 0.12 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.01 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.09 | 0.01 | 0.33 | 0.17 |
| s, saturation flow rate [veh/h] | 1597 | 1676 | 1643 | 1597 | 1676 | 1586 | 1021 | 1578 | 1251 | 1453 |
| c, Capacity [veh/h] | 213 | 1000 | 980 | 28 | 806 | 762 | 159 | 408 | 355 | 376 |
| d1, Uniform Delay [s] | 48.36 | 11.67 | 11.67 | 55.52 | 20.95 | 20.95 | 51.59 | 31.66 | 46.07 | 37.54 |
| k, delay calibration | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.18 |
| I, Upstream Filtering Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| d2, Incremental Delay [s] | 9.89 | 0.93 | 0.95 | 14.48 | 2.73 | 2.88 | 3.55 | 0.04 | 101.24 | 3.01 |
| d3, Initial Queue Delay [s] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Rp, platoon ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| PF, progression factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Lane Group Results

| X, volume / capacity | 0.86 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.53 | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.60 | 0.04 | 1.17 | 0.64 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d, Delay for Lane Group [s/veh] | 58.25 | 12.60 | 12.62 | 70.00 | 23.68 | 23.84 | 55.15 | 31.70 | 147.31 | 40.55 |
| Lane Group LOS | E | B | B | E | C | C | E | C | F | D |
| Critical Lane Group | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| 50th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 5.69 | 4.50 | 4.42 | 0.54 | 8.84 | 8.40 | 2.86 | 0.36 | 20.20 | 6.26 |
| 50th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 142.32 | 112.57 | 110.48 | 13.54 | 220.92 | 209.97 | 71.51 | 8.96 | 504.88 | 156.56 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 9.61 | 7.98 | 7.87 | 0.97 | 13.71 | 13.15 | 5.15 | 0.65 | 30.04 | 10.37 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 240.15 | 199.58 | 196.66 | 24.37 | 342.80 | 328.79 | 128.71 | 16.13 | 750.98 | 259.16 |

Version 4.00-03
Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 58.25 | 12.61 | 12.62 | 70.00 | 23.74 | 23.84 | 55.15 | 31.70 | 31.70 | 147.31 | 40.55 | 40.55 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement LOS | E | B | B | E | C | C | E | C | C | F | D | D |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 22.37 |  |  | 24.54 |  |  | 51.59 |  |  | 108.03 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | F |  |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 46.79 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection V/C | 0.712 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Sequence

| Ring 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ring 2 | 6 | 7 | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ring 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ring 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |



Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 4.00-03
Golden Mesa TIA
Plus Project AM LOS

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 2: Golden Valley Rd/Estates Rd

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay (sec /veh): | Level Of Service: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Volume to Capacity (v/c): | 0.8 |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | V |  |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Southbound |  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\leftrightarrows$ |  | $7 \\|$ |  | \\| |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Right | Left | Thru | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 180.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | Yes |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 14 | 89 | 31 | 845 | 640 | 7 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 9 | 65 | 27 | 0 | 16 | 2 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 23 | 154 | 58 | 845 | 656 | 9 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.7400 | 0.7400 | 0.7400 | 0.7400 | 0.7400 | 0.7400 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 8 | 52 | 20 | 285 | 222 | 3 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 31 | 208 | 78 | 1142 | 886 | 12 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.10 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 70.80 | 15.26 | 10.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Movement LOS | F | C | B | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 1.44 | 1.72 | 0.35 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 35.94 | 42.97 | 8.65 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 22.46 |  | 0.66 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 2.62 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 4.00-03
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Plus Project AM LOS

Intersection Setup

| Name | Access 5 |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Southbound |  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\Gamma$ |  |  |  | ! $\dagger$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Right | Left | Thru | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Access 5 |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 859 | 647 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 16 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 16 | 0 | 868 | 649 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.0000 | 0.7400 | 1.0000 | 0.7400 | 0.7400 | 0.7400 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 5 | 0 | 293 | 219 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 22 | 0 | 1173 | 877 | 1 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$\mathrm{W}=R \mathrm{RS}$

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 11.62 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Movement LOS |  | B |  | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 3.03 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 11.62 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 0.12 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
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|  |  | Intersection Level Of Service Report <br> Intersection 4: Estates Rd/Access 4 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Control Type: | Two-way stop |  | Delay (sec / veh): | Level Of Service: | Intersection 4: Estates Rd/Access 4

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Access 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{t}$ |  | $4$ |  | $\leftrightarrows$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 38 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 18 | 12 | 0 | 54 | 20 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 56 | 12 | 0 | 157 | 20 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.7400 | 0.7400 | 0.7400 | 0.7400 | 0.7400 | 0.7400 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 19 | 4 | 0 | 53 | 7 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 76 | 16 | 0 | 212 | 27 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$\mathrm{W}^{\prime \prime}-R \mathrm{RF}$

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.40 | 0.00 | 10.39 | 8.90 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | B | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.12 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.03 | 3.03 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 10.39 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | B |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 0.85 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
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Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 5: Estates Rd/Indian Ln


Two-way stop
HCM 2010
15 minutes

| Delay (sec / veh): | 9.9 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Level Of Service: | A |
| Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.093 |

9.9
0.093

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Indian Ln |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | $\cdots$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 7 | 8 | 6 | 33 | 29 | 2 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 12 | 6 | 0 | 35 | 19 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 19 | 14 | 6 | 68 | 48 | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 8 | 6 | 2 | 27 | 19 | 1 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 30 | 22 | 10 | 108 | 76 | 3 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$W^{\mu}-R K S$

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.33 | 0.00 | 9.88 | 8.96 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.32 | 0.32 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.15 | 6.15 | 7.95 | 7.95 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.62 |  | 9.84 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 3.42 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 4.00-03
Golden Mesa TIA
Plus Project AM LOS

Two-way stop
HCM 2010
15 minutes
15 minutes

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 6: Indian Ln/Access 3

## Control Type: <br> Analysis Method: <br> Analysis Period:

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
\text { Delay (sec / veh): } & 9.5 \\
\text { Level Of Service: } & \mathrm{A} \\
\text { Volume to Capacity }(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}): & 0.000
\end{array}
$$

Intersection Setup

| Name | Access 3 |  |  | Access 3 |  |  | Indian Ln |  |  | Indian Ln |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{t}{4}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{H}{\square}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{f}{5}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{H}{4}$ |  |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Access 3 |  |  | Access 3 |  |  | Indian Ln |  |  | Indian Ln |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 31 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 5 | 22 | 5 | 0 | 49 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |

## Traffll

W-Mrs

Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 9.17 | 9.54 | 8.49 | 9.05 | 9.55 | 8.59 | 7.32 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.27 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 1.22 | 1.22 | 1.22 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.57 | 1.57 | 1.57 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 9.17 |  |  | 8.59 |  |  | 1.14 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 2.72 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 4.00-03
Golden Mesa TIA

|  |  | Intersection Level Of Service Report <br> Intersection 7: Estates Rd/Access 2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Control Type: | Two-way stop |  | Delay (sec / veh): | Level Of Service: | Intersection 7: Estates Rd/Access 2

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Access 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{t}$ |  | $4$ |  | $\leftrightarrows$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 9 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 5 | 6 | 0 | 16 | 18 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 14 | 6 | 0 | 55 | 18 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 6 | 2 | 0 | 22 | 7 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 22 | 10 | 0 | 87 | 29 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$\mathrm{W}=R \mathrm{HS}$

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.28 | 0.00 | 9.22 | 8.57 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.55 | 2.55 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 9.22 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 1.81 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 4.00-03
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## Intersection Level Of Service Report

## Intersection 8: Estates Road/Access 1

Control Type:
Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:

Two-way stop
HCM 2010
15 minutes
15 minutes

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Access1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{t}$ |  | $4$ |  | $\cdots$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 9 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 9 | 5 | 0 | 39 | 16 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 | 0.6300 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 4 | 2 | 0 | 15 | 6 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 14 | 8 | 0 | 62 | 25 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$\mathrm{W}^{\prime \prime}-R \mathrm{RF}$

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.26 | 0.00 | 9.01 | 8.50 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.08 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.09 | 2.09 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 9.01 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 2.07 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 4.00-03
-03
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## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 1: Golden Valley Rd/N Hills Blvd

Control Type:
Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:
$\begin{array}{cc}\text { Delay (sec / veh): } & 58.4 \\ \text { Level Of Service: } & \text { E } \\ \text { Volume to Capacity }(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}): & 0.765\end{array}$

Intersection Setup

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northeastbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\rightarrow \\|$ |  |  | $\neg \\|$ |  |  | $\pi \hat{F}$ |  |  | $7 \\|$ |  |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 150.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 150.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 125.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 512 | 581 | 23 | 2 | 308 | 103 | 54 | 19 | 14 | 176 | 13 | 393 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Right-Turn on Red Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 512 | 661 | 23 | 2 | 355 | 109 | 54 | 19 | 14 | 186 | 13 | 393 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 131 | 169 | 6 | 1 | 91 | 28 | 14 | 5 | 4 | 47 | 3 | 100 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 522 | 674 | 23 | 2 | 362 | 111 | 55 | 19 | 14 | 190 | 13 | 401 |
| Presence of On-Street Parking | No |  | No | No |  | No | No |  | No | No |  | No |
| On-Street Parking Maneuver Rate [/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Bus Stopping Rate [/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Bicycle Volume [bicycles/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |

## Trafflc

Winrs

Golden Mesa TIA

## Version 4.00-03

 Plus Project PM LOS
## Intersection Settings

| Located in CBD |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Signal Coordination Group |  |
| Cycle Length [s] |  |
| Coordination Type | - |
| Actuation Type | Time of Day Pattern Coordinated |
| Offset [s] | Semi-actuated |
| Offset Reference | 0.0 |
| Permissive Mode | LeadGreen |
| Lost time [s] | SingleBand |
|  | 0.00 |

## Phasing \& Timing

| Control Type | Protecte | Permiss | Permiss | Protecte | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signal group | 3 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Auxiliary Signal Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead / Lag | Lead | - | - | Lead | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Green [s] | 4 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Maximum Green [s] | 35 | 35 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 |
| Amber [s] | 4.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |
| All red [s] | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| Split [s] | 40 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| Vehicle Extension [s] | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
| Walk [s] | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Clearance [s] | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| 11, Start-Up Lost Time [s] | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 |
| I2, Clearance Lost Time [s] | 2.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 |
| Minimum Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Maximum Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Pedestrian Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Detector Location [ft] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector Length [ft] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| I, Upstream Filtering Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

## Exclusive Pedestrian Phase

| Pedestrian Signal Group |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| Pedestrian Walk [s] | 0 |
| Pedestrian Clearance [s] |  |

## Trafflc <br> Weriss

## Generated with PTV VISTRO

Version 4.00-03
Lane Group Calculations

| Lane Group | L | C | C | L | C | C | L | C | L | C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L, Total Lost Time per Cycle [s] | 4.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 4.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 |
| I1_p, Permitted Start-Up Lost Time [s] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 |
| I2, Clearance Lost Time [s] | 2.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| g_i, Effective Green Time [s] | 36 | 70 | 70 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| g / C, Green / Cycle | 0.31 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| (v/s)_i Volume / Saturation Flow Rate | 0.33 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.15 | 0.29 |
| s, saturation flow rate [veh/h] | 1597 | 1676 | 1657 | 1597 | 1676 | 1545 | 871 | 1560 | 1233 | 1432 |
| c, Capacity [veh/h] | 497 | 1023 | 1011 | 6 | 507 | 467 | 63 | 404 | 341 | 370 |
| d1, Uniform Delay [s] | 39.25 | 10.95 | 10.95 | 56.63 | 32.44 | 32.55 | 57.00 | 31.99 | 40.45 | 42.25 |
| k, delay calibration | 0.48 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.15 | 0.50 |
| I, Upstream Filtering Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| d2, Incremental Delay [s] | 53.47 | 0.91 | 0.93 | 27.18 | 3.24 | 3.65 | 27.85 | 0.09 | 1.93 | 82.47 |
| d3, Initial Queue Delay [s] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Rp, platoon ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| PF, progression factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Lane Group Results

| X, volume / capacity | 1.05 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.32 | 0.48 | 0.49 | 0.87 | 0.08 | 0.56 | 1.12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d, Delay for Lane Group [s/veh] | 92.72 | 11.87 | 11.88 | 83.81 | 35.67 | 36.20 | 84.85 | 32.08 | 42.37 | 124.72 |
| Lane Group LOS | F | B | B | F | D | D | F | C | D | F |
| Critical Lane Group | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes |
| 50th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 21.05 | 4.44 | 4.40 | 0.10 | 5.93 | 5.64 | 2.07 | 0.70 | 5.05 | 18.78 |
| 50th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 526.18 | 111.06 | 109.96 | 2.61 | 148.28 | 141.07 | 51.81 | 17.59 | 126.13 | 469.44 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 29.49 | 7.90 | 7.84 | 0.19 | 9.93 | 9.54 | 3.73 | 1.27 | 8.73 | 27.58 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 737.24 | 197.48 | 195.94 | 4.70 | 248.14 | 238.47 | 93.25 | 31.67 | 218.22 | 689.60 |

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 92.72 | 11.87 | 11.88 | 83.81 | 35.84 | 36.20 | 84.85 | 32.08 | 32.08 | 42.37 | 124.72 | 124.72 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement LOS | F | B | B | F | D | D | F | C | C | D | F | F |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 46.49 |  |  | 36.13 |  |  | 65.06 |  |  | 98.81 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | D |  |  | D |  |  | E |  |  | F |  |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 58.36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection V/C | 0.765 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Sequence

| Ring 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ring 2 | 6 | 7 | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ring 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ring 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
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## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 2: Golden Valley Rd/Estates Rd

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay (sec /veh): | Level Of Service: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Volume to Capacity (v/c): | 0.0 |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes |  |  |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Southbound |  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $T \Gamma$ |  | $4 \\|$ |  | ! $\dagger$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Right | Left | Thru | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 180.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | Yes |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 6 | 43 | 102 | 544 | 419 | 12 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 6 | 42 | 90 | 0 | 11 | 8 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 12 | 85 | 192 | 544 | 430 | 20 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 3 | 23 | 53 | 149 | 118 | 5 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 13 | 93 | 211 | 598 | 473 | 22 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.20 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 33.01 | 10.46 | 9.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Movement LOS | D | B | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.30 | 0.42 | 0.74 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 7.45 | 10.52 | 18.40 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 13.22 |  | 2.40 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 2.37 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | D |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 3: Golden Valley Rd/Access 5

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay $(\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}):$ | 9.8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | A |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.016 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Access 5 |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Southbound |  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\Gamma$ |  |  |  | ! $\dagger$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Right | Left | Thru | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Access 5 |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 550 | 431 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 11 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 3 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 11 | 0 | 556 | 439 | 3 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.0000 | 0.9100 | 1.0000 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 3 | 0 | 153 | 121 | 1 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 12 | 0 | 611 | 482 | 3 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$\mathrm{W}=\mathrm{Rk}$

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 9.82 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Movement LOS |  | A |  | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 1.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 9.82 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 0.11 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 4.00-03
Golden Mesa TIA

|  |  | Intersection Level Of Service Report |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection 4: Estates Rd/Access 4 |  |  |  |  |$\quad$ Delay (sec / veh): $\quad 10.3$ Intersection 4: Estates Rd/Access 4

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Access 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{t}$ |  | $4$ |  | $\leftrightarrows$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 114 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 59 | 39 | 0 | 35 | 13 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 173 | 39 | 0 | 84 | 13 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 48 | 11 | 0 | 23 | 4 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 190 | 43 | 0 | 92 | 14 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$\mathrm{W}^{\prime \prime}-R \mathrm{RF}$

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.70 | 0.00 | 10.34 | 9.45 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | B | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.06 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.56 | 1.56 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 10.34 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | B |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 0.43 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
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|  |  | Intersection Level Of Service Report <br> Intersection 5: Estates Rd/Indian Ln |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Control Type: | Two-way stop |  | Delay (sec / veh): | Level Of Service: |



Analysis Period:

Golden Mesa TIA
Plus Project PM LOS
tersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Indian Ln |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{5}$ |  | $4$ |  | $\leftrightarrows$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 51 | 30 | 1 | 18 | 20 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 39 | 21 | 0 | 23 | 13 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 90 | 51 | 1 | 41 | 33 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 26 | 15 | 0 | 12 | 10 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 105 | 59 | 1 | 48 | 38 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$W^{\mu}-R K S$

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.55 | 0.00 | 9.70 | 9.16 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.15 | 0.15 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.69 | 2.69 | 3.71 | 3.71 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.15 |  | 9.70 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 1.50 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 6: Indian Ln/Access 3

Two-way stop
HCM 2010
15 minutes

Delay (sec / veh):
9.6

Level Of Service:
Volume to Capacity (v/c):

A
0.000

Intersection Setup

| Name | Access 3 |  |  | Access 3 |  |  | Indian Ln |  |  | Indian Ln |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{t}{4}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{H}{4}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{H}{4}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{H}{\square}$ |  |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Access 3 |  |  | Access 3 |  |  | Indian Ln |  |  | Indian Ln |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 31 | 9 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 14 | 36 | 10 | 0 | 23 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |

## Traffll

Weriss

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 9.15 | 9.59 | 8.53 | 9.09 | 9.61 | 8.44 | 7.28 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.31 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 2.94 | 2.94 | 2.94 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 9.15 |  |  | 8.44 |  |  | 1.70 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 2.38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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|  |  | Intersection Level Of Service Report <br> Intersection 7: Estates Rd/Access 2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Control Type: | Two-way stop |  | Delay (sec/veh): | Level Of Service: |

## ntersection Level Of Service Report

Delay (sec / veh):
A
Volume to Capacity (v/c):
0.016

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Access 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{5}$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  | $\stackrel{\square}{4}$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Access 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 51 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 18 | 21 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 69 | 21 | 0 | 30 | 12 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 20 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 80 | 24 | 0 | 35 | 14 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

Werns

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.42 | 0.00 | 9.22 | 8.80 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.23 | 1.23 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 9.22 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 0.84 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Intersection 8: Estates Road/Access 1

Control Type:
Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:

Two-way stop
HCM 2010
15 minutes

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Access1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{t}$ |  | $4$ |  | $\cdots$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 51 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 51 | 18 | 0 | 19 | 11 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 | 0.8600 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 15 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 59 | 21 | 0 | 22 | 13 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$\mathrm{W}=R \mathrm{HS}$

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.37 | 0.00 | 9.02 | 8.68 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.09 | 1.09 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 9.02 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 1.02 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix C

## Demand Model Outputs



Appendix D

10-Year Horizon Baseline Conditions LOS Calculations

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 4.00-03
Golden Mesa TIA
10-Year Horizon Baseline AM Peal LOS

## Intersection Level Of Service Report

 Intersection 1: Golden Valley Rd/N Hills BlvdControl Type:
Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:

Signalized
HCM 2010
15 minutes

| Delay (sec / veh): | 49.6 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Level Of Service: | D |
| Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.699 |

0.699

Intersection Setup

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northeastbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $7 \\|$ |  |  | $71 F$ |  |  | $76$ |  |  | $71$ |  |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 150.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 150.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 125.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 147 | 486 | 31 | 12 | 513 | 100 | 76 | 9 | 5 | 328 | 25 | 168 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Right-Turn on Red Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 171 | 564 | 36 | 14 | 595 | 116 | 88 | 10 | 6 | 380 | 29 | 195 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 48 | 157 | 10 | 4 | 165 | 32 | 24 | 3 | 2 | 106 | 8 | 54 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 190 | 627 | 40 | 16 | 661 | 129 | 98 | 11 | 7 | 422 | 32 | 217 |
| Presence of On-Street Parking | No |  | No | No |  | No | No |  | No | No |  | No |
| On-Street Parking Maneuver Rate [/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Bus Stopping Rate [/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Bicycle Volume [bicycles/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |

## Trafflc

W:~RK
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Intersection Settings

| Located in CBD |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Signal Coordination Group |  |
| Cycle Length [s] |  |
| Coordination Type | - |
| Actuation Type | Time of Day Pattern Coordinated |
| Offset [s] | Semi-actuated |
| Offset Reference | 0.0 |
| Permissive Mode | LeadGreen |
| Lost time [s] | SingleBand |

## Phasing \& Timing

| Control Type | Protecte | Permiss | Permiss | Protecte | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signal group | 3 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Auxiliary Signal Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead / Lag | Lead | - | - | Lead | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Green [s] | 4 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Maximum Green [s] | 35 | 35 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 |
| Amber [s] | 4.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |
| All red [s] | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| Split [s] | 40 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| Vehicle Extension [s] | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
| Walk [s] | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Clearance [s] | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| 11, Start-Up Lost Time [s] | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 |
| I2, Clearance Lost Time [s] | 2.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 |
| Minimum Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Maximum Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Pedestrian Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Detector Location [ft] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector Length [ft] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| I, Upstream Filtering Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

## Exclusive Pedestrian Phase

| Pedestrian Signal Group |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| Pedestrian Walk [s] | 0 |
| Pedestrian Clearance [s] | 0 |

## Trafflc <br> Winrs
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Lane Group Calculations

| Lane Group | L | C | C | L | C | C | L | C | L |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L, Total Lost Time per Cycle [s] | 4.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 4.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 |
| I1_p, Permitted Start-Up Lost Time [s] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 |
| I2, Clearance Lost Time [s] | 2.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| g_i, Effective Green Time [s] | 16 | 68 | 68 | 2 | 54 | 54 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| g / C, Green / Cycle | 0.14 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.02 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| (v/s)_i Volume / Saturation Flow Rate | 0.12 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.01 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.10 | 0.01 | 0.34 | 0.17 |
| s, saturation flow rate [veh/h] | 1597 | 1676 | 1641 | 1597 | 1676 | 1583 | 1014 | 1569 | 1250 | 1453 |
| c, Capacity [veh/h] | 219 | 998 | 977 | 30 | 799 | 754 | 152 | 406 | 354 | 376 |
| d1, Uniform Delay [s] | 48.14 | 11.68 | 11.68 | 55.46 | 20.60 | 20.61 | 52.43 | 31.68 | 46.11 | 37.79 |
| k, delay calibration | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.19 |
| I, Upstream Filtering Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| d2, Incremental Delay [s] | 9.87 | 0.92 | 0.94 | 14.35 | 2.30 | 2.45 | 4.47 | 0.04 | 111.05 | 3.57 |
| d3, Initial Queue Delay [s] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Rp, platoon ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| PF, progression factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Lane Group Results

| X, volume / capacity | 0.87 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.54 | 0.51 | 0.51 | 0.64 | 0.04 | 1.19 | 0.66 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d, Delay for Lane Group [s/veh] | 58.01 | 12.59 | 12.61 | 69.81 | 22.90 | 23.06 | 56.90 | 31.72 | 157.16 | 41.36 |
| Lane Group LOS | E | B | B | E | C | C | E | C | F | D |
| Critical Lane Group | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| 50th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 5.87 | 4.43 | 4.35 | 0.57 | 7.84 | 7.45 | 3.01 | 0.38 | 21.11 | 6.56 |
| 50th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 146.78 | 110.82 | 108.67 | 14.36 | 196.09 | 186.24 | 75.24 | 9.50 | 527.68 | 163.99 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 9.84 | 7.89 | 7.77 | 1.03 | 12.44 | 11.93 | 5.42 | 0.68 | 31.56 | 10.76 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 246.12 | 197.14 | 194.16 | 25.84 | 310.92 | 298.15 | 135.43 | 17.10 | 788.88 | 268.99 |

## Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 58.01 | 12.60 | 12.61 | 69.81 | 22.96 | 23.06 | 56.90 | 31.72 | 31.72 | 157.16 | 41.36 | 41.36 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement LOS | E | B | B | E | C | C | E | C | C | F | D | D |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 22.67 |  |  | 23.91 |  |  | 53.00 |  |  | 114.19 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | F |  |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 49.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection V/C | 0.699 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Sequence

| Ring 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ring 2 | 6 | 7 | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ring 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ring 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
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## Intersection 2: Golden Valley Rd/Estates Rd

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay (sec /veh): | 59.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | F |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.233 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Southbound |  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\leftrightarrows$ |  |  |  | \\| |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Right | Left | Thru | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 180.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | Yes |  |

## Volumes

| Name |  |  |  | Rd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 14 | 89 | 31 | 845 | 640 | 7 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 16 | 103 | 36 | 980 | 742 | 8 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 5 | 32 | 11 | 306 | 232 | 3 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 20 | 129 | 45 | 1225 | 928 | 10 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Trafflc

W

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 59.19 | 13.73 | 10.28 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Movement LOS | F | B | B | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.83 | 0.92 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 20.68 | 23.08 | 4.94 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 19.83 |  | 0.36 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 1.45 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Intersection 5: Estates Rd/Indian Ln



Analysis Method: Analysis Period:

Delay (sec / veh):
Level Of Service:
Volume to Capacity (v/c):
9.2

A
0.054

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Indian Ln |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\hat{\Gamma}$ |  | $-$ |  | $\leftrightarrows$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Indian Ln |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 7 | 8 | 6 | 33 | 29 | 2 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 8 | 9 | 7 | 38 | 34 | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.7000 | 0.7000 | 0.7000 | 0.7000 | 0.7000 | 0.7000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 3 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 12 | 1 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 11 | 13 | 10 | 54 | 49 | 3 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.28 | 0.00 | 9.23 | 8.63 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.18 | 0.18 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.14 | 3.14 | 4.53 | 4.53 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 1.14 |  | 9.19 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 3.93 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
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Version 4.00-03
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Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 1: Golden Valley Rd/N Hills Blvd
Control Type:
Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:

Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:

Intersection Setup

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northeastbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $7 \\|$ |  |  | $71 F$ |  |  | $76$ |  |  | $71$ |  |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 150.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 150.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 125.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 512 | 581 | 23 | 2 | 308 | 103 | 54 | 19 | 14 | 176 | 13 | 393 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Right-Turn on Red Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 594 | 674 | 27 | 2 | 357 | 119 | 63 | 22 | 16 | 204 | 15 | 456 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 152 | 172 | 7 | 1 | 91 | 30 | 16 | 6 | 4 | 52 | 4 | 116 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 606 | 688 | 28 | 2 | 364 | 121 | 64 | 22 | 16 | 208 | 15 | 465 |
| Presence of On-Street Parking | No |  | No | No |  | No | No |  | No | No |  | No |
| On-Street Parking Maneuver Rate [/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Bus Stopping Rate [/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Bicycle Volume [bicycles/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

## Trafflc

Wins

Golden Mesa TIA
Version 4.00-03
10-Year Horizon Baseline PM Peak LOS
Intersection Settings

| Located in CBD |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Signal Coordination Group |  |
| Cycle Length [s] |  |
| Coordination Type | - |
| Actuation Type | Time of Day Pattern Coordinated |
| Offset [s] | Semi-actuated |
| Offset Reference | 0.0 |
| Permissive Mode | LeadGreen |
| Lost time [s] | SingleBand |
|  | 0.00 |

## Phasing \& Timing

| Control Type | Protecte | Permiss | Permiss | Protecte | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signal group | 3 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Auxiliary Signal Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead / Lag | Lead | - | - | Lead | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Green [s] | 4 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Maximum Green [s] | 35 | 35 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 |
| Amber [s] | 4.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |
| All red [s] | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| Split [s] | 40 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| Vehicle Extension [s] | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
| Walk [s] | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Clearance [s] | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| 11, Start-Up Lost Time [s] | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 |
| I2, Clearance Lost Time [s] | 2.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 |
| Minimum Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Maximum Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Pedestrian Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Detector Location [ft] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector Length [ft] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| I, Upstream Filtering Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

## Exclusive Pedestrian Phase

| Pedestrian Signal Group | 0 |
| :---: | :--- |
| Pedestrian Walk [s] | 0 |
| Pedestrian Clearance [s] | 0 |

## Trafflic <br> Weriss

## Generated with PTV VISTRO

Golden Mesa TIA
Version 4.00-03
10-Year Horizon Baseline PM Peak LOS
Lane Group Calculations

| Lane Group | L | C | C | L | C | C | L | C | L |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L, Total Lost Time per Cycle [s] | 4.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 4.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 |
| I1_p, Permitted Start-Up Lost Time [s] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 |
| I2, Clearance Lost Time [s] | 2.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| g_i, Effective Green Time [s] | 36 | 70 | 70 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| g / C, Green / Cycle | 0.31 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| (v/s)_i Volume / Saturation Flow Rate | 0.38 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.08 | 0.02 | 0.17 | 0.34 |
| s, saturation flow rate [veh/h] | 1597 | 1676 | 1654 | 1597 | 1676 | 1537 | 820 | 1561 | 1228 | 1432 |
| c, Capacity [veh/h] | 497 | 1023 | 1009 | 6 | 507 | 465 | 63 | 404 | 337 | 370 |
| d1, Uniform Delay [s] | 39.25 | 11.03 | 11.04 | 56.63 | 32.59 | 32.71 | 57.00 | 32.10 | 41.46 | 42.25 |
| k, delay calibration | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.19 | 0.50 |
| I, Upstream Filtering Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| d2, Incremental Delay [s] | 115.64 | 0.95 | 0.97 | 27.18 | 3.41 | 3.87 | 56.07 | 0.10 | 3.21 | 151.69 |
| d3, Initial Queue Delay [s] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Rp, platoon ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| PF, progression factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Lane Group Results

| X, volume / capacity | 1.22 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.32 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 1.01 | 0.09 | 0.62 | 1.30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d, Delay for Lane Group [s/veh] | 154.89 | 11.99 | 12.01 | 83.81 | 36.00 | 36.58 | 113.07 | 32.20 | 44.67 | 193.94 |
| Lane Group LOS | F | B | B | F | D | D | F | C | D | F |
| Critical Lane Group | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes |
| 50th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 29.63 | 4.60 | 4.55 | 0.10 | 6.14 | 5.81 | 2.80 | 0.81 | 5.74 | 25.90 |
| 50th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 740.84 | 115.05 | 113.82 | 2.61 | 153.38 | 145.32 | 70.04 | 20.33 | 143.55 | 647.53 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 43.39 | 8.12 | 8.05 | 0.19 | 10.20 | 9.77 | 5.04 | 1.46 | 9.67 | 39.25 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 1084.76 | 203.00 | 201.31 | 4.70 | 254.93 | 244.16 | 126.07 | 36.59 | 241.79 | 981.19 |

## Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 154.89 | 12.00 | 12.01 | 83.81 | 36.18 | 36.58 | 113.07 | 32.20 | 32.20 | 44.67 | 193.94 | 193.94 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement LOS | F | B | B | F | D | D | F | C | C | D | F | F |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 77.50 |  |  | 36.48 |  |  | 82.94 |  |  | 148.81 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | E |  |  | D |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 88.90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection V/C | 0.867 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Sequence

| Ring 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ring 2 | 6 | 7 | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ring 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ring 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
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## Intersection 2: Golden Valley Rd/Estates Rd

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay (sec /veh): | Level Of Service: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | D |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | 0.048 |  |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Southbound |  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $T \Gamma$ |  | $4 \\|$ |  | ! $\dagger$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Right | Left | Thru | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 180.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | Yes |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 6 | 43 | 102 | 544 | 419 | 12 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 7 | 50 | 118 | 631 | 486 | 14 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 2 | 14 | 32 | 173 | 134 | 4 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 8 | 55 | 130 | 693 | 534 | 15 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 27.56 | 10.39 | 9.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Movement LOS | D | B | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.15 | 0.25 | 0.44 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 3.73 | 6.16 | 10.95 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 12.57 |  | 1.43 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 1.37 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | D |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 4.00-03
Golden Mesa TIA
10-Year Horizon Baseline PM Peak LOS
Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 5: Estates Rd/Indian Ln

Control Type: Analysis Method: Analysis Period:

Two-way stop
HCM 2010
15 minutes

Delay (sec / veh):
Level Of Service:
Volume to Capacity (v/c):
9.2

A
0.029

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Indian Ln |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{\\|}{\square}$ |  | $4$ |  | $\leftrightarrows$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 51 | 30 | 1 | 18 | 20 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 59 | 35 | 1 | 21 | 23 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 16 | 10 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 66 | 39 | 1 | 23 | 26 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll
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## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.42 | 0.00 | 9.19 | 8.82 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.09 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.23 | 1.23 | 2.27 | 2.27 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.31 |  | 9.19 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 1.59 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix E

10-Year Horizon Plus Project Conditions LOS Calculations

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 4.00-03
-03
Golden Mesa TIA
10-Year Plus Projecy AM LOS

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 1: Golden Valley Rd/N Hills Blvd

Control Type:
Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:

Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:

Intersection Setup

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northeastbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\neg \\|$ |  |  | $\rightarrow \hat{\\|}$ |  |  | $\pi t$ |  |  | $7 \hat{F}$ |  |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 150.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 150.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 125.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 147 | 486 | 31 | 12 | 513 | 100 | 76 | 9 | 5 | 328 | 25 | 168 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Right-Turn on Red Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 171 | 588 | 36 | 14 | 667 | 125 | 88 | 10 | 6 | 383 | 29 | 195 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 48 | 163 | 10 | 4 | 185 | 35 | 24 | 3 | 2 | 106 | 8 | 54 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 190 | 653 | 40 | 16 | 741 | 139 | 98 | 11 | 7 | 426 | 32 | 217 |
| Presence of On-Street Parking | No |  | No | No |  | No | No |  | No | No |  | No |
| On-Street Parking Maneuver Rate [/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Bus Stopping Rate [/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Bicycle Volume [bicycles/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |

## Trafflc

Wintry

Golden Mesa TIA
Version 4.00-03 10-Year Plus Projecy AM LOS

Intersection Settings

| Located in CBD |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Signal Coordination Group |  |
| Cycle Length [s] |  |
| Coordination Type | - |
| Actuation Type | Time of Day Pattern Coordinated |
| Offset [s] | Semi-actuated |
| Offset Reference | 0.0 |
| Permissive Mode | LeadGreen |
| Lost time [s] | SingleBand |
|  | 0.00 |

## Phasing \& Timing

| Control Type | Protecte | Permiss | Permiss | Protecte | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signal group | 3 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Auxiliary Signal Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead / Lag | Lead | - | - | Lead | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Green [s] | 4 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Maximum Green [s] | 35 | 35 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 |
| Amber [s] | 4.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |
| All red [s] | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| Split [s] | 40 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| Vehicle Extension [s] | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
| Walk [s] | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Clearance [s] | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| 11, Start-Up Lost Time [s] | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 |
| 12, Clearance Lost Time [s] | 2.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 |
| Minimum Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Maximum Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Pedestrian Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Detector Location [ft] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector Length [ft] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| I, Upstream Filtering Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

## Exclusive Pedestrian Phase

| Pedestrian Signal Group | 0 |
| :---: | :--- |
| Pedestrian Walk [s] | 0 |
| Pedestrian Clearance [s] | 0 |

## Trafflic <br> Weriss

## Generated with PTV VISTRO

Version 4.00-03
10-Year Plus Projecy AM LOS
Lane Group Calculations

| Lane Group | L | C | C | L | C | C | L | C | L | C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L, Total Lost Time per Cycle [s] | 4.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 4.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 |
| I1_p, Permitted Start-Up Lost Time [s] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 |
| 2, Clearance Lost Time [s] | 2.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| g_i, Effective Green Time [s] | 16 | 68 | 68 | 2 | 54 | 54 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| g / C, Green / Cycle | 0.14 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.02 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| (v/s)_i Volume / Saturation Flow Rate | 0.12 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.01 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.10 | 0.01 | 0.34 | 0.17 |
| s, saturation flow rate [veh/h] | 1597 | 1676 | 1643 | 1597 | 1676 | 1586 | 1014 | 1569 | 1250 | 1453 |
| c, Capacity [veh/h] | 219 | 998 | 978 | 30 | 799 | 756 | 152 | 406 | 354 | 376 |
| d1, Uniform Delay [s] | 48.14 | 11.79 | 11.79 | 55.46 | 21.38 | 21.38 | 52.43 | 31.68 | 46.11 | 37.79 |
| k, delay calibration | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.19 |
| I, Upstream Filtering Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| d2, Incremental Delay [s] | 9.87 | 0.97 | 0.99 | 14.35 | 2.89 | 3.06 | 4.47 | 0.04 | 115.43 | 3.57 |
| d3, Initial Queue Delay [s] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Rp, platoon ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| PF, progression factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Lane Group Results

| X, volume / capacity | 0.87 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.54 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.64 | 0.04 | 1.20 | 0.66 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d, Delay for Lane Group [s/veh] | 58.01 | 12.76 | 12.78 | 69.81 | 24.27 | 24.44 | 56.90 | 31.72 | 161.53 | 41.36 |
| Lane Group LOS | E | B | B | E | C | C | E | C | F | D |
| Critical Lane Group | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| 50th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 5.87 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 0.57 | 9.12 | 8.66 | 3.01 | 0.38 | 21.54 | 6.56 |
| 50th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 146.78 | 116.30 | 114.11 | 14.36 | 227.89 | 216.50 | 75.24 | 9.50 | 538.44 | 163.99 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 9.84 | 8.19 | 8.07 | 1.03 | 14.07 | 13.49 | 5.42 | 0.68 | 32.26 | 10.76 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 246.12 | 204.73 | 201.71 | 25.84 | 351.68 | 337.15 | 135.43 | 17.10 | 806.58 | 268.99 |

## Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 58.01 | 12.77 | 12.78 | 69.81 | 24.34 | 24.44 | 56.90 | 31.72 | 31.72 | 161.53 | 41.36 | 41.36 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement LOS | E | B | B | E | C | C | E | C | C | F | D | D |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 22.50 |  |  | 25.16 |  |  | 53.00 |  |  | 117.20 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | F |  |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 49.68 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection V/C | 0.730 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Sequence

| Ring 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ring 2 | 6 | 7 | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ring 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ring 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
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## Intersection Level Of Service Report

## Intersection 2: Golden Valley Rd/Estates Rd

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay (sec /veh): | Level Of Service: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | F |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes |  | 0.437 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Southbound |  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\leftrightarrows$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\dagger}{\square}$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Right | Left | Thru | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 180.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | Yes |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 14 | 89 | 31 | 845 | 640 | 7 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 9 | 65 | 27 | 0 | 16 | 2 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 25 | 168 | 63 | 980 | 758 | 10 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 8 | 53 | 20 | 306 | 237 | 3 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 31 | 210 | 79 | 1225 | 948 | 13 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.44 | 0.40 | 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 90.49 | 16.13 | 10.69 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Movement LOS | F | C | B | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 1.73 | 1.87 | 0.37 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 43.27 | 46.80 | 9.32 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 25.69 |  | 0.65 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Approach LOS | D |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 2.81 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Intersection Level Of Service Report

 Intersection 3: Golden Valley Rd/Access 5| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay $(\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}):$ | 11.9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | B |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.037 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Access 5 |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Southbound |  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\Gamma$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  | \\| ${ }^{\text {I }}$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Right | Left | Thru | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Access 5 |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 859 | 647 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.16 | 1.00 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 16 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 16 | 0 | 1005 | 753 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.0000 | 0.8000 | 1.0000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 5 | 0 | 314 | 235 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 20 | 0 | 1256 | 941 | 1 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Trafflc

$\mathrm{W}=$ RKS

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 11.93 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Movement LOS |  | B |  | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 2.88 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 11.93 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 0.11 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
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Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 4: Estates Rd/Access 4
Control Type:
Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:

Two-way stop
HCM 2010
15 minutes
15 minutes

| Delay (sec / veh): | 10.4 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Level Of Service: | B |
| Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.036 |

10.4
0.036

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Access 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{5}$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  | $\stackrel{\square}{4}$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Access 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 38 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 18 | 12 | 0 | 54 | 20 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 62 | 12 | 0 | 173 | 20 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 | 0.8000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 19 | 4 | 0 | 54 | 6 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 78 | 15 | 0 | 216 | 25 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$W^{\mu}-R K S$

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.40 | 0.00 | 10.41 | 8.89 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | B | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.11 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.82 | 2.82 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 10.41 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | B |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 0.78 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
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Intersection Level Of Service Report
Intersection 5: Estates Rd/Indian Ln

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay (sec /veh): | 10.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | A |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.102 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Indian Ln |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\Gamma}$ |  |  |  | $T$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Indian Ln |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 7 | 8 | 6 | 33 | 29 | 2 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 12 | 6 | 0 | 35 | 19 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 20 | 15 | 7 | 73 | 53 | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 8 | 6 | 3 | 28 | 20 | 1 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 31 | 23 | 11 | 112 | 82 | 3 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$\mathrm{W}=$ RKS

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.34 | 0.00 | 9.98 | 9.02 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.35 | 0.35 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.45 | 6.45 | 8.72 | 8.72 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.66 |  | 9.94 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 3.53 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Intersection Level Of Service Report

 Intersection 6: Indian Ln/Access 3Two-way stop
HCM 2010
15 minutes

Intersection Setup

| Name | Access 3 |  |  | Access 3 |  |  | Indian Ln |  |  | Indian Ln |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{t}{4}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{f}{4}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{t}{4}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{A}{6}$ |  |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Access 3 |  |  | Access 3 |  |  | Indian Ln |  |  | Indian Ln |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 36 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 0 | 55 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |

## Trafflc

W-MRS

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 9.22 | 9.60 | 8.50 | 9.10 | 9.60 | 8.61 | 7.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.27 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 1.23 | 1.23 | 1.23 | 1.13 | 1.13 | 1.13 | 1.73 | 1.73 | 1.73 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] |  | 9.22 |  |  | 8.61 |  |  | 1.05 |  |  | 0.00 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 2.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 7: Estates Rd/Access 2

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay (sec /veh): | 9.3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | A |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity (v/c): | 0.032 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Access 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\square}$ |  |  |  | $T$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Access 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 9 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 5 | 6 | 0 | 16 | 18 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 15 | 6 | 0 | 61 | 18 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 6 | 2 | 0 | 23 | 7 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 23 | 9 | 0 | 94 | 28 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$\mathrm{W}=$ RKS

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.28 | 0.00 | 9.26 | 8.57 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.48 | 2.48 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 9.26 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 1.68 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Intersection Level Of Service Report

## Intersection 8: Estates Road/Access 1

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay $(\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}):$ | 9.1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | A |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.027 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Access1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $F$ |  | $4$ |  | $T$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Access1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 9 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 10 | 5 | 0 | 45 | 16 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 | 0.6500 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 4 | 2 | 0 | 17 | 6 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 15 | 8 | 0 | 69 | 25 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$\mathrm{W}^{\prime \prime}-\operatorname{RES}$

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.26 | 0.00 | 9.05 | 8.51 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.08 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.11 | 2.11 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 9.05 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 1.93 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 4.00-03
03
Golden Mesa TIA
10-Year Plus Project PM LOS

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 1: Golden Valley Rd/N Hills Blvd

Control Type:
Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:

Signalized
HCM 2010
15 minutes

| Delay (sec / veh): | 86.0 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Level Of Service: | F |
| Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.884 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northeastbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\rightarrow \hat{\\|}$ |  |  | $\rightarrow \hat{\\|}$ |  |  | $\leftrightarrows \hat{F}$ |  |  | $T \hat{F}$ |  |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 150.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 150.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 125.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  | N Hills Blvd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 512 | 581 | 23 | 2 | 308 | 103 | 54 | 19 | 14 | 176 | 13 | 393 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Right-Turn on Red Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 594 | 754 | 27 | 2 | 404 | 125 | 63 | 22 | 16 | 214 | 15 | 456 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 152 | 192 | 7 | 1 | 103 | 32 | 16 | 6 | 4 | 55 | 4 | 116 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 606 | 769 | 28 | 2 | 412 | 128 | 64 | 22 | 16 | 218 | 15 | 465 |
| Presence of On-Street Parking | No |  | No | No |  | No | No |  | No | No |  | No |
| On-Street Parking Maneuver Rate [/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Bus Stopping Rate [/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Bicycle Volume [bicycles/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |

Golden Mesa TIA
Version 4.00-03 10-Year Plus Project PM LOS

Intersection Settings

| Located in CBD |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Signal Coordination Group |  |
| Cycle Length [s] |  |
| Coordination Type | - |
| Actuation Type | Time of Day Pattern Coordinated |
| Offset [s] | Semi-actuated |
| Offset Reference | 0.0 |
| Permissive Mode | LeadGreen |
| Lost time [s] | SingleBand |
|  | 0.00 |

## Phasing \& Timing

| Control Type | Protecte | Permiss | Permiss | Protecte | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss | Permiss |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signal group | 3 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Auxiliary Signal Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead / Lag | Lead | - | - | Lead | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Green [s] | 4 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Maximum Green [s] | 35 | 35 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 |
| Amber [s] | 4.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |
| All red [s] | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| Split [s] | 40 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| Vehicle Extension [s] | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
| Walk [s] | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Clearance [s] | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| 11, Start-Up Lost Time [s] | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 |
| I2, Clearance Lost Time [s] | 2.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 |
| Minimum Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Maximum Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Pedestrian Recall | No | No |  | No | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Detector Location [ft] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector Length [ft] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| I, Upstream Filtering Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

## Exclusive Pedestrian Phase

| Pedestrian Signal Group | 0 |
| :---: | :--- |
| Pedestrian Walk [s] | 0 |
| Pedestrian Clearance [s] | 0 |

## Trafflic <br> Weriss

## Generated with PTV VISTRO

Version 4.00-03
10-Year Plus Project PM LOS
Lane Group Calculations

| Lane Group | L | C | C | L | C | C | L | C | L | C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L, Total Lost Time per Cycle [s] | 4.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 4.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 |
| I1_p, Permitted Start-Up Lost Time [s] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 |
| 2, Clearance Lost Time [s] | 2.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| g_i, Effective Green Time [s] | 36 | 70 | 70 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| g / C, Green / Cycle | 0.31 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| (v/s)_i Volume / Saturation Flow Rate | 0.38 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.08 | 0.02 | 0.18 | 0.34 |
| s, saturation flow rate [veh/h] | 1597 | 1676 | 1656 | 1597 | 1676 | 1543 | 820 | 1561 | 1228 | 1432 |
| c, Capacity [veh/h] | 497 | 1023 | 1010 | 6 | 507 | 467 | 63 | 404 | 337 | 370 |
| d1, Uniform Delay [s] | 39.25 | 11.38 | 11.39 | 56.63 | 33.26 | 33.36 | 57.00 | 32.10 | 41.87 | 42.25 |
| k, delay calibration | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.21 | 0.50 |
| I, Upstream Filtering Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| d2, Incremental Delay [s] | 115.64 | 1.13 | 1.15 | 27.18 | 4.25 | 4.77 | 56.07 | 0.10 | 4.06 | 151.69 |
| d3, Initial Queue Delay [s] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Rp, platoon ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| PF, progression factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Lane Group Results

| X, volume / capacity | 1.22 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.32 | 0.55 | 0.56 | 1.01 | 0.09 | 0.65 | 1.30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d, Delay for Lane Group [s/veh] | 154.89 | 12.51 | 12.54 | 83.81 | 37.50 | 38.13 | 113.07 | 32.20 | 45.93 | 193.94 |
| Lane Group LOS | F | B | B | F | D | D | F | C | D | F |
| Critical Lane Group | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes |
| 50th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 29.63 | 5.29 | 5.24 | 0.10 | 7.03 | 6.65 | 2.80 | 0.81 | 6.14 | 25.90 |
| 50th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 740.84 | 132.22 | 131.11 | 2.61 | 175.67 | 166.19 | 70.04 | 20.33 | 153.49 | 647.53 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 43.39 | 9.06 | 9.00 | 0.19 | 11.37 | 10.88 | 5.04 | 1.46 | 10.20 | 39.25 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 1084.76 | 226.51 | 225.01 | 4.70 | 284.36 | 271.90 | 126.07 | 36.59 | 255.08 | 981.19 |

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 154.89 | 12.52 | 12.54 | 83.81 | 37.71 | 38.13 | 113.07 | 32.20 | 32.20 | 45.93 | 193.94 | 193.94 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement LOS | F | B | B | F | D | D | F | C | C | D | F | F |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 74.02 |  |  | 37.98 |  |  | 82.94 |  |  | 147.71 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | E |  |  | D |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 85.97 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection V/C | 0.884 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Sequence

| Ring 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ring 2 | 6 | 7 | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ring 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ring 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |



## Intersection Level Of Service Report

## Intersection 2: Golden Valley Rd/Estates Rd

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay $(\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}):$ | 43.6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | E |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.131 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Southbound |  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $7 \Gamma$ |  | $71$ |  | $1 \%$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Right | Left | Thru | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 180.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | Yes |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 6 | 43 | 102 | 544 | 419 | 12 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 6 | 42 | 90 | 0 | 11 | 8 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 13 | 92 | 208 | 631 | 497 | 22 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 4 | 25 | 57 | 173 | 137 | 6 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 14 | 101 | 229 | 693 | 546 | 24 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.23 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 43.59 | 10.89 | 9.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Movement LOS | E | B | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.43 | 0.49 | 0.88 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 10.87 | 12.32 | 22.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 14.87 |  | 2.40 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 2.44 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | E |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 4.00-03
Golden Mesa TIA
10-Year Horizon Plus Project PM Peak LOS
Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 3: Golden Valley Rd/Access 5

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay $(\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}):$ | 10.1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | B |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.017 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Access 5 |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Southbound |  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\Gamma$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Right | Left | Thru | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Access 5 |  | Golden Valley Rd |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 550 | 431 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.16 | 1.00 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 11 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 3 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 11 | 0 | 644 | 508 | 3 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.0000 | 0.9100 | 1.0000 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 3 | 0 | 177 | 140 | 1 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 12 | 0 | 708 | 558 | 3 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$\mathrm{W}=$ RKS

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 10.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Movement LOS |  | B |  | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 1.28 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 10.11 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 0.09 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 4.00-03
Golden Mesa TIA
10-Year Horizon Plus Project PM Peak LOS
Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 4: Estates Rd/Access 4
Control Type:
Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:

Two-way stop
HCM 2010
15 minutes
15 minutes

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Access 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{t}$ |  | $4$ |  | $\leftrightarrows$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Access 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 114 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 59 | 39 | 0 | 35 | 13 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 191 | 39 | 0 | 92 | 13 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 | 0.9100 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 52 | 11 | 0 | 25 | 4 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 210 | 43 | 0 | 101 | 14 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$\mathrm{W}=R K$

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.74 | 0.00 | 10.55 | 9.57 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | B | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.06 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.62 | 1.62 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 10.55 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | B |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 0.40 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
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## Intersection 5: Estates Rd/Indian Ln

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay (sec /veh): | 9.8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | A |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity (v/c): | 0.050 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Indian Ln |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{t}{\square}$ |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 51 | 30 | 1 | 18 | 20 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 39 | 21 | 0 | 23 | 13 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 98 | 56 | 1 | 44 | 36 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 27 | 16 | 0 | 12 | 10 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 109 | 62 | 1 | 49 | 40 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$\mathrm{W}^{\prime \prime}-R \mathrm{RF}$

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.56 | 0.00 | 9.75 | 9.20 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.76 | 2.76 | 3.95 | 3.95 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.15 |  | 9.75 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 1.52 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
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## Control Type: <br> Analysis Method: <br> Analysis Period:

Two-way stop
HCM 2010
15 minutes

| Delay (sec / veh): | 9.6 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Level Of Service: | A |
| Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.000 | 0.000

Intersection Setup

| Name | Access 3 |  |  | Access 3 |  |  | Indian Ln |  |  | Indian Ln |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Access 3 |  |  | Access 3 |  |  | Indian Ln |  |  | Indian Ln |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 36 | 9 | 0 | 23 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 40 | 10 | 0 | 26 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 9.18 | 9.61 | 8.55 | 9.12 | 9.63 | 8.46 | 7.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.31 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 3.10 | 3.10 | 3.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] |  | 9.18 |  |  | 8.46 |  |  | 1.50 |  |  | 0.00 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 2.18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay (sec /veh): | 9.3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | A |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity (v/c): | 0.015 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Access 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{t}$ |  | $4$ |  | $\leftrightarrows$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 51 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 18 | 21 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 77 | 21 | 0 | 33 | 12 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 21 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 86 | 23 | 0 | 37 | 13 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$\mathrm{W}^{\prime \prime}-R \mathrm{RF}$

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.43 | 0.00 | 9.25 | 8.82 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.15 | 1.15 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 9.25 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 0.76 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay $(\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}):$ | 9.1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | A |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.013 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Estates Rd |  | Estates Rd |  | Access1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{t}$ |  | $4$ |  | $\cdots$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  | 30.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |
| Crosswalk | No |  | No |  | No |  |

## Volumes

| Name |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 51 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 59 | 18 | 0 | 22 | 11 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 16 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 66 | 20 | 0 | 24 | 12 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

$\mathrm{W}^{\prime \prime}-R \mathrm{RF}$

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.38 | 0.00 | 9.06 | 8.71 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 9.06 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 0.89 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Golden Mesa - Supplemental Traffic Analysis

Following the completion of the Traffic Impact Study for Golden Mesa dated June 27, 2016, additional analysis was performed in response to NDOT District II review comments and as required by the Tentative Map Conditions of Approval. Two additional study intersections are included in this supplemental analysis. The following intersections were analyzed:

- Golden Valley Road/US 395 NB Ramps
- Golden Valley Road/US 395 SB Ramps

This report serves as a supplemental traffic analysis to the original "Traffic Impact Study for Golden Mesa" dated June 27, 2016 and provides additional traffic analysis for these two intersections.

Please refer to the original traffic impact study for methodology, traffic volumes, trip generation and distribution, project impacts, and mitigations at other study intersections on Golden Valley Road.

## Land Uses

The proposed project, land uses, quantities, and their locations are unchanged. Please refer to the "Traffic Impact Study for Golden Mesa" dated June 27, 2016.

## Level of Service Policy

The Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) Traffic Impact Study Requirements publication states "Level of Service "C" will be the design objective for capacity and under no circumstances will less than Level of Service "D" be accepted for site and non-site traffic."

Hence, we have used LOS "D" as the criteria for this analysis.

## Existing Conditions Traffic Volumes

Existing traffic volumes at both additional study intersections were obtained by collecting new turning movement counts at the study intersections. The counts were conducted on an average mid-week day in May 2017, with schools in session. The existing lane configurations and intersection controls are shown in Figure 1. The existing AM and PM peak hour intersection traffic volumes are shown in Figure 2.


Figure 1. Existing Lane Configurations

US 395, although being a north-south freeway, travels east-west at the Golden Valley Road interchange. For the purposes of this report, the US 395 Ramps are considered eastbound/westbound approaches and the Golden Valley Road approaches are considered northbound/southbound approaches.

## Existing Intersection Level of Service Analysis

Level of service (LOS) calculations were performed using the existing traffic volumes, lane configurations, and traffic controls. Table 1 summarizes the existing conditions LOS at the two study intersections. Detailed calculation sheets are provided in Appendix A, attached.

As shown in Table 1, both ramp intersections operate at unacceptable conditions during the existing AM and PM peak hours. The westbound approach at the Golden Valley Road/US 395 NB Ramps intersection operates at LOS "F" during both the AM and PM peak hours. The eastbound approach at the Golden Valley Road /US 395 SB Ramps intersection operates at LOS " $F$ " and LOS "E" during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively.
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Figure 2. Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes
Table 1: Existing Conditions Intersection Level of Service Summary

| Intersection | Control | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Golden Valley Rd/US 395 NB Ramps | TWSC |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound Approach |  | F | 59.98 | F | 92.75 |
| Westbound Left |  | F | 59.98 | F | 92.75 |
| Golden Valley Rd/US 395 SB Ramps | TWSC |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound Approach |  | F | 83.62 | E | 44.09 |
| Eastbound Left |  | F | 98.85 | F | 50.38 |
| Eastbound Right |  | B | 11.17 | B | 11.61 |
| Northbound Approach |  | C | 23.15 | C | 18.83 |
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## Trip Generation

Table 2 provides the Daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour trip generation calculation details for the proposed project.

Table 2: Trip Generation Estimates

| ITE Land Use | Size | Daily | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| 210 - Single-Family <br> Detached Housing | 158 Dwelling <br> Units | 1,600 | 120 | 30 | 90 | 159 | 100 | 59 |

As shown in Table 2, the proposed project is anticipated to generate up to 1,600 daily trips, 120 AM peak hour trips, and 159 PM peak hour trips. These trip generation estimates are the same as presented in the original Traffic Impact Study.

## Trip Distribution and Assignment

$80 \%$ of the project trips were assigned to US 395 in the original Traffic Impact Study. Of that 80\%, 70\% of the project traffic is assigned to/from the south via US 395 and $10 \%$ is assigned to/from the north via US 395. The project trips at the two study intersections are shown in Figure 3.

## Project Access

The number and location of access points remain unchanged. Please refer to the Traffic Impact Study for Golden Mesa" dated June 27, 2016.
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Figure 3. Trip Assignment

## Existing Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Analysis

Existing Plus Project volumes were obtained by adding the project generated trips to the existing traffic volumes and are shown in Figure 4. The "Plus Project" condition Peak Hour Factors (PHF) and travel patterns were assumed to remain the same as were observed under existing conditions.

Table 3 presents the level of service analysis summary for the "Plus Project" scenario assuming the existing intersection configurations. Detailed calculation sheets are provided in Appendix B, attached. As shown in Table 3, both the study intersections operate at LOS "F" during the peak hours. However, it should be noted that these two intersections operate at unacceptable LOS conditions even under existing conditions (without the project).
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Figure 4. Plus Project Traffic Volumes
Table 3: Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Summary

| Intersection | Control | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Golden Valley Rd/US 395 NB Ramps | TWSC |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound Approach |  | F | 76.73 | F | 119.39 |
| Westbound Left |  | F | 76.73 | F | 119.39 |
| Golden Valley Rd/US 395 SB Ramps | TWSC |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound Approach |  | F | 120.13 | F | 58.64 |
| Eastbound Left |  | F | 142.73 | F | 67.24 |
| Eastbound Right |  | B | 12.06 | B | 11.82 |
| Northbound Approach |  | D | 26.83 | C | 20.31 |
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## 20-Year Horizon Traffic Volumes

Traffic volumes in the study area are anticipated to increase in the future as development continues in the North Valleys region. Traffic growth rates were obtained from the Washoe County RTC's travel demand model. The latest iteration of the travel demand model was used to determine future growth rates.

Growth rates were calculated based on the traffic volume increases at multiple points along Golden Valley Road and on the ramp approaches. A uniform growth factor of 1.4 ( $40 \%$ increase) was used to estimate 20 -Year Horizon baseline peak hour traffic volumes. The 20 -Year Horizon baseline peak hour traffic volumes are shown in Figure 5 and growth rate calculations are shown in Table 4.


Figure 5. 20-Year Horizon Baseline Traffic Volumes
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Table 4: Growth Rate Calculations

|  | GV N/O Ramps | GV b/w Ramps | GV S/O Ramps | NB Off Ramp | NB On Ramp SB Off Ramp | SB On Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2020 Model | 15,614 | 11,847 | 9,314 | 8,747 | 4,541 | 4,285 | 7,916 |
| 2040 Model | 18,770 | 16,282 | 14,972 | 12,094 | 3,333 | 2,583 | 11,528 |
| Difference | 3,156 | 4,435 | 5,658 | 3,347 | $-1,208$ | $-1,702$ | 3,612 |
| 20 Years \% Change | $20 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $-27 \%$ | $-40 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| 20 Years Growth Rate | $1.0 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $-1.3 \%$ | $-2.0 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| 20 years Growth Factor | 1.20 | 1.37 | 1.61 | 1.38 | 0.73 | 0.60 | 1.46 |

## 20-Year Horizon Level of Service Analysis

Table 5 presents the level of service analysis summary for the "20-Year Horizon Baseline" scenario assuming the existing intersection configurations. Detailed calculation sheets are provided in Appendix C, attached.

Table 5: 20-Year Horizon Baseline Level of Service Summary

| Intersection | Control | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Golden Valley Rd/US 395 NB Ramps | TWSC |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound Approach |  | F | >180 | F | >180 |
| Westbound Left |  | F | >180 | F | >180 |
| Golden Valley Rd/US 395 SB Ramps | TWSC |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound Approach |  | F | >180 | F | >180 |
| Eastbound Left |  | F | >180 | F | >180 |
| Eastbound Right |  | B | 14.32 | B | 14.02 |
| Northbound Approach |  | F | 93.44 | E | 48.11 |

As shown in Table 5, both the study intersections will operate at deep LOS " $F$ " with excessive delay during both the AM and PM peak hours.

## 20-Year Horizon Plus Project Level of Service Analysis

20-Year Plus Project volumes were obtained by adding the project generated trips to the 20-Year Baseline traffic volumes and are shown in Figure 6.

Table 6 presents the level of service analysis summary for the "20-Year Plus Project" scenario assuming the existing intersection configurations. Detailed calculation sheets are provided in Appendix D, attached. As shown in Table 6, both study intersections operate at LOS "F" under 20-Year Horizon Plus Project conditions. Note that these two intersections operate at deep LOF "F" even without the project.

## Traffll

W"RKS


Figure 6. 20-Year Plus Project Traffic Volumes
Table 6: 20-Year Plus Project Level of Service Summary
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## Crash Analysis

Crash data was requested and obtained from NDOT for the most recent five years (October 2011- October 2016) at both study intersections. Table 7 and Table 8 show the summary of crash data at the Golden Valley Road/ US 395 NB Ramps and Golden Valley Road/ US 395 SB Ramps intersections respectively. 15 crashes were reported at each intersection between October 2011 and October 2016.

Table 7: 5-Year Crash Data Summary @ Golden Valley Road/US 395 NB Ramps

| Crash Type | Number | PDO | Injury | Fatality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Angle | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Rear-End | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Non-Collision | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Side Swipe | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 15 |  |  |  |

Table 8: 5-Year Crash Data Summary @ Golden Valley Road/US 395 NB Ramps

| Crash Type | Number | PDO | Injury | Fatality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Angle | 10 | 3 | 7 | 0 |
| Rear-End | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Head-On | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Non-Collision | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 15 |  |  |  |

Based on the data obtained, of the 15 reported crashes at the Golden Valley Road/ US 395 NB Ramps intersection, 2 were reported in 2012, 3 were reported in 2013, 6 were reported in 2014, 2 were reported in 2015, and 2 were reported in 2016. A majority of the crashes were angle crashes ( $40 \%$ of all the crashes), followed by rear-end crashes (27\%), non-collision crashes (27\%), and sideswipe crashes (6\%). No casualties were reported.

Of the 15 reported crashes at the Golden Valley Road/ US 395 SB Ramps intersection, 2 were reported in 2011, 2 were reported in 2012, 1 was reported in 2013, 2 were reported in 2014, 6 were reported in 2015, and 2 were reported in 2016. The majority of crashes were angle collisions ( $67 \%$ of all the crashes), followed by rear-end crashes (20\%), head-on crashes (12.5\%), and non-collision crashes (12.5\%). No casualties were reported. Neither location meets the criteria of a high-crash location.

## Potential Improvements

It should be noted that both ramp intersections operate at unacceptable levels of service during the existing and 20-year horizon baseline conditions (without the addition of the project). Hence, improvements should be planned at these two intersections irrespective of this project, or any other new development that accesses the Golden Valley interchange. The following two potential improvements were tested with existing lane configurations to assist in future planning:

- Installing a traffic signal at both the ramp intersections
- Constructing a single-lane roundabout at both ramp intersections

Any new improvements constructed at these intersections should ideally provide acceptable traffic operations for at least 20 years. Hence, these two improvement options were tested with the 20-Year Horizon peak hour traffic volumes. Table 9 and Table 10 show the level of service summary with either signals or roundabouts constructed for 20-Year with and without project conditions.

Table 9: 20-Year Horizon Baseline Level of Service Summary with Signals or Roundabouts

| Intersection | Control | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Golden Valley Rd/US 395 NB Ramps | Signal | B | 11.53 | B | 15.97 |
| Golden Valley Rd/US 395 SB Ramps | Signal | E | 61.4 | B | 15.55 |
| Golden Valley Rd/US 395 NB Ramps | Roundabout | D | 26.29 | B | 14.49 |
| Golden Valley Rd/US 395 SB Ramps | Roundabout | E | 36.28 | C | 21.59 |

Table 10: 20-Year Horizon Plus Project Level of Service Summary with Signals or Roundabouts

| Intersection | Control | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Golden Valley Rd/US 395 NB Ramps | Signal | B | 12.51 | B | 16.8 |
| Golden Valley Rd/US 395 SB Ramps | Signal | F | 88.3 | C | 22.93 |
| Golden Valley Rd/US 395 NB Ramps | Roundabout | E | 36.6 | C | 16.57 |
| Golden Valley Rd/US 395 SB Ramps | Roundabout | E | 48.5 | D | $\mathbf{2 5 . 1 4}$ |

As shown in Table 9, neither signalization of existing intersections nor one-lane roundabouts would be anticipated to provide acceptable level of service in the 20 -year horizon, irrespective of the project. The Golden Valley Road/ US 395 SB Ramps intersection is anticipated to operate at LOS "E" conditions in the 20-Year Horizon Baseline conditions (without the project) with a signal or a roundabout. However, the Golden Valley Road/ US 395 NB Ramps intersection is anticipated to function at acceptable LOS with a signal or roundabout. However, it is not recommended to change the intersection control to a signal or a roundabout at only one of the ramp intersections. A holistic approach that will provide acceptable traffic operations at both the ramp intersections should be followed when recommending improvements at freeway interchanges. With only 158 residential units proposed, long-term improvement of the interchange is well beyond the scope or responsibility of this project. Hence, it is recommended that NDOT perform an interchange study to determine appropriate measures (addition of lanes, interchange reconfiguration etc) for improving long-term traffic operations at these two intersections.

Since neither of the tested improvements work for a 20-year horizon, we performed an analysis for the 10-year horizon with and without the project to determine if installing traffic signals with the existing lane configurations at the ramp intersections would provide acceptable level of service conditions for a 10 year
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timeframe. Table 11 and Table 12 show the level of service summary with signals constructed for the 10Year horizon with and without the project traffic.

Table 11: 10-Year Horizon Baseline Level of Service Summary with Signals

| Intersection | Control | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Golden Valley Rd/US 395 NB Ramps | Signal | A | 9.56 | B | 14.22 |
| Golden Valley Rd/US 395 SB Ramps | Signal | C | 27.75 | B | 14.7 |

Table 12: 10-Year Horizon Plus Project Level of Service Summary with Signals

| Intersection | Control | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Golden Valley Rd/US 395 NB Ramps | Signal | A | 9.98 | B | 14.24 |
| Golden Valley Rd/US 395 SB Ramps | Signal | D | 37.82 | B | 15.95 |

As shown in Table 11 and Table 12, preliminary analysis shows that installing traffic signals at both ramp intersections would provide acceptable level of service conditions over a 10-Year horizon. If NDOT and other local agencies (Washoe County/RTC) decide to install signals at the Golden Valley Road ramp intersections, the Regional Road Impact Fee from this project, and other potential projects that access the Golden Valley Interchange could potentially be pooled together towards a signalization project. However, we recommend performing a full signal-warrant study before installing signals.

## Conclusions

Following is a list of key findings and conclusions:

- The Golden Valley Road/ US 395 NB Ramps and Golden Valley Road/ US 395 SB Ramps intersections operate at LOS " $F$ " under existing and 20-year horizon baseline conditions (without the project).
- Both ramp terminal intersections are anticipated to continue to operate at LOS " $F$ " with the addition of the project traffic.
- It is recommended that NDOT perform an interchange study to determine appropriate long-term improvements that would provide acceptable traffic operations at both ramp intersections.
- Preliminary analysis shows installing traffic signals would provide acceptable level of service conditions for a 10-year timeframe should NDOT and the local agencies wish to pursue such a project.
- The project will contribution standard Regional Road Impact Fees (RRIF) in the amount of approximately $\$ 609,000$ to mitigate the project's impacts on the overall roadway network.

Please do not hesitate to contact us at (775) 322-4300 with any questions.
Sincerely,
TRAFFIC WORKS, LLC

Loren E. Chilson, PE Principal
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## Existing Conditions LOS Calculations

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00
Golden Mesa
Existing AM

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 9: Golden Valley/NB Ramps

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay (sec /veh): | 60.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | F |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.598 |

Intersection Setup

| Name |  | en Valle |  |  | n Valle |  | US | 5 NB R | mps |  | 5 NB R | mps |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach |  | orthbound |  |  | uthbound |  |  | astboun |  |  | hwestbo |  |
| Lane Configuration |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\boldsymbol{\\|}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 190.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 200.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 30 | 374 | 0 | 0 | 599 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 331 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 30 | 374 | 0 | 0 | 599 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 331 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 8 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 166 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 33 | 416 | 0 | 0 | 666 | 176 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |

Version 5.00-00

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 9.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 59.98 | 54.57 | 10.65 |
| Movement LOS | A | A |  |  | A | A |  |  |  | F | F | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.14 | 3.14 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 2.78 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 78.60 | 78.60 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.66 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 59.98 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | F |  |  |
| d_l, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 4.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00
Existing AM

## Intersection Level Of Service Report

 Intersection 10: Golden Valley/SB RampsControl Type:
Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:
Two-way stop
HCM 2010
15 minutes Delay (sec / veh):
Level Of Service:
Volume to Capacity (v/c):

Intersection Setup

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northeastbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\square}$ |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\oplus}{\square}$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 450.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 170.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 0 | 185 | 132 | 486 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219 | 3 | 47 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 185 | 132 | 486 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219 | 3 | 47 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.0000 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 50 | 0 | 132 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 1 | 13 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 201 | 0 | 528 | 210 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 238 | 3 | 51 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
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## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.51 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.98 | 0.01 | 0.09 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 23.15 | 21.59 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 98.85 | 97.73 | 11.71 |
| Movement LOS |  | C | C | A | A |  |  |  |  | F | F | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 2.78 | 2.78 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 9.36 | 9.36 | 0.28 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 69.57 | 69.57 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 234.01 | 234.01 | 7.10 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] |  | 23.15 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 83.62 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | F |  |
| d_l, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 23.61 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00

Existing PM

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 9: Golden Valley/NB Ramps

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay $(\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}):$ | 92.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | F |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.921 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $7$ |  |  | $\\| \Gamma$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 190.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 200.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 42 | 357 | 0 | 0 | 451 | 256 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 0 | 585 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 42 | 357 | 0 | 0 | 451 | 256 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 0 | 585 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 11 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 43 | 364 | 0 | 0 | 460 | 261 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 186 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

Version 5.00-00

## Intersection Settings

| Priority Scheme | Free | Free | Stop |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flared Lane |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Area [veh] | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Two-Stage Gap Acceptance |  |  | 0 |  |
| Number of Storage Spaces in Median | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.92 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 8.40 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 92.75 | 88.57 | 10.29 |
| Movement LOS | A | A |  |  | A | A |  |  |  | F | F | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.41 | 7.41 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 3.05 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 185.27 | 185.27 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.89 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 92.75 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | F |  |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 13.40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00
Existing PM

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 10: Golden Valley/SB Ramps

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay $(\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}):$ | 50.4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | F |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.753 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northeastbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{F}{5}$ |  |  | $7$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 450.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 170.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 0 | 200 | 106 | 346 | 287 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 | 2 | 38 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 200 | 106 | 346 | 287 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 | 2 | 38 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.0000 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 52 | 0 | 90 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 1 | 10 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 208 | 0 | 360 | 290 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 205 | 2 | 40 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

## Traffll

W-Mrs

Version 5.00-00

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.45 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.75 | 0.01 | 0.07 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 18.83 | 17.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 50.38 | 49.57 | 11.61 |
| Movement LOS |  | C | C | A | A |  |  |  |  | F | E | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 2.26 | 2.26 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5.62 | 5.62 | 0.22 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 56.59 | 56.59 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 140.50 | 140.50 | 5.49 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] |  | 18.83 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 44.09 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | E |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 13.29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix B

Plus Project Conditions LOS Calculations

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00
Golden Mesa
Existing Plus Project AM

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 9: Golden Valley/NB Ramps

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay $(\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}):$ | 76.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | F |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.678 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $7$ |  |  | $\\| \Gamma$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 190.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 200.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 30 | 374 | 0 | 0 | 599 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 331 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 30 | 377 | 0 | 0 | 662 | 167 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 352 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 1.0000 | 1.000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 8 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 184 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 33 | 419 | 0 | 0 | 736 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

## Intersection Settings

| Priority Scheme | Free | Free | Stop |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flared Lane |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Area [veh] | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Two-Stage Gap Acceptance |  |  | 0 |  |
| Number of Storage Spaces in Median | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.68 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 9.30 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 76.73 | 70.11 | 10.68 |
| Movement LOS | A | A |  |  | A | A |  |  |  | F | F | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.71 | 3.71 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 2.96 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 92.82 | 92.82 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] |  | 0.68 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 76.73 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | F |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 4.88 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00
Golden Mesa
Existing Plus Project AM
Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 10: Golden Valley/SB Ramps
Control Type:
Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:

Two-way stop
HCM 2010
15 minutes
15 minutes

Intersection Setup

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northeastbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 450.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 170.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 0 | 185 | 132 | 486 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219 | 3 | 47 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 185 | 132 | 549 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 222 | 3 | 47 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.0000 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 50 | 0 | 149 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 1 | 13 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 201 | 0 | 597 | 210 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 241 | 3 | 51 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |

Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.56 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.10 | 0.01 | 0.09 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 26.83 | 25.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 142.73 | 141.27 | 12.06 |
| Movement LOS |  | D | D | A | A |  |  |  |  | F | F | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 3.25 | 3.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 11.30 | 11.30 | 0.30 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 81.16 | 81.16 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 282.54 | 282.54 | 7.46 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 26.83 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 120.13 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | D |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | F |  |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 31.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00
Golden Mesa
Existing Plus Project PM

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 9: Golden Valley/NB Ramps

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay (sec /veh): | 119.4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | F |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity (v/c): | 1.005 |

Intersection Setup

| Name |  | en Valle |  |  | n Valle |  | US | 5 NB R | mps |  | 5 NB R | mps |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach |  | orthbound |  |  | uthbound |  |  | astboun |  |  | westbo |  |
| Lane Configuration |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\boldsymbol{\dagger}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 31 |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 190.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 200.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 42 | 357 | 0 | 0 | 451 | 256 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 0 | 585 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 42 | 367 | 0 | 0 | 492 | 262 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 0 | 655 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 11 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 43 | 374 | 0 | 0 | 502 | 267 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 186 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |

## Intersection Settings

| Priority Scheme | Free | Free | Stop |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flared Lane |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Area [veh] | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Two-Stage Gap Acceptance |  |  | 0 |  |
| Number of Storage Spaces in Median | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 8.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 119.39 | 114.60 | 10.36 |
| Movement LOS | A | A |  |  | A | A |  |  |  | F | F | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 8.41 | 8.41 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 3.16 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 210.26 | 210.26 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] |  | 0.88 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 119.39 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | F |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 16.45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00
Golden Mesa
Existing Plus Project PM
Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 10: Golden Valley/SB Ramps
Control Type:
Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:

Two-way stop
HCM 2010
15 minutes
15 minutes

Intersection Setup

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northeastbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 450.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 170.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 0 | 200 | 106 | 346 | 287 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 | 2 | 38 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 200 | 106 | 387 | 287 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 207 | 2 | 38 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.0000 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 52 | 0 | 101 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 1 | 10 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 208 | 0 | 403 | 299 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 216 | 2 | 40 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.47 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.85 | 0.01 | 0.07 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 20.31 | 18.90 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 67.24 | 66.25 | 11.82 |
| Movement LOS |  | C | C | A | A |  |  |  |  | F | F | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 2.48 | 2.48 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.03 | 7.03 | 0.23 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 61.95 | 61.95 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 175.74 | 175.74 | 5.66 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 20.31 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 58.64 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | F |  |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 16.57 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix C

20-Year Horizon Baseline Conditions LOS Calculations

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00
Golden Mesa
20 Year Baseline $\mathrm{A}<=\mathrm{M}$

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 9: Golden Valley/NB Ramps

Two-way stop
HCM 2010
15 minutes

Delay (sec / veh):
Level Of Service:
Volume to Capacity (v/c):
485.1

F
1.743

Intersection Setup

| Name |  | en Valle |  |  | n Valle |  | US | 5 NB R | mps |  | 5 NB R | mps |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach |  | orthbound |  |  | uthbound |  |  | astboun |  |  | hwestbo |  |
| Lane Configuration |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\boldsymbol{\\|}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 190.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 200.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 30 | 374 | 0 | 0 | 599 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 331 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.40 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 42 | 524 | 0 | 0 | 839 | 221 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 0 | 463 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 11 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 228 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 46 | 570 | 0 | 0 | 912 | 240 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00
20 Year Baseline A<=M
Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.74 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 10.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 485.06 | 468.51 | 11.91 |
| Movement LOS | B | A |  |  | A | A |  |  |  | F | F | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 10.76 | 10.76 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 4.91 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 268.89 | 268.89 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.76 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 485.06 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | F |  |  |
| d_l, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 31.56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00
Golden Mesa
20 Year Baseline $\mathrm{A}<=\mathrm{M}$

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 10: Golden Valley/SB Ramps

## Control Type: Analysis Method: Analysis Period:

Two-way stop
HCM 2010
15 minutes

Delay (sec / veh):
Level Of Service:
Volume to Capacity (v/c):
753.7

F 2.486

Intersection Setup

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northeastbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $F$ |  |  | $7$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 450.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 170.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 0 | 185 | 132 | 486 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219 | 3 | 47 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.40 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 259 | 185 | 680 | 270 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 307 | 4 | 66 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.0000 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 70 | 0 | 185 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 1 | 18 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 282 | 0 | 739 | 293 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 334 | 4 | 72 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00
20 Year Baseline A<=M
Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.49 | 0.03 | 0.16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 93.44 | 91.23 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 753.66 | 749.77 | 14.32 |
| Movement LOS |  | F | F | A | A |  |  |  |  | F | F | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 10.28 | 10.28 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 29.69 | 29.69 | 0.55 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 256.91 | 256.91 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 742.34 | 742.34 | 13.83 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 93.44 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 623.79 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | F |  |  |
| d_l, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 163.63 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 9: Golden Valley/NB Ramps

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay (sec /veh): | Level Of Service: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Lev.6 |  |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity (v/c): | 2.539 |

Intersection Setup

| Name |  | en Valle |  |  | n Valle |  | US | 5 NB R | mps |  | 5 NB R | mps |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach |  | orthbound |  |  | uthbound |  |  | astboun |  |  | westbo |  |
| Lane Configuration |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\boldsymbol{\dagger}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 31 |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 190.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 200.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 42 | 357 | 0 | 0 | 451 | 256 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 0 | 585 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.40 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 59 | 500 | 0 | 0 | 631 | 358 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 255 | 0 | 819 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 15 | 128 | 0 | 0 | 161 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 60 | 510 | 0 | 0 | 644 | 365 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 260 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

## Generated with PTV VISTRO

Version 5.00-00
Intersection Settings

| Prority Scheme | Free | Free | Stop |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flared Lane |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Area [veh] | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Two-Stage Gap Acceptance |  |  | 0 |  |
| Number of Storage Spaces in Median | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.54 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 9.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 786.62 | 774.48 | 11.39 |
| Movement LOS | A | A |  |  | A | A |  |  |  | F | F | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 23.80 | 23.80 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 5.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 594.95 | 594.95 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] |  | 0.96 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 786.62 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | F |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 111.51 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00

Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 10: Golden Valley/SB Ramps

Two-way stop
HCM 2010
15 minutes

Delay (sec / veh):
Level Of Service:
Volume to Capacity (v/c):
452.7

F
1.828

Intersection Setup

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northeastbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ |  |  | $71$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{H}{*}$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 450.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 170.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 0 | 200 | 106 | 346 | 287 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 | 2 | 38 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.40 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 280 | 148 | 484 | 402 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 276 | 3 | 53 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.0000 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 73 | 0 | 126 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 1 | 14 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 292 | 0 | 504 | 419 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 288 | 3 | 55 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |

## Generated with PTV VISTRO

Version 5.00-00
Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.82 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.83 | 0.02 | 0.12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 48.11 | 46.37 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 452.69 | 449.78 | 14.02 |
| Movement LOS |  | E | E | A | A |  |  |  |  | F | F | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 7.22 | 7.22 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 21.69 | 21.69 | 0.41 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 180.50 | 180.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 542.26 | 542.26 | 10.25 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] |  | 48.11 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 382.94 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | F |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 93.88 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Appendix D

20-Year Horizon Plus Project Conditions LOS Calculations

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00
Golden Mesa
20 Year Plus Project AM

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 9: Golden Valley/NB Ramps

Two-way stop
HCM 2010
15 minutes
15 minutes

Delay (sec / veh):
Level Of Service:
Volume to Capacity (v/c):
600.1

F
1.978

Intersection Setup

| Name |  | en Valle |  |  | n Valle |  | US | 5 NB R | mps |  | 5 NB R | mps |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach |  | orthbound |  |  | uthbound |  |  | astboun |  |  | westbo |  |
| Lane Configuration |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\boldsymbol{\dagger}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 31 |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 190.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 200.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 30 | 374 | 0 | 0 | 599 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 331 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.40 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 42 | 527 | 0 | 0 | 902 | 230 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 0 | 484 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 11 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 245 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 46 | 573 | 0 | 0 | 980 | 250 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00
Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.98 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 10.47 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 600.11 | 580.47 | 11.94 |
| Movement LOS | B | A |  |  | A | A |  |  |  | F | F | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 11.51 | 11.51 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 5.23 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 287.82 | 287.82 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.78 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 600.11 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | F |  |  |
| d_l, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 37.39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00
Golden Mesa
20 Year Plus Project AM

Control Type: Analysis Method: Analysis Period:

Two-way stop
HCM 2010
15 minutes

Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 10: Golden Valley/SB Ramps

Intersection Setup

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northeastbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 450.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 170.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 0 | 185 | 132 | 486 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219 | 3 | 47 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.40 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 259 | 185 | 743 | 270 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 310 | 4 | 66 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.0000 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 70 | 0 | 202 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 1 | 18 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 282 | 0 | 808 | 293 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 337 | 4 | 72 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00
Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 1.10 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.80 | 0.03 | 0.16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 126.99 | 124.56 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 901.82 | 897.11 | 14.84 |
| Movement LOS |  | F | F | A | A |  |  |  |  | F | F | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 11.97 | 11.97 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 31.60 | 31.60 | 0.58 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 299.21 | 299.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 790.10 | 790.10 | 14.59 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 126.99 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 747.15 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | F |  |  |
| d_l, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 191.75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00
Golden Mesa
20 Year Plus Project PM

|  | Intersection Level Of Service Report <br> Intersection 9: Golden Valley/NB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Control Type: | Dwo-way stop | Delay (sec/veh): | 900.0 |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 2010 | Level Of Service: | F |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 2.779 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $7$ |  |  | $\\| \Gamma$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 190.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 200.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  | US 395 NB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 42 | 357 | 0 | 0 | 451 | 256 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 0 | 585 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.40 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 59 | 510 | 0 | 0 | 672 | 364 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 255 | 0 | 889 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 1.0000 | 1.000 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 | 0.9800 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 15 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 171 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 60 | 520 | 0 | 0 | 686 | 371 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 260 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00
Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.78 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 9.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 899.98 | 886.29 | 11.47 |
| Movement LOS | A | A |  |  | A | A |  |  |  | F | F | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24.74 | 24.74 | 0.00 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 5.30 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 618.59 | 618.59 | 0.00 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.96 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 899.98 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | F |  |  |
| d_l, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 123.64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Generated with PTV VISTRO
Version 5.00-00
Golden Mesa
20 Year Plus Project PM

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 10: Golden Valley/SB Ramps

Control Type:
Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:
Two-way stop
HCM 2010
15 minutes

Delay (sec / veh):
Level Of Service
Volume to Capacity (v/c):
542.9

F
2.026

Intersection Setup

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northeastbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $F$ |  |  | $7$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 450.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 170.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  | 30.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | Golden Valley Rd |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  | US 395 SB Ramps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 0 | 200 | 106 | 346 | 287 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 | 2 | 38 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Growth Rate | 1.00 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.40 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 280 | 148 | 525 | 402 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 286 | 3 | 53 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.0000 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 | 0.9600 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 73 | 0 | 137 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 1 | 14 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 29 | 0 | 547 | 419 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 298 | 3 | 55 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

## Intersection Settings

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

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.87 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.03 | 0.02 | 0.12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 57.53 | 55.68 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 542.87 | 539.56 | 14.32 |
| Movement LOS |  | F | F | A | A |  |  |  |  | F | F | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 0.00 | 8.08 | 8.08 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 23.93 | 23.93 | 0.42 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 0.00 | 202.07 | 202.07 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 598.26 | 598.26 | 10.59 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 57.53 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 461.19 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | F |  |  |
| d_l, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 112.13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 BACKGROUND

This report presents the results of a Hydrology Master Plan investigation for the proposed Golden Mesa project. The project is in Golden Valley, about 4 miles north of Reno (Figure 1). The project is in Section 11, T20N, R19E. It is east of Estates Road and north of East Golden Valley Road. The project consists of 3 parcels, APN 552-100-01 (southern), 552-050-01 (northern), and 552-092-20 (central). The study was conducted to determine flow rates at key sites in Golden Valley, evaluate the impacts of the proposed development and determine the size of proposed detention/retention basins.

### 1.2 DESCRIPTION OF GOLDEN VALLEY AND EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERN

Golden Valley is located north of Reno and is in both the Washoe County and City of Reno spheres of influence. Development is proposed for 3 parcels within Washoe County's jurisdiction. The principal drainage feature of the area is Golden Valley Wash which flows east to west through the southern parcel. This parcel is the point at which storm runoff from the area east of Estates Road (about 2 square miles) collects before passing westward through culverts under Estates Road. The channel then turns northward toward Swan Lake. Estates Road and the west boundary of North Valleys High School form the west boundary of the study area, while the natural topographic divides form the north, east and south boundaries (Figure 2A).

The watershed affecting the development is roughly divided into 2 parts at the east-west boundary between the southern parcel (APN 552-100-01) and the central parcel (552-092-20), just north of East Golden Valley Road. The northern part of the drainage area affecting the project slopes southwest at a slope of about $3 \%$ in the flatter areas with slopes of up to $50 \%$ in the steeper hills. Offsite flows reach the project area from BLM land to the north and from developed areas to the east. This runoff flows southwestward generally towards the intersection of Estates Road and Golden Valley Road. In undeveloped areas the vegetation consists of sagebrush and grasses. Developed areas consist of large residential parcels typically 1 acre in size. These developed areas have numerous small drainage channels alongside streets that flow either north-south or east-west. The channels have small culverts under driveways that limit the channel's capacity. During significant storm events the capacity of these culverts is likely exceeded and shallow flow across lots and streets could occur. Watersheds in this area have the prefix GMN on Figure 2A.

The southern part is more densely developed with lots typically 0.25 acres in size. The land slopes generally southward at $10 \%$ or more, although developments have modified the slopes. Undeveloped areas are vegetated with sagebrush and grasses. The southern watershed contains North Valleys High School (NVHS), the Northridge, Northstar Ranch and Golden Highlands developments. On Figure 2A, Northstar Ranch watersheds have the prefix NR, Northridge has the prefix RDG, Golden Highlands has GH and the high school is NVHS. These developments and the high school have detention basins designed to mitigate their impacts on flow rates. Northstar has 3 (Northridge uses one of these to mitigate its impacts), Golden Highlands has 2 and NVHS has 1 pond. The drainage system of North Valley High School
appears to have been designed to control the runoff from the areas south and east of the school. Its drainage system collects runoff from Golden Valley Highlands development, routes it through the NVHS detention basin and discharges it across and under Golden Valley Road to GMS-4, the southern parcel in the project (Parcel APN 552-100-01). Runoff from the far eastern portion of the watershed, including Northstar Ranch, is intercepted by a 42-inch culvert at the northeast corner of the NVHS campus (near the intersection of Spearhead and East Golden Valley Road) and routed west to the NVHS detention basin then to GMS-4. Because the NVHS drainage system was designed using lower rainfall values than are now recommended, the culvert near Spearhead and the detention basin may be undersized based on the current rainfall values. Runoff probably overtops East Golden Valley road at these locations. The runoff overtopping near the 42-inch culvert flows northwestward across East Golden Valley Road and flows generally westward along the road to Estates Road. The runoff spilling from the NVHS detention basin flows northward onto Golden Valley Road. Calculations indicate the the road has the capacity to intercept this stormwater and convey it west to storm drains about 500 feet west of Estates Road. Calculations for these two sites are shown in Appendix D. GMS-4 is the collecting point for runoff from all parts of the study area. The runoff then passes under Estates Road and turns north to Swan Lake. The culverts under Estates ( 18 -inch and 36 -inch RCPs) have limited capacity and during the 100 year event stormwater overtops Estates and re-enters a channel on the west side of Estates Road.

### 1.3 Proposed Project and Drainage

1.3.1 Northern Watersheds The parcels are planned to be developed with relatively large ( 30,000 sq. ft.) residential lots. Two detention/retention basins will be constructed to mitigate the impacts of development. One (DB-A) will be at the northwest corner of GMN-9 (the northern parcel) and the second (DB-B) will be near the south west corner of GMN-9. Runoff from the BLM land (watersheds GMN-5A and 5B) will be collected in an open channel and routed westward into DB-A.-The outflow from DB-A will be routed south in an open channel adjacent to Estates Road and discharged into DB-B. Runoff from offsite watersheds GMN-6 and -8 will be routed through GMN-9, combined with runoff from GMN-9, and also discharged into DB-B. DB$B$ will discharge into a piped system that will convey the flow through GMN-11 (the central parcel) and collect the runoff from GMN-11 and discharge into an engineered open channel on GMS-4 (southern parcel).

Storm runoff from further to the north and east, watersheds GMN-4 and -7, plus runoff from areas adjacent to Indian Lane, GMN-2 and -10, are modeled as reaching the intersection of Indian Lane and Estates Road. This is a simplification, as the runoff from these areas likely travel as sheet flow and will reach Estates Road over a wide area, not a point. However, we believe that this gives a realistic estimate of how much water will reach Estates Road from these areas, although it all may not reach Estates at Indian Lane.

Runoff from GMN-1 and - 3 will combine at the northeast corner of GMS-4. It will be conveyed a short distance south to the proposed channel across GMS-4. GMS-3 runoff will collected in an open channel along the east boundary of GMS-4 and also conveyed to the proposed channel.
1.3.2 Southern Watersheds In the southern watersheds, improvements are planned for only GMS-4. Large lots similar to those planned for the other 2 parcels are proposed. Drainage improvements include an engineered channel to route flows from east to west through GMS-4.. A channel is also planned along the east boundary of GMS-4. This channel will collect runoff from GMN-1 and -3 and GMS-3 as described in section 1.3.1. It will also collect the stormwater crossing Golden Valley Road near the east ;boundary of NVHS. All of these flows will be conveyed to the east-west channel through GMS-4. This channel will have a 30 foot bottom width, $4: 1$ side slopes, and is capable of carrying the current effective FEMA flow rate of 960 cfs. The runoff from the NVHS outlet culverts will be piped from Golden Valley Road to the channel and discharge to it near Estates Road. This channel will also collect the flow from the piped system from Pond $B$. This flow will enter the channel upstream of Estates Drive. Figure $2 B$ shows the proposed conditions drainage pattern.

### 1.4 FEMA Floodplains

The parcels are located on Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) panel 32031C3027G (Figure 4). The north parcel is in Zone X (unshaded), outside the 100-year floodplain. The southern and central parcels are in Zone $X$ and Zone AE, in the 100 year floodplain with flood elevations determined. The flood elevations range from 5092 to 5104 feet, 1988 datum. The effective FEMA 100-year flow rate in this area is 969 cfs in Golden Valley Wash. A Letter of Map Revision is currently being reviewed by FEMA. When approved, it will reduce the width of the FEMA floodplain (Figure 5).

### 2.0 PREVIOUS STUDIES

Nolte and Associates, Washoe County, Nevada, Flood Insurance Study Hydrologic Analysis Final Project \# SD0338 HO, 1998. This study calculated the flow rates and defined the flood plain that is the current effective flood plain shown on the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) for the subject parcels. Nolte used regression equations developed by the U.S. Geological Survey to calculate the flow rates at different locations within Golden Valley. For the upstream section of Golden Valley Wash, the 100 year (or $1 \%$ chance) flow rate is 136 cubic feet per second (cfs). At Spearhead Way, the flow rate increases to 969 cfs. This is the flow rate through the Golden Mesa south parcel. Downstream of the parcel, at Browning Way, the flow rate increases to 1,904 cfs. These flow rates were used in a hydraulic model along with channel cross sections to determine the floodplain for Golden Valley Wash.

Stantec, Stead Drainage Master Plan, August, 2000. Stead and surrounding areas are part of the North Valleys, as is Golden Valley. Stead is near Swan Lake (also known as Lemmon Lake), which is the terminus of Golden Valley Wash. Swan Lake is a closed basin which means that discharge from the lake is by evaporation or infiltration only. Stantec's study was done to provide information on flow rates and runoff volumes for the region for existing and future conditions. They developed a hydrologic model (HEC-1) for this purpose. In their model, the subject parcel and the area draining to it are included in a single watershed, labeled GV-1. This watershed also included additional area that doesn't discharge onto these parcels. The area of GV-1 is 3.13 square miles. In their model, the runoff rate from GV-1 was 497 cfs under existing conditions.

North Valleys Flood Control Hydrologic Analysis and Mitigation Options, Quad Knopf, March 30, 2007. This study was conducted to determine the regulatory water surface elevations in Swan Lake and another playa, Silver Lake, should be. They adopted the Stantec model with a few modifications. Watershed GV-1 has the same area in this model as in Stantec's, but the runoff coefficients, or runoff Curve Numbers (CN), were modified. Quad Knopf subcontracted a consultant to provide more precise information for calculating the curve numbers. In general, the curve numbers are lower than in Stantec's model, but include a percent impervious area that partially offsets the lower CN. This study did not include a 100-year, 24 -hour storm event, so it provides helpful information (CN) but does not have model results to compare to other studies.

Hydrology Master Plan Tobler South Property, Nimbus Engineers, April, 2005. This report is a detailed hydrology report on the subject parcel, APN 552-100-01. This study analyzed the hydrology of this parcel and the area draining to it using a HEC-1 hydrologic model. It divided the drainage area into 11 watersheds in order to provide more detailed information of the flow rates at different locations. It calculated a 100 year flow rate of 287 cfs at the southwest corner of the project site. This is at the corner of Estates Road and Golden Valley Road. Currently, the water ponds here and then flows over Estates Road. In the proposed conditions model, it included 2 detention basins to mitigate the impacts of developing the parcel.
Hydrology Master Plan Golden Mesa North Project Revised, Quad Knopf, October, 2006. This report is a detailed hydrology report a parcel north of the Golden Mesa South property. It revises the area modeled in the Nimbus report on Tobler South slightly to provide more detail on
the northern parcel. It divides the total watershed area of 2.25 square miles into 14 watersheds. The model for this project calculated a 100-year, 24-hour flow rate of 358 cfs at the southwest corner of the southern parcel, at Estates Drive and Golden Valley Road. The reason for the increase in the flow rate is that the Tobler South report used a rainfall value of 2.664 inches while the Golden Mesa North report used 4.07 inches. Hence, this report in essence supersedes the Tobler South report.

Marlin and Lemmon Channels Floodplain Analysis \& Improvement Alternatives Final Report, Manhard, Feb., 2010. Manhard conducted a hydrologic and hydraulic analysis to evaluate means of mitigating the flood problems in Golden and Lemmon Valley. They used the EPA's SWMM hydrologic model to evaluate flow rates and the Corps of Engineers' HEC-RAS model to do hydraulic analysis. It appears that both GMN 9 and GMN 11 are in Manhard's Subbasin 14 which also includes additional area. The 100 year flow from Subbasin 14 is 91 cfs.

Master Drainage Study for Northstar Ranch Phases 1-4, Wood Rodgers, Nov. 22, 2005. This report analyzed the hydrology for the Northstar Ranch located at the southeast portion of the Golden Valley watershed. Four detention basins were included in the study to mitigate the impacts of the project.

Drainage Report for North Valleys High School, Odyssey Engineers, Nov. 1999. This report designed the drainage plan of the North Valleys High School (NVHS) and included a detention basin in their analysis. In the NVHS plan, much or all of the flow reaching Spearhead Drive is intercepted and routed west through the school property and into the detention basin. The basin discharges through a culvert under Golden Valley Road to Parcel 552-100-01.

Application for Letter of Map Revision Golden Mesa South Project Washoe County, Nevada, DEW Hydrology, June 8, 2017. When approved, this LOMR application will reduce the floodplain width of Golden Valley Wash through the southern parcel (GMS-4). This study uses the effective FEMA flow, 969 cfs, but uses newer and more detailed topographic data to reduce the floodplain width.

### 3.0 HYDROLOGIC ANALYSIS

### 3.1 Methodology

The U.S Army Corps of Engineers HEC-1 (v. 4.1R) computer program was used in this analysis. This program incorporates watershed area, time of concentration, curve number and precipitation data to compute peak flow rates and runoff volumes. These parameters and the values used in the model are discussed below. Procedures described in the Truckee Meadows Regional Drainage Manual (Manual) were followed in this analysis. A summary of the parameters is shown in Tables 1A, 1B, and 2.

Models were developed for the 100-year and 5-year events for existing and proposed conditions. The models are presented in Appendix C. In addition to maintaining peak flow rates at or below existing rates, the runoff volume must also be controlled. The increase in the 100year, 10-day storm volume must be retained on site. The 10-day storm models are also in appendix C .

### 3.2 Rainfall Depth and Distribution

Rainfall data was obtained from National Weather Service Website http://dipper.nws.noaa.gov/hdsc/pfds/sa/nv_pfds.html.. For this study, the the 100-year, 24-hour value of 3.97 inches was used in the northern portion and 3.87 in the southern portion of the watershed. The 5-year, 24-hour precipitation depth is 2.19 inches in the north and 2.14 inches in the south. A balanced storm distribution was used in this study.

### 3.3 Watershed Delineation

The Golden Mesa watershed boundaries are based on existing topography as well as subdivision grading, roads, ditches and other man-made features. The watershed affecting the proposed project area was divided into 25 sub-watersheds (Figure 2).

### 3.4 Runoff Curve Number

To calculate the runoff curve number (CN), the soil types within each sub-watershed were identified by hydrologic soil groups. Soils have been classified by the U.S. National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) into 4 hydrologic soil groups: A, B, C, and D. Infiltration rates decrease from soil groups $A$ through $D$. Group $A$ soils have a rapid infiltration rate and include very porous soils such as sands. Groups $B$ and $C$ have intermediate infiltration rates. Group $D$ soils have a very slow infiltration rate which results in a larger percentage of the rainfall contributing to runoff. The hydrologic soil groups were obtained from the NRCS web soil survey found at hitp://websoilsurvey.nrcs. usda.gov/app. The soils map (Figure 3) shows that soils affecting the project fall mostly into soil groups $C$ and $D$, with some $A$.

Relative soil moisture content is described in the NRCS methodology by the term "antecedent moisture condition" or AMC. Three different relative conditions are describe by the NRCS, AMC I, II and III. AMC I is an extremely dry condition and infiltration rates for the soil are near their maximum. AMC III is a saturated condition with limited infiltration and AMC II is an average
condition. As prescribed in the Truckee Meadows Regional Drainage Manual (Manual), AMC II was used in this analysis. Vegetation also is a factor in evaluating curve number. An investigation of the site showed that the vegetation type in the study area is sagebrush and cheatgrass in fair condition. The developed areas around Golden Mesa North are developed with a typical lot size of 1 acre. Golden Mesa North will have 30,000 square foot lots.

Curve numbers were based on the characteristics described above and Table 702 of the Manual. Curve number calculations are shown in Appendix B.

### 3.5 Watershed Lag Time

Watershed time of concentration is the time it takes for water to reach the watershed outlet from the most hydraulic distant point in the watershed. The watershed lag time is used for the SCS methodology in the HEC-1 program. Using the SCS methodology, the lag time (TLAG) is equal to 0.6 times the time of concentration $\left(T_{c}\right)$, or TLAG $=0.6 \times T_{c}$.

Table 703 and Figure 701 from the Regional Drainage Manual were used to calculate time of concentration for most watersheds. Calculations are presented in Appendix B.

### 3.6 Hydrograph Routing

Channel and overland flow routing were performed with the Muskingum-Cunge method. This method takes into account channel characteristics such as shape, slope, length and roughness.

### 3.7 Summary of Existing Conditions

Tables $1 A$ and $1 B$ show the watershed parameters under existing conditions.

| TABLE 1A. WATERSHED PARAMETERS, GOLDEN MESA NORTH WATERSHEDS |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WATERSHED | AREA, ACRES | AREA, SQ. MI. | CURVE NO. | LAG TIME, HR |
| GMN1 | 64.67 | 0.104 | 75 | 0.27 |
| GMN2 | 25.67 | 0.040 | 79 | 0.29 |
| GMN3 | 178.13 | 0.278 | 64 | 0.42 |
| GMN4 | 149.18 | 0.233 | 64 | 0.36 |
| GMN5A | 44.46 | 0.069 | 74 | 0.24 |
| GMN5B | 49.07 | 0.077 | 64 | 0.23 |
| GMN6 | 7.93 | 0.012 | 77 | 0.2 |
| GMN7 | 40.02 | 0.063 | 54 | 0.21 |
| GMN8 | 17.4 | 0.027 | 54 | 0.12 |
| GMN9 | 97.45 | 0.152 | 65 | 0.31 |
| GMN10 | 6.67 | 0.01 | 79 | 0.05 |
| GMN11 | 18.5 | 0.029 | 70 | 0.19 |
| GMN12 | 7.6 | 0.01 | 79 | 0.11 |


| TABLE 1B. WATERSHED PARAMETERS, GOLDEN MESA SOUTH WATERSHEDS |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WATERSHED | AREA, ACRES | AREA, SQ. MI. | CURVE NO. | LAG TIME, HR |
| GMS-1 | 46.79 | 0.073 | 75 | 0.26 |
| GMS-2 | 90.7 | 0.142 | 77 | 0.33 |
| GMS-3 | 128.09 | 0.20 | 63 | 0.34 |
| GMS-4 | 34.64 | 0.054 | 70 | 0.19 |
| NR-1 | 40.26 | 0.063 | 87 | 0.18 |
| NR-2 | 15.96 | 0.025 | 68 | 0.16 |
| RDG-1 | 26 | 0.041 | 78 | 0.16 |
| GH-1 | 5.7 | 0.009 | 85 | 0.12 |
| GH-2 | 22.54 | 0.035 | 78 | 0.17 |
| GH-3 | 32.28 | 0.050 | 78 | 0.21 |
| GH-4 | 17.39 | 0.027 | 79 | 0.17 |
| GH-5 | 62.39 | 0.097 | 80 | 0.2 |
| NVHS | 74.5 | 0.116 | 89 | 0.18 |

### 3.8 Proposed Conditions

Proposed conditions improvements are detailed in Section 1.3 and summarized below. The sub-watersheds proposed for development are GMN-9 (North), GMN-11 (Central) and GMS-4 (South). The proposed conditions parameters for these are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2. WATERSHED PARAMETERS, PROPOSED CONDITIONS

| WATERSHED | AREA, ACRES | AREA, SQ. MI. | CURVE NO. | LAG TIME, HR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GMN-9 | 97.45 | 0.152 | 76 | 0.32 |
| GMN-11 | 18.50 | 0.029 | 80 | 0.17 |
| GMS-4 | 34.64 | 0.054 | 80 | 0.18 |

To mitigate the impacts of developing these sub-watersheds, 2 detention basins are planned for the project (Figure 2B). Pond $A$ is at the northwest corner of GMN-9, near Estates Road. Pond $B$ is near the southwest corner of GMN-9. In addition, an engineered channel will be constructed through the southern parcel, GMS-4. This channel will flow from east to west collecting runoff from the east, north and south. It will end at the Estates Drive culverts. The channelized area upstream of the Estates Road culverts will be designed for use in detention/retention. The detention basins were first sized to mitigate the impacts of the project on peak flow rates, then modified to retain the increase in runoff volume as described in Section 3.10.

### 3.9 24-Hour Storm Results

Seven key design points (DP) were established to compare flow rates for existing and proposed conditions. These are shown on Figures $2 A$ and $2 B$ and are described below.

DP-1 is at the northwest corner of GMN-9 and is the flow from offsite watershed GMN-5B under existing conditions and the outflow from Pond $A$ under proposed conditions. This is the flow reaching Estates Road at the northern boundary of the project.

DP-2 is near the southwest corner of GMN-9 and is the flow rate that exits the northern portion of the project to Estates Road under existing conditions. Under proposed conditions, this is the flow leaving Pond $B$ and is piped southward to the southern parcel.

DP-3 is at the intersection of Indian Lane and Estates Drive. This is the flow that travels south adjacent to Estates Drive.

DP-4 is at the southern boundary of GMN-11 and is the flow rate leaving the central parcel.
DP-5 is at the point where the channel along Estates Drive enters the south parcel.
DP-6 is at the inlets to the culverts under Estates Drive and is the total flow from all watersheds, both north and south.

DP-7 is on the west side of Estates Drive, at the outlet of the Estates Drive culverts. This is the flow leaving the Golden Mesa Project and continuing to Swan Lake.

Table 4 shows the flow rates under existing and proposed conditions from the 24-hour event models.

| TABLE 3. Results From 24-Hour Storm Events, Flow Rates in cfs |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Point | 5-Year Storm |  | 100-Year Storm |  |  |
|  | Existing | Proposed | Existing | Proposed |  |
| DP-1 | 1 | 2 | 31 | 11 |  |
| DP-2 | 3 | 7 | 63 | 55 |  |
| DP-3 | 12 | 8 | 142 | 38 |  |
| DP-4 | 2 | 8 | 19 | 33 |  |
| DP-5 | 19 | 10 | 230 | 95 |  |
| DP-6 | 57 | 63 | 620 | 538 |  |
| DP-7 | 57 | 60 | 594 | 538 |  |

### 3.10 10-Day Storm Analysis

The ten day storm depth of 8.91 inches was used to determine the volume increase from the 3 parcels proposed for development. The results are shown in Table 4.

| TABLE 4. RUNOFF VOLUMES FROM 10-DAY STORM IN ACRE-FEET |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SUB-WATERSHED | EXISTING COND. | PROPOSED COND. | INCREASE |
| GMN-9 (North) | 22.6 | 31.5 | 8.9 |
| GMN-11 (Central) | 5.1 | 6.7 | 1.6 |
| GMS-4 (South) | 9.4 | 12.4 | 3.0 |

Table 4 shows that 13.5 acre-feet must be retained onsite to mitigate the impact on runoff volume. Percolation tests were conducted at the sites of proposed retention/detention basins to determine if they were suitable for retention and estimate the amount of time it would take to infiltrate the stored water. At Detention Basins $A$ and $B$ the percolation rates were $1 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hour}$. Two tests were run on the south parcel. Near the Estates Road culverts the rate was 2.25 $\mathrm{in} /$ hour and a test near the east property boundary the rate was $0.75 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hour}$. Storing water to a depth of 4.5 feet in Ponds $A$ and $B$ will account for the necessary storage. Since $4.5 \mathrm{ft}=54$ inches, the water would percolate in 54 hours, within the 72 hour limit.

### 4.0 SEDIMENTATION ANALYSIS

### 4.1 Sedimentation

A sedimentation study was conducted for the onsite watersheds and the offsite watersheds north and east of the Golden Mesa project. The area south of Golden Valley Road is almost entirely developed and the area drains into detention basins south of the Road, so we do not believe that significant amounts of sediment will reach Golden Mesa from that area. The Modified Universal Soil Loss Equation (MUSLE) as described in section 1305.3.4 of the Manual was used. Nine locations where sediment could enter the project site were identified and analysis conducted for them. The peak flow rates and flow volumes needed in the analysis were obtained from HEC-1 analysis of the 100-year, 50-year, 25-year, 10-year and 2-year storm events. Basic soils information was obtained from the National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) website. The soil erodibility factor, K , ranges from 0.1 to 0.32 . The average annual water yield, 15 mm or 0.05 feet, was estimated from Plate 3 A of Surface Water Hydrology (Wolman and Riggs, 1990). The sediment calculations are shown in Appendix E. The 9 locations and the average annual sediment yield and the yield during the 100-year event are shown in Table 6.

TABLE 5. Results From Sedimentation Analysis, Volumes in Cubic Yards

| Point | Source of Sediment | 100 -year Volume | Ave. Annual Volume |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $5 B$ | GMN-5B | 3.5 | 0.66 |
| $5 A$ | GMN-5A | 5.8 | 1.5 |
| 6 | GMN-6 | 0.7 | 0.5 |
| 9 | GMN-9 | 2.9 | 1.1 |
| $10+12$ | GMN-10+GMN-12 | 0.75 | 0.3 |
| $4+7+2$ | GMN-4+GMN-7+GMN2 | 5.6 | 2.7 |
| $3+1$ | GMN-3+GMN-1 | 16.5 | 7.8 |
| 11 | GMN-11 | 1.5 | 0.4 |
| $10+12$ | GMN10+12 | 0.75 | 0.3 |

The calculations and models are shown in Appendix E. The maximum volume of sediment at any location during a 24 -hour storm is 16.5 cubic yards. This is equal to 445.5 cubic feet. If this entire volume came during a 3 -minute period of the storm, the peak flow would be increased by only 2.5 cfs. All channels and detention/retention basins have adequate capacity to handle this increase. The detention/retention basins also have the capacity to contain the 3 year volumes. For example, 5B and 5A enter into Pond A. Their combined total of sediment over 3 years is 27.9 cubic yards. This is equal to 753.3 cubic feet or 0.02 acre-feet and this pond is designed to store at least 3.8 acre-feet. Therefore a regular inspection program consisting of inspecting the facilities annually and after significant events, and performing routine maintenance should keep the facilities functioning properly.

### 5.0 HYDRAULIC ANALYSIS

### 5.1 South Parcel Channel

A channel is proposed to convey water from east to west across the southern parcel. It will originate at the east parcel boundary and terminate at Estates Road, discharging to the existing 18 -inch and 36 -inch culverts under Estates Road. The channel will have a 30 -inch base and have $4: 1$ side slopes. Two drop structures and one road crossing are planned for this channel. A HEC-RAS model was prepared to evaluate the capacity of the channel. This model is presented in Appendix F. The model results show that this channel can convey any expected flows, even the current FEMA flow rate of 960 cfs with adequate freeboard.

### 6.0 FINDINGS

The findings of this study are:

- Stormwater from the watershed impacting the Golden Mesa project currently collects on GMS-4 in the northeast corner of the intersection of East Golden Valley Road and Estates Road. It then flows westward under Estates Road. In extreme events, it may overtop Estates Road. The stormwater eventually reaches Swan Lake.
- The development of 3 parcels for the Golden Mesa Project will increase the peak runoff rates and volumes from the parcels.
- The impacts on the regional flow rate will be mitigated by two planned detention/retention basins and channels.
- The 5 -year flow rate leaving the project site will increase by 3 cfs.
- 5-year and 100-year flow rates in the channel adjacent to Estates Road will be reduced.
- The 100-year flow rate leaving the site will be reduced by 56 cfs.
- The increase in stormwater volume can be retained on site through the use of detention/retention basins. Percolation tests indicate that the stored water will infiltrate within the required 72 hours.
- The proposed facilities are designed to function even with the estimated sediment load.
- The project as proposed can be constructed without increasing the flood hazard to adjacent or downstream residents.
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## APPENDIX B

## SUPPORTING CALCULATIONS

NOAA Atlas 14, Volume 1, Version 5
Location name: Reno, Nevada, USA*
Latitude: $39.6079^{\circ}$, Longitude: $-119.8263^{\circ}$
Elevation: $5101.59 \mathrm{ft}^{* *}$
source: ESRI Maps
** source: USGS

## POINT PRECIPITATION FREQUENCY ESTIMATES

Sanja Perica, Sarah Dietz, Sarah Heim, Lillian Hiner, Kazungu Maitaria, Deborah Martin, Sandra Paviovic, Ishani Roy, Carl Trypaluk, Dale Unruh, Fenglin Yan, Michael Yekta, Tan Zhao, Geoffrey Bonnin, Daniel Brewer, Li-Chuan Chen, Tye Parzybok, John Yarchoan

NOAA, National Weather Service, Silver Spring, Maryland
PF tabular | PF graphical | Maps \& aerials
PF tabular

| PDS-based point precipitation frequency estimates with $90 \%$ confidence intervals (in inches) ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Duration | Average recurrence interval (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 50 | 100 | 200 | 500 | 1000 |
| 5-min | 0.102 <br> $(0.086-0.117)$ | 0.126 <br> $(0.107-0.147)$ | 0.168 <br> $(0.144-0.198)$ | 0.209 <br> $(0.178-0.248)$ | 0.278 <br> $(0.231-0.334)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.343 \\ (0.276-0.417) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.421 \\ (0.328-0.520) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.516 \\ (0.387-0.652) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.672 \\ (0.475-0.879) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.817 \\ (0.553-1.09) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 10-mi | $\begin{gathered} 0.154 \\ (0.131-0.177) \end{gathered}$ | 0.192 <br> $(0.163-0.224)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.256 \\ (0.219-0.302) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.318 \\ (0.271-0.377) \end{gathered}$ | 0.423 <br> $(0.351-0.508)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.522 \\ (0.421-0.635) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.640 \\ (0.500-0.792) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.785 \\ (0.589-0.992) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.02 \\ (0.724-1.34) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.24 \\ (0.842-1.67) \end{gathered}$ |
| 15-min | $\begin{gathered} 0.192 \\ (0.162-0.220) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.238 <br> $(0.202-0.277)$ | 0.318 <br> $(0.271-0.374)$ | 0.395 <br> $(0.336-0.468)$ | 0.525 <br> $(0.436-0.630)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.647 \\ (0.521-0.787) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.793 \\ (0.619-0.981) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.973 \\ (0.729-1.23) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.27 \\ (0.897-1.66) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.54 \\ (1.04-2.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| 30-m | $\begin{gathered} 0.258 \\ (0.218-0.296) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.321 \\ (0.272-0.374) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.428 \\ (0.365-0.504) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.532 \\ (0.452-0.630) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.707 <br> $(0.587-0.849)$ | 0.871 <br> $(0.702-1.06)$ | 1.07 <br> $(0.834-1.32)$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.31 \\ (0.982-1.66) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.71 \\ (1.21-2.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline 2.08 \\ (1.41-2.78) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $60-\mathrm{min}$ | 0.320 <br> $(0.270-0.367)$ | 0.397 <br> $(0.337-0.462)$ | 0.530 <br> $(0.452-0.624)$ | 0.658 <br> $(0.560-0.779)$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.875 \\ (0.727-1.05) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline 1.08 \\ (0.869-1.31) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.32 \\ (1.03-1.64) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.62 \\ (1.22-2.05) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.11 \\ (1.50-2.76) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.57 \\ (1.74-3.44) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2-hr | $\begin{gathered} 0.424 \\ (0.376-0.484) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 0.526 \\ (0.469-0.603) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0.673 <br> $(0.593-0.774)$ <br> $(0.800$ | 0.803 <br> $(0.698-0.923)$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.00 \\ (0.850-1.16) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.19 \\ (0.979-1.39) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.40 \\ (1.13-1.66) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.68 \\ (1.30-2.07) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.19 \\ (1.62-2.79) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.69 \\ (1.91-3.48) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 3-hr | $\begin{gathered} 0.516 \\ (0.463-0.582) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.641 \\ (0.580-0.726) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.800 \\ (0.719-0.905) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.931 \\ (0.828-1.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.12 \\ (0.977-1.27) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.28 \\ (1.10-1.48) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.48 \\ (1.25-1.73) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.76 \\ (1.45-2.09) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.25 \\ (1.80-2.82) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.71 \\ (2.11-3.51) \end{gathered}$ |
| 6-hr | $\begin{gathered} 0.753 \\ (0.680-0.841) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.941 \\ (0.848-1.05) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.16 \\ (1.04-1.30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.33 \\ (1.18-1.49) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.54 \\ (1.36-1.74) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.70 \\ (1.48-1.94) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.87 \\ (1.61-2.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.07 \\ (1.75-2.41) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.47 \\ (2.05-2.92) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.89 \\ (2.36-3.55) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 12-hr | $\begin{gathered} 1.03 \\ (0.927-1.15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.29 \\ (1.16-1.44) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.62 \\ (1.45-1.81) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.88 \\ (1.67-2.10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.21 \\ (1.95-2.50) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.47 \\ (2.15-2.81) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.74 \\ (2.35-3.15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.00 \\ (2.53-3.50) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.36 \\ (2.76-3.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.66 \\ (2.94-4.41) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 24-hr | $\begin{gathered} 1.36 \\ (1.23-1.53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.71 \\ (1.54-1.92) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.17 \\ (1.95-2.43) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2.55 \\ (2.28-2.85) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3.07 \\ (2.73-3.44) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.49 \\ (3.08-3.92) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.93 \\ (3.44-4.44) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.39 \\ (3.80-4.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.02 \\ (4.27-5.76) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.53 \\ (4.63-6.41) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2-day | $\begin{gathered} 1.67 \\ (1.49-1.90) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.11 \\ (1.88-2.40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.72 \\ (2.41-3.09) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.22 \\ (2.84-3.65) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.93 \\ (3.44-4.47) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.50 \\ (3.91-5.15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.11 \\ (4.38-5.89) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.76 \\ (4.88-6.69) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.68 \\ (5.54-7.87) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.42 \\ (6.05-8.87) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3-day | $\begin{gathered} 1.83 \\ (1.62-2.08) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.32 \\ (2.06-2.64) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.02 \\ (2.68-3.44) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.61 \\ (3.18-4.11) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.44 \\ (3.87-5.07) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.12 \\ (4.43-5.87) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.86 \\ (5.00-6.76) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.64 \\ (5.59-7.72) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.76 \\ (6.39-9.15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.68 \\ (7.02-10.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4-day | $\begin{gathered} 1.98 \\ (1.75-2.26) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.53 \\ (2.23-2.88) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.33 \\ (2.94-3.80) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.99 \\ (3.51-4.56) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.95 \\ (4.31-5.67) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.74 \\ (4.95-6.59) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.60 \\ (5.61-7.63) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.52 \\ (6.30-8.75) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.85 \\ (7.24-10.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.94 \\ (8.00-11.9) \end{gathered}$ |
| 7-day | $\begin{gathered} 2.35 \\ (2.06-2.72) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.01 \\ (2.63-3.49) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.02 \\ (3.50-4.65) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.83 \\ (4.19-5.60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.00 \\ (5.15-6.97) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.95 \\ (5.91-8.11) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.98 \\ (6.72 .9 .38) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.07 \\ (7.54-10.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.6 \\ (8.65-12.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.9 \\ (9.55-14.5) \end{gathered}$ |
| 10-day | $\begin{gathered} 2.67 \\ (2.33-3.08) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.43 \\ (3.00-3.96) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.58 \\ (3.99-5.29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.50 \\ (4.78-6.35) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.78 \\ (5.84-7.86) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7.81 \\ (6.67-9.08) \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.91 \\ (7.53-10,4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.1 \\ (8.39-11.9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.7 \\ (9.56-13.9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.0 \\ (10.5-15.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 20-day | $\begin{gathered} 3.45 \\ (3.03-3.97) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.44 \\ (3.89-5.11) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.90 \\ (5.16-6.79) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.03 \\ (6.13-8.09) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8.57 \\ (7.42-9.87) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.76 \\ (8.40-11.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.0 \\ (9.38-12.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12.3 \\ (10.4-14.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.1 \\ (11.7-16.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15.5 \\ (12.7-18.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 30-day | $\begin{gathered} 4.12 \\ (3.61-4.75) \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.30 \\ (4.66-6.13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.04 \\ (6.16-8.13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 8.38 <br> $(7.31-9.66)$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.2 \\ (8.84-11.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.6 \\ (9.99-13.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.1 \\ (11.1-15.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 14.6 \\ (12.3-17.1) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.6 \\ (13.9-19.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18.3 \\ (15.0-21.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 45-day | $\begin{gathered} 4.98 \\ (4.36-5.64) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.42 \\ (5.63-7.28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.50 \\ (7.44-9.63) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.1 \\ (8.78-11.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12.1 \\ (10.5-13.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 13.7 \\ (11.8-15.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15.3 \\ (13.1-17.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.9 \\ (14.4-19.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19.2 \\ (16.1-22.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.9 \\ (17.3-24.5) \end{gathered}$ |
| 60-day | $\begin{gathered} 5.73 \\ (4.99-6.51) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.43 \\ (6.48-8.44) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.83 \\ (8.56-11.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.6 \\ (10.0-13.1) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.8 \\ (11.9-15.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15.4 \\ (13.2-17.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17.0 \\ (14.5-19.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18.6 \\ (15.8-21.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.7 \\ (17.4-24.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22.2 \\ (18.5-26.0) \end{gathered}$ |

[^0]NOAA Atlas 14, Volume 1, Version 5
Location name: Reno, Nevada, USA*
Latitude: $39.6077^{\circ}$, Longitude: $-119.8174^{\circ}$
Elevation: $5125.64 \mathrm{ft}^{* *}$
source: ESRI Maps
** source: USGS

Sanja Perica, Sarah Dietz, Sarah Heim, Lillian Miner, Kazungu Maitaria, Deborah Martin, Sandra Pavlovic, Ishani Roy, Carl Trypaluk, Dale Unruh, Fenglin Man, Michael Yekta, Tan Zhao, Geoffrey Bonnin, Daniel Brewer, Li-Chuan Chen, Tye Parzybok, John Yarchoan

NOAA, National Weather Service, Silver Spring, Maryland
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## PDS-based point precipitation frequency estimates with $90 \%$ confidence intervals (in inches) ${ }^{1}$


${ }^{1}$ Precipitation frequency (PF) estimates in this table are based on frequency analysis of partial duration series (PDS).
Numbers in parenthesis are PF estimates at lower and upper bounds of the $90 \%$ confidence interval. The probability that precipitation frequency estimates (for a given duration and average recurrence interval) will be greater than the upper bound (or less than the lower bound) is $5 \%$. Estimates at upper bounds are not checked against probable maximum precipitation (PMP) estimates and may be higher than currently valid PMP values.
Please refer to NOAA Atlas 14 document for more information.

CURVE NUMBER CALCULATION WORKSHEET


PROJECT: Golden Mesa
SUBBASIN: GMN-3
AREA, AC.: 178.13
CALCULATED BY: DEW

|  |  | CALCULA | BY: | W |  | REMARKS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HSG | LAND USE | AREA, | FRACTION | WTD. |  |  |
|  | \& CONDITION | ACRES | OF AREA | CN* | CN |  |
| A | Brush/fair cond. | 52.13 | 0.293 | 35 | 10.2 |  |
| C | Brush/fair cond. | 10.30 | 0.058 | 70 | 4.0 |  |
| D | Brush/fair cond. | 86.80 | 0.487 | 77 | 37.5 |  |
| None | Brush/fair cond. | 28.90 | 0.162 | 77 | 12.5 |  |
|  |  |  | 0.000 |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  |  | 0.000 |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  | 178.13 | 1.000 |  |  |  |
|  |  | FINAL CN VALUE: |  |  | 64.3 |  |
| *Curve | r values based on | Meadow | Regional Dra | ge M | al (200) |  |

CURVE NUMBER CALCULATION WORKSHEET
PROJECT: Golden Mesa
SUBBASIN: GMN-4
AREA, AC.: 149.18
CALCULATED BY: DEW

| HSG | LAND USE CONDITIO | AREA, | FRACTION | WTD. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ACRES | OF AREA | CN* | CN | REMARKS |
| A | 1 acre lots | 29.35 | 0.197 | 51 | 10.0 |  |
| D | 1 acre lots | 9.85 | 0.066 | 84 | 5.5 |  |
| A | Brush/fair | 29.65 | 0.199 | 35 | 7.0 |  |
| D | Brush/fair | 80.15 | 0.537 | 77 | 41.4 |  |
| 0.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 149.00 | 0.999 |  |  |  |
|  |  | FINAL | FINAL CN VALUE: 63.9 |  | 63.9 |  |

*Curve number values based on Truckee Meadows Regional Drainage Manual (2009)
PROJECT: Golden Mesa
SUBBASIN: GMN-5A
AREA, AC.: 44.5
CALCULATED BY: DEW

| HSG | LAND USE CONDITIO | AREA, ACRES | FRACTION OF AREA | WTD. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | CN* | CN | REMARKS |
| A | Brush/fair | 0.00 | 0.000 | 35 | 0.0 |  |
| C | Brush/fair | 17.90 | 0.402 | 70 | 28.2 |  |
| D | Brush/fair | 26.60 | 0.598 | 77 | 46.0 |  |
| 0.00 |  |  | 0.000 | 77 | 0.0 |  |
|  |  |  | 0.000 |  | 0.0 |  |
| 44.50 |  |  | 1.000 |  |  |  |
| FINAL CN VALUE: 74.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Curve number values based on Truckee Meadows Regional Drainage Manual (2009)

PROJECT: Golden Mesa
SUBBASIN: GMN-6
AREA, AC.: 7.93
CALCULATED BY: DEW

| LAND USE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| HSG | CONDITIO | ACRES | FRACTION | OF AREA | CN* | WTD. |
| CN | REMARKS |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | Brush/fair | 0.00 | 0.000 | 35 | 0.0 |  |
| C | Brush/fair | 0.21 | 0.026 | 70 | 1.9 |  |
| D | Brush/fair | 7.71 | 0.972 | 77 | 74.9 |  |
| 0.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 7.92 | 0.999 |  |  |  |
|  |  | FINAL CN VALUE: |  | 76.7 |  |  |

*Curve number values based on Truckee Meadows Regional Drainage Manual (2009)

CURVE NUMBER CALCULATION WORKSHEET
PROJECT: Golden Mesa
SUBBASIN: GMN-7
AREA, AC.: 40.02
CALCULATED BY: DEW

| HSG | LAND USE CONDITIO | AREA, | FRACTION | WTD. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ACRES | OF AREA | CN* | CN | REMARKS |
| A | 1 acre lots | 35.60 | 0.890 | 51 | 45.4 |  |
| C | 1 acre lots | 4.42 | 0.110 | 79 | 8.7 |  |
|  |  |  | 0.000 |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  |  | 0.000 |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  | 40.02 | 1.000 |  |  |  |
|  |  | FINAL | CN VALUE: |  | 54.1 |  |

* Curve number values based on Truckee Meadows Regional Drainage Manual (2009)

PROJECT: Golden Mesa
SUBBASIN: GMN-8
AREA, AC.: 17.4
CALCULATED BY: DEW

| HSG | LAND USE : CONDITIO | AREA, ACRES | FRACTION OF AREA | CN* | WTD. CN | REMARKS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | 1-acre lots | 15.79 | 0.907 | 51 | 46.3 |  |
| C | 1-acre lots | 1.43 | 0.082 | 79 | 6.5 |  |
| D | 1-acre lots | 0.18 | 0.010 | 84 | 0.9 |  |
|  |  |  | 0.000 |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  |  | 0.000 |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  | 17.40 | 1.000 |  |  |  |
|  |  | FINAL | CN VALUE: |  | 53.6 |  |

* Curve number values based on Truckee Meadows Regional Drainage Manual (2009)

PROJECT: Golden Mesa
SUBBASIN:GMN-9 Existing conditions
AREA, AC.: 97.45
CALCULATED BY: DEW

| HSG | LAND USE CONDITIO | AREA, | FRACTION | WTD. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ACRES | OF AREA | CN* | CN | REMARKS |
| A | Brush/fair | 18.62 | 0.191 | 35 | 6.7 |  |
| C | Brush/fair | 60.74 | 0.623 | 70 | 43.6 |  |
| D | Brush/fair | 18.09 | 0.186 | 77 | 14.3 |  |
|  |  |  | 0.000 |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  |  | 0.000 |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  | 97.45 | 1.000 |  |  |  |
|  |  | FINA | CN VALUE: |  | 64.6 |  |

*Curve number values based on Truckee Meadows Regional Drainage Manual (2009)

CURVE NUMBER CALCULATION WORKSHEET
PROJECT: Golden Mesa
SUBBASIN: GMN-10
AREA, AC.: 3.87
CALCULATED BY: DEW

| HSG | LAND USE CONDITIO | AREA, ACRES | FRACTION OF AREA | CN* | WTD. CN | REMARKS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | 1 acre lots | 0.00 | 0.000 | 51 | 0.0 |  |
| C | 1 acre lots | 3.87 | 1.000 | 79 | 79.0 |  |
|  |  |  | 0.000 |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  |  | 0.000 |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  | 3.87 | 1.000 |  |  |  |
|  |  | FINAL | CN VALUE: |  | 79.0 |  |

* Curve number values based on Truckee Meadows Regional Drainage Manual (2009)

SUBBASIN: GMN-11 Existing conditions
AREA, AC.: 34.05
CALCULATED BY: DEW

| HSG | LAND USE CONDITIO | AREA, ACRES | FRACTION OF AREA | CN* | WTD. CN | REMARKS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Brush/fair | 0.00 | 0.000 | 51 | 0.0 |  |
| C | Brush/fair | 18.56 | 0.545 | 70 | 38.2 |  |
| D | Brush/fair | 0.00 | 0.000 | 84 | 0.0 |  |
|  |  |  | 0.000 |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  |  | 0.000 |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  | 18.56 | 0.545 |  |  |  |
|  |  | FINAL CN VALUE: |  | 38.2 |  |  |

* Curve number values based on Truckee Meadows Regional Drainage Manual (2009)


CURVE NUMBER CALCULATION WORKSHEET
PROJECT: Golden Mesa
SUBBASIN: GMN-9 Proposed conditions
AREA, AC.: 97.45
CALCULATED BY: DEW

| HSG | LAND USE : CONDITIO | AREA, ACRES | FRACTION OF AREA | CN* | WTD. CN | REMARKS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | 75 acre lot: | 18.62 | 0.191 | 53 | 10.1 |  |
| C | 75 acre lot: | 60.74 | 0.623 | 80 | 49.9 |  |
| D | 75 acre lot: | 18.09 | 0.186 | 85 | 15.8 |  |
|  |  |  | 0.000 |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  | 97.45 | 1.000 |  |  |  |
| FINAL CN VALUE: |  |  |  | 75.8 |  |  |

*Curve number values based on Truckee Meadows Regional Drainage Manual (2009)


PROJECT: Golden Mesa
SUBBASIN: GMN-11 Proposed conditions
AREA, AC.: 18.56
CALCULATED BY: DEW

| HSG | LAND USE : CONDITIO | AREA, ACRES | FRACTION OF AREA | CN* | WTD. CN | REMARKS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | 75 acre lot: | 0.00 | 0.000 | 53 | 0.0 |  |
| C | 75 acre lot: | 18.56 | 1.000 | 80 | 80.0 |  |
| D | 75 acre lot: | 0.00 | 0.000 | 85 | 0.0 |  |
|  |  |  | 0.000 |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  |  | 0.000 |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  | 18.56 | 1.000 |  |  |  |
| FINAL CN VALUE: |  |  |  |  | 80.0 |  |

* Curve number values based on Truckee Meadows Regional Drainage Manual (2009)

PROJECT: Golden Mesa
SUBBASIN: GMN-5B Existing conditions
AREA, AC.: 49.07
CALCULATED BY: DEW

| HSG | LAND USE CONDITIO | AREA, ACRES | FRACTION OF AREA | CN* | WTD. CN | REMARKS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Brush/fair | 14.00 | 0.285 | 35 | 10.0 |  |
| C | Brush/fair | 9.48 | 0.193 | 70 | 13.5 |  |
| D | Brush/fair | 22.68 | 0.462 | 77 | 35.6 |  |
| None |  | 2.90 | 0.059 | 77 | 4.6 | Bare rock |
|  |  |  | 0.000 |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  | 49.06 | 1.000 |  |  |  |
| FINAL CN VALUE: |  |  |  | 63.6 |  |  |

## CURVE NUMBER CALCULATION WORKSHEET

PROJECT: Golden Valley CALCULATED BY: SUBBASIN: GMS-1
TOTAL AREA: $\quad 46.79$ ACRES

PROJECT: Golden Valley CALCULATED BY: DEW

SUBBASIN: GMS-2
TOTAL AREA: 90.1 ACRES


CURVE NUMBER CALCULATION WORKSHEET
PROJECT: Golden Valley CALCULATED BY: DEW
SUBBASIN: GMS-3
TOTAL AREA: 133.49 ACRES



PROJECT: Golden Valley CALCULATED BY: DEW
SUBBASIN: GMS-4 DEVELOPED
TOTAL AREA: 34.64 ACRES

| HSG | AREA, ACRES | FRACTION OF AREA | LAND USE \& CONDITION | CN | WTD. CN | REMARKS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | 27.64 | 0.798 | . 75 acre lots | 80 | 63.8 |  |
| C | 7 | 0.202 | Open space (channel) | 79 | 16.0 |  |
|  |  | 0.000 |  | 79 | 0.0 |  |
|  |  | 0.000 |  | 84 | 0.0 |  |
|  |  | 0.000 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
|  | 34.64 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | FINAL CN VALU |  | 79.8 |  |

## CURVE NUMBER CALCULATION WORKSHEET

PROJECT: Golden Valley CALCULATED BY: DEW

SUBBASIN: GH-1
TOTAL AREA: 5.7 ACRES

| HSG | AREA, ACRES | FRACTION OF AREA | LAND USE \& CONDITION | CN | WTD. CN | REMARKS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D | 4.85 | 0.851 | 0.25 acre lots | 87 | 74.0 |  |
| D | 0.85 | 0.149 | Sage w/grass und/ fair | 70 | 10.4 |  |
|  |  | 0.000 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  | 0.000 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  | 0.000 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
|  | 5.7 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | FINAL CN VALU |  | 84.5 |  |

PROJECT: Golden Valley CALCULATED BY: DEW

SUBBASIN: GH-2
TOTAL AREA: 22.54 ACRES

| HSG | AREA, - ACRES | FRACTION OFAREA | LAND USE \& CONDITION | CN | WTD. CN | REMARKS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D | 10.8 | 0.479 | 0.25 ac lots | 87 | 41.7 |  |
| D | 11.74 | 0.521 | Sage w/ grass und./fair | 70 | 36.5 |  |
|  |  | 0.000 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  | 0.000 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
|  | 22.54 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | FINAL CN VALUE |  | 78.1 |  |

PROJECT: Golden Valley CALCULATED BY: DEW

SUBBASIN: GH-3
TOTAL AREA: 32.28 ACRES


## CURVE NUMBER CALCULATION WORKSHEET

```
PROJECT: Golden Valley CALCULATED BY: DEW
SUBBASIN: GH-4
TOTAL AREA: 17.39 ACRES
```

| HSG | AREA, ACRES | FRACTION OF AREA | LAND USE \& CONDITION | CN | WTD. CN | REMARKS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D | 8.64 | 0.497 | 0.25 acre lots | 87 | 43.2 |  |
| D | 8.82 | 0.507 | sage w/ grass und/ fair | 70 | 35.5 |  |
|  |  | 0.000 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  | 0.000 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
|  | 17.46 | 1.004 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | FINAL CN VALU |  | 78.7 |  |



PROJECT: Golden Valley CALCULATED BY: DEW SUBBASIN:
TOTAL AREA: 1 ACRES

| HSG | AREA, ACRES | FRACTION OF AREA | LAND USE \& CONDITION | CN | WTD. CN | REMARKS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.5 | 0.500 |  | 0 | 0.0 |  |
|  | 0.5 | 0.500 |  | 0 | 0.0 |  |
|  |  | 0.000 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
|  |  | 0.000 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
|  | 1 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | FINAL CN VA |  | 0.0 |  |

## CURVE NUMBER CALCULATION WORKSHEET

SUBBASIN: NR-1
TOTAL AREA: 40.26 ACRES

|  | AREA, | FRACTION | LAND USE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HSG | ACRES | OF AREA | \& CONDITION | CN | WTD. |
| CN | 40.26 | 1.000 | .25 acre lots | 87 | 87.0 |
|  |  | 0.000 |  |  | 0.0 |
|  | 40.26 | 1.000 |  |  | REMARKS |

PROJECT: Golden Mesa South CALCULATED BY: DEW
SUBBASIN: NR-2
TOTAL AREA: 15.6 ACRES


SUBBASIN: RDG=1
TOTAL AREA: 26 ACRES

|  | AREA, | FRACTION <br> HSG <br> ACRES | LAND USE <br> \& CONDITION | CN | WTD. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CN | REMARKS |  |  |  |  |
| D | 26 | 1.000 | .25 acre lots | 87 | 87.0 |
|  |  | 0.000 |  |  | 0.0 |
|  | 26 | 1.000 |  |  | 87.0 |

PROJECT: Golden Mesa South CALCULATED BY: DEW

SUBBASIN: NVHS
TOTAL AREA: 74.5 ACRES

|  | AREA, | FRACTION | LAND USE | WTD. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HSG | ACRES | OF AREA | \& CONDITION | CN | CN | REMARKS |
| C | 26.74 | 0.359 | SCHOOL | 86 | 30.9 | Est impervious area |
| D | 47.76 | 0.641 | SCHOOL | 90 | 57.7 | at 50\%, CN estimated |
|  | 0 | 0.000 |  |  | 0.0 | from table based on |
|  |  | 0.000 |  | 0.0 | that. |  |
|  | 74.5 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 88.6 |  |

TIME OF CONCENTRATION CALCULATIONS
PROJECT: Golden Mesa (south watersheds)

| $\begin{gathered} \text { SUB-BASIN } \\ \text { DATA } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  | INITIAL/OVERLAND TIME |  |  | TRAVEL TIME, $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}}$ |  |  |  |  | URANIZED BASINS CHECK |  | FINAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{t}_{1}$ |  |  | L, | S, | Vel, | TRAVEL TIME, | $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | TOTAL | $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{c}}$ |  |
| NAME | CN | R | L, FT | S, \% | TIME, $\mathrm{t}_{\text {i }}$ | ft | \% | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | tt, , min | $t_{1}+t_{t}$ | LENGTH, FT |  | min |
| GH-1 | 84.5 | 0.73 | 418 | 7.7 | 7.03 | 673 | 1.2 | 2.25 | 4.99 | 12.01 | 1091 | 16.06 | 12.01 |
| GH-2 | 78.1 | 0.64 | 470 | 2.8 | 12.75 | 783 | 1 | 2 | 6.53 | 19.28 | 1253 | 16.96 | 16.96 |
| GH-3 | 78.4 | 0.64 | 313 | 5.1 | 8.47 | 418 | 2.41 | 2 | 3.48 | 11.95 | 731 | 14.06 |  |
| GH-3 cont |  | \#\#\#\# | 0 |  | 0.00 | 1260 | 2.1 | 2.9 | 10.72 | 22.67 | 1991 | 21.06 | 21.06 |
| GH-4 | 78.5 | 0.65 | 500 | 2.8 | 13.00 | 63 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 0.58 | 13.59 | 563 | 13.13 |  |
| GH-4 cont |  | \#\#\#\# |  |  | \#VALUE! | 626 | 1 | 2 | 5.22 | 18.80 | 1189 | 16.61 | 16.61 |
| GH-5 | 79.7 | 0.66 | 500 | 2.8 | 12.55 | 261 | 3 | 1.8 | 2.42 | 14.97 | 761 | 14.23 |  |
| GH-5 cont |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! | 992 | 0.7 | 1.74 | 9.50 | 24.47 | 1753 | 19.74 | 19.74 |
| NVHS | 89 | 0.78 | 677 | 19.8 | 5.51 | 1636 | 0.6 | 1.55 | 17.59 | 23.10 | 2313 | 22.85 | 18 |
| GMS-1 | 75 | 0.6 | 0 | 1 | 0.00 | 2797 | 3.6 | 1.8 | 25.90 | 25.90 | 2797 | 25.54 | 26 |
| GMS-2 | 77 | 0.63 | 240 | 2.5 | 9.76 | 4260 | 3.6 | 3 | 23.67 | 33.43 | 4500 | 35.00 | 33 |
| GMS-3 | 65 | 0.47 | 100 | 2 | 9.05 | 4181 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 29.03 | 38.08 | 4281 | 33.78 | 34 |
| GMS-4* | 63 | 0.44 | 494 | 1.6 | 22.56 | 1140 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 23.75 | 46.31 | 1634 | 19.08 | 19 |
| NR-1 | 78 | 0.64 | 170 | 1.2 | 10.17 | 1094 | 2.6 | 1.8 | 10.13 | 20.30 | 1264 | 17.02 | 17 |
| NR-2 | 83 | 0.71 | 300 | 4.3 | 7.60 | 2797 | 3.6 | 2.7 | 17.27 | 24.86 | 3097 | 27.21 | 24 |
| RDG-1 | 78 | 0.64 | 303 | 5.28 | 8.33 | 1204 | 7.3 | 2.6 | 7.72 | 16.05 | 1507 | 18.37 | 16 |
|  |  | -0.39 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | 0 | 10.00 |  |
| GMS-4** | 80 | 0.67 | 234 | 1 | 11.95 | 1170 | 1 | 1.5 | 13.00 | 24.95 | 1404 | 17.80 | 18 |

Velocity for travel time calculations from Fig. 701 in TMRDM $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{c}}=(\mathrm{L} / 180)+10$
**Developed conditions $t_{i}=((1.8)(1.1-R))\left(L^{\wedge} .5 / S^{\wedge} .33\right)$ Urbanized basins check:

* Undeveloped conditions
TIME OF CONCENTRATION CALCULATIONS

| $\begin{gathered} \text { SUB-BASIN } \\ \text { DATA } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  | INITIAL/OVERLAND TIME |  |  | travel time, $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}}$ |  |  |  |  | URANIzED basins check |  | FINAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{t}_{1}$ |  |  | L, | S, | Vel, | travel time, | $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | total | $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{c}}$ |  |
| NAME | CN | R | L, FT | s, \% | TIME, $t_{1}$ | ft | \% | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | tt, min | $t_{i}+t_{t}$ | LENGTH, FT |  | min |
| RDG 1 | 78 | 0.64 | 303 | 5.28 | 8.330287 | 1204 | 7.3 | 2.6 | 7.71794872 | 16.04824 | 1507 | 18.37222 | 16 |
| RDG 2* | 78 | 0.64 | 160 | 0.3 | 15.59616 | 1706 | 12.5 | 1.4 | 20.3095238 | 35.90569 | 1866 | 20.36667 | * |
| NR-1 | 87 | 0.76 | 227 | 15.85 | 3.722148 | 727 | 0.55 | 1.1 | 11.0151515 | 14.7373 | 954 | 15.3 |  |
| NR-1 cont | 0 | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! | 986 | 5.1 | 4.8 | 3.42361111 | 18.16091 | 1940 | 20.77778 | 18 |
|  |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  |
| RDG-1 | 87 | 0.76 | 300 | 10 | 4.981395 | 2520 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 10.7692308 | 15.75063 | 2820 | 25.66667 | 11 |
|  |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#VALUE! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | -0.39 |  |  | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX C

HEC-1 MODELS

5-YEAR EXISTING CONDITIONS
$1 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *$
$*$
$*$
$*$
$*$
$*$
$*$

```
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
HYDROLOGIC ENGINEERING CENTER
    609 SECOND STREET
    DAVIS, CALIFORNIA }9561
        (916) 756-1104
```

| $X$ | $X$ | $X X X X X X X$ | $X X X X X X$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |  |
| $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |  | $X X$ |
| $X X X X X X X$ | $X X X X$ | $X$ |  | $X X X X X$ | $X$ |
| $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |  |  |
| $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |  |  |  |
| $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |  |
| $X$ | $X$ | $X X X X X X X$ | $X X X X X$ |  | $X$ |
| $X$ | $X X X$ |  |  |  |  |

THIS PROGRAM REPLACES ALL PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF HEC-1 KNOWN AS HEC1 (JAN 73), HEC1GS, HEC1DE, AND HEC1KW.
THE DEFINITIONS OF VARIABLES -RTIMP- AND -RTIOR- HAVE CHANGED FROM THOSE USED WITH THE 1973-STYLE INPUT STRUCTURE THE DEFINITION OF -AMSKK- ON RM-CARD WAS CHANGED WITH REVISIONS DATED 28 SEP 81. THIS IS THE FORTRAN77 VERSION NEW OPTIONS: DAMBREAK OUTFLOW SUBMERGENCE , SINGLE EVENT DAMAGE CALCULATION, DSS:WRITE STAGE FREQUENCY, DSS:READ TIME SERIES AT DESIRED CALCULATION INIERVAL LOSS RATE:GREEN AND AMPT INFILTRATION KINEMATIC WAVE: NEW FINITE DIFFERENCE ALGORITHM

HEC-1 INPUT




HEC-1 INPUT

$\qquad$

| GP3 | GOLDEN HIGHLANDS POND 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OUTLET IS | 36 -INCH | RCP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | STOR | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -287 | -355 | 432 | -575 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5128 | 5130 | 5132 | 5133 |  | 45 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 5 | 18 | 35 | 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5128 | 5129 | 5130 | 5131 | 5132 | 5133 | 5134 |  |  |  |  |





## (***) RUNOFF ALSO COMPUTED AT THIS LOCATION <br> $1 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *$

```
FLOOD HYDROGRAPH PACKAGE (HEC-1) JUN 1998 AND FEB 2010 VERSION 4.1 R
RGMHEC2000 WWW.HEC-1.COM RUN DATE 11SEP17 TIME 16:35:00
```



MODEL TO DETERMINE FLOW RATES FOR GOLDEN MESA SOUTH
EXISTING CONDITIONS MODEL
MODEL NAME GY-5E.DAT
5 YR24 HR PRECIP
** ERROR *** SPECIFIED START AND END DATES RESULT IN TOO MANY TIME PERIODS


PEAK FLOW AND STAGE (END-OF-PERIOD) SUMMARY FOR MULTIPLE PLAN-RATIO ECONOMIC COMPUTATIONS FLOWS IN CUBIC FEET PER SECOND, AREA IN SQUARE MILES TIME TO PEAK IN HOURS


| Routed to | ROUT-1 | . 077 | 1 |  | 1.10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | TIME |  | 12.90 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | Gmin5A | . 069 | 1 | FLOW | 8.28 | 8.00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.28 | 12.28 |
| ROUTED to |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | ROUT-1 | . 069 | 1 | FLOW | 8.22 | 7.95 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.55 | 12.55 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | CP-1 | . 146 | 1 | FLOW | 8.22 | 7.95 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.55 | 12.55 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | ginc | . 012 | 1 | FLOW | 3.14 | 3.06 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.12 | 12.12 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMN8 | . 027 | 1 | FLOW | . 07 | . 07 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 23.73 | 23.98 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | CP-2 | . 039 | 1 | FLow | 3.14 | 3.06 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.12 | 12.12 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMN9 | . 152 | 1 | ELOW | 2.28 | 2.07 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.52 | 12.52 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CP-3 | . 191 | 1 | FLOW | 3.27 | 3.16 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.12 | 12.12 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GMN10 | . 010 | 1 | FLOW | 3.72 | 3.62 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.07 | 12.07 |
| 3 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CP-4 | . 347 | 1 | FLOW | 11.53 | 11.03 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.53 | 12.55 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GMN4 | . 233 | 1 | ELOW | 2.58 | 2.48 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 15.05 | 15.07 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROUT-3 | . 233 | 1 | ELOW | 2.58 | 2.48 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 15.20 | 15.20 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\pm{ }^{+}$ | GMN7 | . 063 | 1 | FLOw | . 17 | . 17 |
| * |  |  |  | TIME | 23.98 | 23.88 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CP-5 | . 296 | 1 | FLOW | 2.58 | 2.48 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 15.20 | 15.20 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | Rour-4 | . 296 | 1 | FLOW | 2.57 | 2.47 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 15.50 | 15.50 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GMN2 | . 042 | 1 | FLOW | 7.58 | 7.40 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.33 | 12.33 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | CP-6 | . 338 | 1 | ELow | 7.58 | 7.40 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.33 | 12.33 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CP-7 | . 685 | 1 | ELOW | 17.07 | 16.39 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.50 | 12.50 |
| hydrograph at |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMN-12 | . 010 | 1 | FLOW | 2.92 | 2.85 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.13 | 12.13 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | CP-7B | . 695 | 1 | FLOW | 17.71 |  |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.50 | 12.50 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMN11 | . 029 | 1 | FLOW | 2.16 | 2.05 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.25 | 12.25 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CP-10 | . 724 | 1 | ELOW | 18.90 | 18.14 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.48 | 12.50 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | NR-2 | . 025 | 1 | flow | 1.15 | 1.07 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.23 | 12.25 |
| ROUTED to |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | NP-2 | . 025 | 1 | FLOW | . 58 | . 54 |
|  |  |  |  | tIME | 12.52 | 12.52 |
|  |  |  | ** | РЕAK stages |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | STAGE | 56.25 | 56.23 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.53 | 12.53 |
| Routed to |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | B2R | . 025 | 1 | FLOW | . 58 | . 54 |


|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.52 | 12.52 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMS-2 | . 142 | 1 | FLOW | 18.98 | 18.45 |
|  |  |  |  | time | 12.38 | 12.38 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | NRCP1 | . 167 | 1 | FLOW | 19.50 | 18.93 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.38 | 12.38 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | RDG-1 | . 040 | 1 | FLOW | 8.74 | 8.51 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| ROUTED to |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | NP-3 | . 040 | 1 | FLOW | 8.92 | 8.92 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 02 | . 02 |
|  |  |  | ** | peak stages | S IN FEET | ** |
|  |  |  | 1 | Stage | 67.00 | 67.00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | NR-1 | . 063 | 1 | FLOW | 26.17 | 25.72 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | PONDI | . 103 | 1 | FLOW | 35.09 | 34.63 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| ROUTED to |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | NP-1 | . 103 | 1 | FLOW | 21.65 | 21.42 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.43 | 12.43 |
|  |  |  | ** | peak stages | 5 in feet | ** |
|  |  |  | 1 | Stage | 39.60 | 39.58 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.43 | 12.43 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMS1 | . 073 | 1 | FLOW | 9.00 | 8.72 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.32 | 12.32 |
| 3 Combined at |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | NRCP2 | . 343 | 1 | FLOW | 49.52 | 48.46 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.37 | 12.37 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 42-IN | . 343 | 1 | ELOW | 37.82 | 37.12 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.63 | 12.63 |
|  |  |  | ** | Peak stages | 5 IN FEET | ** |
|  |  |  | 1 | STAGE S | 5114.89 | 5114.86 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.53 | 12.63 |
| + DIVERSION TO | - |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Oflo | . 343 | 1 | FLOW | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | DV-42 | . 343 | 1 | FLOW | 37.82 | 37.12 |
|  |  |  |  | TTME | 12.63 | 12.63 |
| Routed to |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | ROUTE2 | . 343 | 1 | FLOW | 37.77 | 37.07 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.75 | 12.77 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | GH5 | . 097 | 1 | ELOM | 23.97 | 23.41 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.22 | 12.22 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GP2 | . 097 | 1 | FLOW | 15.36 | 15.02 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.37 | 12.37 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK Stages | IN FEET | ** |
|  |  |  | 1 | StAge 5 | 5153.95 | 5153.92 |
|  |  |  |  | TTME | 12.37 | 12.37 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $+$ | GH4 | . 027 | 1 | ELOW | 6.29 | 6.14 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GH3 | . 052 | 1 | FLOW | 10.30 | 10.03 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.25 | 12.25 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GH2 | . 035 | 1 | FLOW | 7.43 | 7.23 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| 4 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GCP1 | . 211 | 1 | FLOW | 36.58 | 35.70 |
|  |  | , |  | TIME | 12.25 | 12.25 |
| Routed to |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $+$ | GP3 | . 211 | 1 | FLOW | 23.91 | 23.23 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.50 | 12.52 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK Stages | IN FEET |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | Stage 51 | 5130.35 | 5130.31 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.50 | 12.52 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GH1 | . 008 | 1 | ELOW | 3.38 | 3.31 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.15 | 12.15 |



## 100-YEAR EXISTING CONDITIONS



## U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS HYDROLOGIC ENGINEERING CENTER 609 SECOND STREET

THIS PROGRAM REPLACES ALL PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF HEC-1 KNOWN AS HEC1 (JAN 73), HECIGS, HECIDB, AND HECIKW.
THE DEEINITIONS OF VARIABLES -RTIMP- AND -RTIOR- HAVE CHANGED EROM THOSE USED WITH THE I973-STYLE INPUT STRUCTURE. THE DEFINITION OF -AMSKK- ON RM-CARD WAS CHANGED WITH REVISIONS DATED 28 SEP 81. THIS IS THE FORTRAN77 VERSION NEW OPTIONS: DAMBREAK OUTELOW SUBMERGENCE, SINGLE EVENT DAMAGE CALCULATION, DSS: WRITE STAGE EREQUENCY, DSS:READ TIME SERIES AT DESIRED CALCULATION INTERVAL LOSS RATE:GREEN AND AMPT INFILTRATION KINEMATIC WAVE: NEW FINITE DIFFERENCE ALGORITHM

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
* D D I Z \\
\text { ID } & = \\
\text { ID } & = \\
\text { ID } & \\
\text { ID } & \\
\text { ID } & \\
\text { ID } & I \\
\text { ID } & \text { I } \\
\text { ID } & \\
\text { ID } \\
\text { ID } & \\
\star & \\
\text { IT } & \\
\text { IN } \\
\text { ID } \\
\text { JR }
\end{array}
$$

MODEL TO DETERMINE FLOW RATES FOR GOLDEN MESA SOUTH
EXISTING CONDITIONS MODEL
MODEL NAME GM1E.DAT

100 YR24 HR PRECIP WITH UPDATED AREAS


$\qquad$
1
15
15
5
$\qquad$
 $* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *)$ JD CARDS WILL BE REPLACED WITH A JR CARD TO CORRECT THIS PR OBLEM. USERS OF THIS MODEL SHOULD CAREEULLY SELECT AN APPROPRIATE DARF FOR
USER CONCENTRATION POINTS. IT SHOUTE BE CONCENTRATION POINTS. IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT WHEN FLOW IS COMBINED WITH DIVERSION FLOWS, CALCULATED COMBINED TOTAL AREA MAY NOT BE APPROPRI TO BE USED IN SELECTING DARF.


| DARE | AREA (SQ. | MI.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.00 | 0 - |  |



| GMN5B | RUNOFF | FROM WATERSHED GMN5B |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| .077 | 0 | .423 | .797 | 1.33 |


| 0 | .423 | .797 | 1.33 | 1.40 | 1.49 | 1.88 | 2.75 | 3.97 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$$
0.23
$$

ROUT-1 ROUTE GMINS T OUT

| 2300 | .019 | 0.07 |  | TRAP | 4 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

GMN5A RUNOFF FROM WATERSHED GMN5A
.069
74
HEC-1 INPUT
. 24 HEC-1 INPUT
$\qquad$
ROUT-IROUTE GMN5A TO OUTLET OF GMN-9
CP-1
2 COMBINE GMN5A \& GMN5B AT SE CORNER OF GMN-9
GMN6 RUNOFF FROM GMN6
.012
77
.09
GMN8RUNOEF FROM GMN 8

RDG-1
B3SHED B3 EROM NORTHSTAR MODEL
78
NP-3
$\begin{array}{rrrcccr}\text { POND3DETENTION } & \text { POND 3FROM NORTHSTAR RANCH STUDY } \\ \text { I } & \text { FLOW } & 0.0 & 0.0 & & \\ 0.149 & 0.2974 & 0.338 & 0.378 & 0.428 & 0.478 \\ 67 & 68 & 69 & 70 & 71 & 72 \\ 0.0 & 0.5287 & 6.94466 & 9.127010 .8801843 .77214 \\ 67 & 68 & 39 & 70 & 71 & 72\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ccc}\text { B3R } & \text { CNAME POND } 3 \\ 1400 & 0.05 & 0 .\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}0.05 & 0.03 & \text { CIRC } & 2.0\end{array}$
NR-1
B1FROM NORTHSTAR MODEL
. 063
.18
POND1CNAME B1R
POND1CNAME B1R
COMBINE B3 AND B1 AT POND 1
2
NP-1
POND 1
$\begin{array}{rccr}1 & \text { FLOW } & 0.0 & 0.0 \\ 0.1449 & 0.3968 & 0.501 & 0.6159 \\ 36 & 38 & 40 & 42 \\ 0.0 & 3.6571526 .1869282 .85167 \\ 36 & 38 & 40 & 42\end{array}$
GMS1
FORMERLYPART OE BASIN C IN NVHS STUDY BY ODYSSEY
$.073 \quad 75$
$.26 \quad 75$
HEC-1 INPUT
42-IN PONDING AREA AT INLET TO 42" PIPE TO NVHS DET BASIN

| 42-IN | PONDING AREA AT INLET TO 42" PIPE TO NVHS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| 1 | STOR | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0.255 | 2.207 | 3.296 |  |  |  |  |
| 5112 | 5114 | 5116 | 5118 | 260 | 673 | 1130 |  |
| 0 | 9 | 20 | 40 | 260 | 5117 | 5118 |  |

DV-42 DIVERT ELOW OVERTOPPING E. GOLDEN VALIEY DR

| DV-42 | DIVERT |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OFLO |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 40 | 260 | 673 | 1130 |
| 0 | 0 | 200 | 598 | 1040 |

$\begin{array}{cccccc}\text { ROUTE2 } & \text { ROUTE FLOW TO HIGH SCHOOL DETENTION BASIN } & \\ 2320 & 0.006 & 0.025 & \text { TRAP } & 4 & 3\end{array}$
$\begin{aligned} & \text { GH5 START GOLDEN HIGHLANDS MODEL } \\ & .097 \text { RUNOFE FROM GH5 }\end{aligned}$
.09780
GP2POND GP2 ON GOLDEN HIGHLANDS
OUTLET IS 30 -INCH RCP
$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrr}1 & \text { STOR } & 0 & & & & & & & \\ .042 & .326 & .381 & -438 & 0.5 & & & & & \\ 5152 & 5154 & 5156 & 5158 & 5160 & & 35 & 45 & 50 & 56 \\ 0 & 7 & 10 & 16 & 29 & 37 & 60 \\ 5152 & 5153.25 & 5153.5 & 5154 & 5155 & 5156 & 5157 & 5158 & 5159 & 5160\end{array}$
GH4
.027
$.17 \quad 79$
$\cdot 1$
GH3
.052
$\begin{array}{ll}.21 & 78.4\end{array}$
GH2
035
.78
GCPICOMBINE FLOWS AT POND G3
HEC-1 INPUT PAGE 6
LINE



| KK | GP3 | GOLDEN HIGHLANDS POND 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| KM | OUTLET | IS | $36-$ INCH RCP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RS | 1 | STOR | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SA | -287 | .355 | .432 | .575 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SE | 5128 | 5130 | 5132 | 5133 |  | 45 | 60 | 70 |  |  |  |  |
| SQ | 0 | 5 | 18 | 35 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SE | 5128 | 5129 | 5130 | 5131 | 5132 | 5133 | 5134 |  |  |  |  |  |




(***) RUNOFF ALSO COMPUTED AT THIS LOCATION
$1 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *)$

```
GLOOD HYDROGRAPH PACKAGE (HEC-1)
                    N 1998 AND FEB 2010
                    VERSION 4.1R
                    RGMHEC2000 WWW.HEC-1.COM
RUN DATE 11SEP17 TIME 16:28:3
```


## MODEL TO DETERMINE FLOW RATES FOR GOLDEN MESA SOUTH

## EXISTING CONDITIONS MODEL

MODEI NAME GMIE. DAT

100 YR2 4 HR RRECIP WITH UPDATED AREAS

*** ERROR *** SPECIFIED START AND END DATES RESULT IN TOO MANY TIME PERIODS


ENGLISH UNITS
PRECIPITATION DEPTH
UENGTH, ELEVATION FLOW
STORAGE VOLUME
SURFACE AREA
TEMPERATURE
INCHES
EET
CUBIC FEET PER SECOND
ACRE-FEET
ACRES
DEGREES FAHRENHEIT
MULTI-PLAN OPTION
NPLAN
MULTI-RATIO OPTION
RATIOS OF PRECIPITATION
1.00 . 99

| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABIE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | 24.00000 |  |


| WAR | ROUTED | OUTFLOW |  | 71.) | IS | GREATER | THAN | MAXIMUM | OUTELOW | ( | 70.) | IN | STORAGE-OUTFLOW | TABLE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WARNING | ROUTED | OUTELOW | ( | 72.) | IS | GREATER | THAN | MAX IMUM | OUTFLOW | ( | 70.) | IN | STORAGE-OUTELIOW | TABLE |
| WARNING | ROUTED | OUTELOW | ( | 73.) | IS | GREATER | THAN | MAXIMUM | OUTFLOW | ( | 70.) | IN | STORAGE-OUTFLOW | TABLE |
| WARNING | ROUTED | OUTELOW | ( | 74.1 | IS | GREATER | THAN | MAX IMUM | OUTELOW | 1 | 70.) | IN | STORAGE-OUTFLOW | TABLE |
| WARNING | ROUTED | OUTELOW | ! | 75.) | IS | GREATER | THAN | MAXIMUM | OUTELOW | 1 | 70.1 | IN | STORAGE-OUTFLOW | TABLE |
| WARNING | ROUTED | OUTELOW | \} | 76.) | IS | GREATER | THAN | MAXIMUM | OUTELON | 1 | 70.) | IN | STORAGE-OUTFLOW | TABLE |
| WARNING | ROUTED | OUTELOW | ( | 76.) | IS | GREATER | THAN | MAXIMUM | OUTFLow | 1 | 70.7 | IN | STORAGE-OUTFLOW | table |
| WARNING | ROUTED | OUTELOW | ( | 77.1 | IS | GREATER | THAN | MAXIMUM | OUTFLOW | 1 | 70.$)$ | IN | STORAGE-OUTFLOW | TABLE |
| WARNING | ROUTED | OUTFLOW | 1 | 78.1 | IS | GREATER | THAN | MAXIMUM | OUTELOW | 1 | 70.) | IN | STORAGE-OUTELOW | TABLE |
| WARNING | ROUTED | OUTELOW |  | 78.) | IS | REATE | THAN | XIMUM | TFLO |  | 70. |  | TORAGE-OUTELOW |  |



|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.50 | 12.50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Routed to |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROUT-4 | . 296 | 1 | 1 FLOW | 74.09 | 71.89 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.65 | 12.65 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| hydrockar at | GMN2 | . 042 | 1 | FLOW | 34.70 | 34.11 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.33 | 12.33 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | CP-6 | . 338 | 1 | FLOW | 92.24 | 89.57 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.60 | 12.60 |
| $+\quad 2 \text { COMBINED AT }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CP-7 | . 685 | 1 | ELOW | 217.84 | 211.77 |
|  |  |  |  | time | 12.48 | 12.48 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| matograr | GMN-12 | . 010 | 1 | ELOW | 13.42 | 13.19 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.13 | 12.13 |
| $\begin{array}{r} 2 \text { COMBINED AT } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CP-7B | . 695 | 1 | FLOW | 220.65 | 214.56 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.48 | 12.48 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | Gman11 | . 029 | 1 | flow | 19.36 | 18.93 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.23 | 12.23 |
| $+2 \text { COMBINED AT }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CP-10 | . 724 | 1 | FLOW | 230.19 | 223.76 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.47 | 12.47 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | NR-2 | . 025 | 1 | FLOW | 15.38 | 15.01 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | NP-2 | . 025 | 1 | ELOW | 6.13 | 6.07 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.47 | 12.47 |
|  |  |  | ** | * peak stages | IN EEET | ** |
|  |  |  | 1 | Stage | 59.15 | 59.09 |
|  |  |  |  | fime | 12.47 | 12.47 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | B2R | . 025 | 1 | ELOW | 6.13 | 6.07 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.47 | 12.47 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMS-2 | . 142 | 1 | ELOW | 96.53 | 94.77 |
|  |  |  |  | time | 12.37 | 12.37 |
| + 2 COMBINED AT | - |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | NRCP1 | . 167 | 1 | FLOW | 102.57 | 100.76 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.37 | 12.37 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | RDG-1 | . 040 | 1 | FLOW | 42.29 | 41.54 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.18 | 12.18 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | NP-3 | . 040 | 1 | FLOW | 9.11 | 9.10 |
|  |  |  |  | time | 12.60 | 12.60 |
|  |  |  | ** | peak stages | In Feet | ** |
|  |  |  | 1 | STAGE | 69.74 | 69.68 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.60 | 12.60 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | B3R | . 040 | 1 | FLOW | 12.06 | 12.06 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 08 | . 08 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | NR-1 | . 063 | 1 | FLOW | 89.00 | 87.78 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $+$ | POND1 | . 103 | 1 | FLOW | 97.99 | 96.77 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | NP-1 | . 103 | 1 | FLOW | 63.85 | 63.00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.37 | 12.37 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK Stages | IN FEET |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | STAGE | 41.33 | 41.30 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.37 | 12.37 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMS1 | . 073 | 1 | FLOW | 51.89 |  |
|  |  | , |  | TIME | 12.30 | 12.30 |
| 3 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | NRCP2 | . 343 | 1 | FLOM | 215.88 | 212.24 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.35 | 12.35 |
| ROUTED to |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 42-IN | . 343 | 1 | Flow | 201.19 | 197.76 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.43 | 12.43 |
|  |  |  | ** | peak stages | IN FEET |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | Stage 51 | 115.73 | 5115.72 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.43 | 12.43 |


| DIVERSION TO | OFLO | . 343 | 1 | FLIOW | 146.54 | 143.42 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.43 | 12.43 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | DV-42 | . 343 | 1 | FLOW | 54.65 | 54.34 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.43 | 12.43 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | ROUTE2 | . 343 | 1 | FLOW | 54.57 | 54.26 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.55 | 12.55 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GH5 | . 097 | 1 | FLOW | 105.33 | 103.57 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| ROUTED to |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GP2 | . 097 | 1 | FLOW | 48.61 | 48.17 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.45 | 12.45 |
|  |  |  | ** | peak stages | IN FEET | ** |
|  |  |  | 1 | Stage | 5157.72 | 5157.63 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.45 | 12.45 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GH4 | . 027 | 1 | ${ }^{\text {FLIOW }}$ | 28.96 | 28.46 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GH3 | . 052 | 1 | FLOW | 48.71 | 47.86 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.23 | 12.23 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GH2 | . 035 | 1 | FLOW | 35.92 | 35.29 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| 4 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GCP1 | . 211 | 1 | FLOW | 152.29 | 149.87 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.23 | 12.23 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GP3 | . 211 | 1 | ELOW | 79.33 | 78.46 |
|  |  |  |  | THES | 12.60 | 12.60 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK STAGES | IN FEET | ** |
|  |  |  | 1 | stage 5 | 5134.93 | 5134.85 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.60 | 12.60 |
| EYDROGARPE 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GE1 | . 008 | 1 | ELOM | 12.47 | 12.28 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.13 | 12.13 |
| 2 consted ar |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | gecp2 | . 219 | 1 | ELOW | 81.34 12.55 | 80.45 12.55 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30utes 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.72 | 12.72 |
| ExDPograpt ar |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | NYHS | . 116 | 1 | FLOW | 174.48 | 172.23 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| 2 Combined at |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | HS + GH | . 335 | 1 | FLOW | 202.51 | 199.52 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.23 | 12.23 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PNT1 | . 678 | 1 | ELOW | 240.17 | 236.82 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.25 | 12.25 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | DETSCH | . 678 | 1 | FLOW | 145.74 | 143.18 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.78 | 12.78 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK Stages | IN FEET | ** |
|  |  |  | 1 | Stage | 100.39 | 100.37 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.78 | 12.78 |
| DIVERSION TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | DV-GVD | . 678 | 1 | FLOW | 90.10 | 88.31 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.78 | 12.78 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | TOGMS | . 678 | 1 | FLOW | 55.64 | 54.87 |
|  |  |  |  | time | 12.78 | 12.78 |
| 2 Combined at |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - estate | 1.402 | 1 | FLow | 275.51 | 267.93 |
|  |  |  |  | tIME | 12.48 | 12.48 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GMN3 | . 268 | 1 | ELOW | 70.73 | 68.67 |
|  |  |  |  | time | 12.50 | 12.50 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GMN1 | . 104 | 1 | ELOW | 75.89 |  |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.30 | 12.32 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CP-8 | . 372 | 1 | FLOW | 134.46 | 131.19 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.38 | 12.38 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GMS-3 | . 210 | 1 | FLOW | 68.59 | 66.69 |


|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.42 | 12.42 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | RCAL-1 | . 000 | 1 | ELOW | 146.54 | 143.42 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.43 | 12.43 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 3+OFLO | . 210 | 1 | ELOW | 214.79 | 209.80 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.43 | 12.43 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMS 4-E | . 582 | 1 | FLOW | 347.47 | 339.20 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.42 | 12.42 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMS-4 | . 054 | 1 | FLOW | 34.57 | 33.79 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.23 | 12.23 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMS3+4 | . 636 | 1 | ELOW | 368.58 | 359.80 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.40 | 12.40 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | TOTL | 2.038 | 1 | FLOW | 635.74 | 619.72 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.43 | 12.43 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | DB-EST | 2.038 | 1 | FLOW | 635.34 | 619.41 |
|  |  |  |  | TTME | 12.45 | 12.45 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK Stages | IN FEET | ** |
|  |  |  | 1 | STAGE | 5092.04 | 5092.04 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.45 | 12.42 |

## 5-YEAR PROPOSED CONDITIONS



THIS PROGRAM REPLACES ALL PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF HEC-1 KNOWN AS HEC1 (JAN 73), HEC1GS, HEC1DB, AND HEC1KW.
THE DEFINITIONS OF VARIABLES -RTIMP- AND -RTIOR- HAVE CHANGED FROM THOSE USED WITH THE 1973-STYLE INPUT STRUCTURE THE DEFINITION OF -AMSKK- ON RM-CARD WAS CHANGED WITH REVISIONS DATED 28 SEP 81. THIS IS THE FORTRAN77 VERSION NEW OPTIONS: DAMBREAK OUTFLOW SUBMERGENCE , SINGLE EVENT DAMAGE CALCULATION, DSS:WRITE STAGE FREQUENCY, DSS: READ TIME SERIES AT DESIRED CALCULATION INTERVAL LOSS RATE:GREEN AND AMPT INFILTRATION KINEMATIC WAVE: NEW FINITE DIFFERENCE ALGORITHM


|  | 灾灾荗 |  |  | 灾いいんがN | 蜽岕 | 出出㐍 | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MGNGMS | 荗灾 | 芯岕空㟔 |  |  | 〕o |  |  |

LINE


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \\
& 5120 \\
& \begin{array}{r}
\text { GH1 } \\
.008
\end{array} \\
& 84.5 \\
& \begin{array}{r}
\text { GHCP2 } \\
2
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{cccccc}
\text { ROUTEIROUTE THROUGH NVHS } & \text { TO HIGH SCHOOL DET POND } \\
2100 & 0.0013 & 0.025 & \text { TRAP } & 4 & 3
\end{array} \\
& \text { NVHS } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { NVS } \\
.116
\end{array} \\
& 89 \\
& \text { HS+GHCOMBINE FLOW FROM GOLDEN HIGHLANDS \& HIGH SCHOOL } \\
& 2 \\
& \text { PNTIINFLOW TO SCHOOL DETENTION BASIN } \\
& \text { DETSCHDETENTION BASIN AT NORTH VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL } \\
& \text { 12" RCP @ ELEV 93.59 \& 36" RCP @ ELEV } 96.25 \\
& \text { ASSUME OVERTOPPING OCCURS OVER A } 20 \text { FOOTWIDTH OFNORTH BANK OF BASIN } \\
& \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrr} 
\\
1 & \text { STOR } & 0 & 0 & & & & & \\
0 & 0.7163 & 2.0073 & 2.4015 & 2.5210 & 2.6358 & 2.7 & 2.71 & 2.71 & 2.71 \\
59 & 95 & 96 & 97 & 98 & 99 & 100 & 101 & 102 & 103 \\
0 & 2.2 & 5 & 13 & 26.8 & 43.5 & 103.5 & 211.5 & & \\
59 & 95 & 96 & 97 & 98 & 99 & 100 & 101 & &
\end{array} \\
& \text { TOGMS DIVERT FLOW OVFRTOPPTNG E, GOTDEN VITIEY DRTVE } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { TOGMS } \\
\text { DIVERT FLLOW OVERTOPPING E. GOLDEN } \\
\text { DIVEW THAT FLOWS WEST ON GOLIDEN VAL.LEY DR. }
\end{array} \\
& \\
& \text { ESTATECOMBINE GM NORTH FLOWS AT ESTATES ROAD PONDING AREA } \\
& \text { HEC-1 INPUT }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{rr}
\text { GMN3 } & \text { RU } \\
.278 & 64 \\
.42 &
\end{array} \\
& \text { RUNOFE FROM GMN3 } \\
& \text { GMN1 RUNOFE FROM GMN1 } \\
& \begin{array}{ll}
.104 & 76 \\
.27
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{r}
\text { CP-N10 } \\
2
\end{array} \quad \text { COMBINE GMN3 \& 1AT NE CORNER OF GMS-4 } \\
& \begin{array}{r}
\text { GMS-3 } \\
.2
\end{array} \\
& 34 \quad 65 \\
& \text { RCAL-1 RECALL OVERFLOW FROM 42" PIPE } \\
& \text { OFLO } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { CP-N11 } \\
\text { GMS-3 } \\
2
\end{array} \text { OVERFLOW FROM 42" PIPE } \\
& \text { CP-N12 } \\
& \begin{array}{c}
\text { COMBINE GMN-3, GMN-1, OFLO, AND GMS-3, TOTAL FLOW @ E. BDRY OF GMS-4 } \\
2
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { RCL-2 } \\
\text { DET-C }
\end{array} \quad \text { RECALL ELOW FROM DET POND C } \\
& \text { DET-C } \\
& \text { GMS-4RUNOFF FROM APN 552-100-01 DEVELOPED CONDITIONS } \\
& .05480 \\
& .18 \\
& \text { CP-N13 COMBINE GMS-3 AND FLOW FROM POND B } \\
& \text { CP-N14 TOTAL FLOW AT MIDDLE OF GMS-4 } \\
& \text { NOT INCLUDING FLOW EROM HIGH SCHOOL OR ALONG ESTATES RD } \\
& \text { CP-N15 COMBINE ONSITE +OFFSITE FLOWS FROM EAST \& SOUTH } \\
& \text { AT ESTATES ROAD POND AREA } \\
& \text { TOTAL } \\
& \text { COMBINE ALL FLOW AT ESTATES PONDING AREA } \\
& \text { HEC-1 INPUT }
\end{aligned}
$$




U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS HYDROLOGIC ENGINEERING CENTER 609 SECOND STREET DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616 ( 916 ) $756-1104$

MODEL TO DETERMINE FLOW RATES FOR GOLDEN MESA SOUTH
ENLARGED POND B TO 2 ACRES
PROPOSED CONDITIONS MODEL
MODEL NAME GM-5P.DAT
5 YR 24 HR PRECIP


*** ERROR *** SPECIFIED START AND END DATES RESULT IN TOO MANY TIME PERIODS

| - 13 IO | OUTPUT CONTROL VARIABLES |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IPRNT 5 | PRINT CONTROL |
|  | IPLOT 0 | PLOT CONTROL |
|  | QSCAL 0. | HYDROGRAPH PLOT SCALE |
| IT | HYDROGRAPH TIME DATA |  |
|  | NMIN 1 | MINUTES IN COMPUTATION INTERVAL |
|  | IDATE 10 | STARTING DATE |
|  | ITIME 0000 | STARTING TIME |
|  | NQ 2000 | NUMBER OF HYDROGRAPH ORDINATES |
|  | NDDATE 20 | ENDING DATE |
|  | NDTIME 0919 | ENDING TIME |
|  | ICENT 19 | CENTURY MARK |
|  | COMPUTATION INTERVAL | . 02 HOURS |
|  | TOTAL TIME BASE | 33.32 HOURS | ENGLISH UNITS

DRAINAGE AREA SQUARE MILES
PRECIPITATION DEPTH
INCHES
FEET
CUBIC FEET PER SECOND
ELOW
STORAGE VOLUME
SURFACE AREA
ACRE-FEET
TEMPERATURE
ACRES
DEGREES FAHRENHEIT
JP
MULTI-PLAN OPTION
NPLAN
1

JR MULTI-RATIO OPTION

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
\text { RATIOS OF PRECIPITATION } \\
1.00 & .99 & .98 & .97
\end{array}
$$

VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG . 01667 . 01667 24.00000

VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG . 01667 . 01667 24.00000
VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG . 01667 . 24.00000
VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG .01667 . 01667.00000
VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG $.01667 \quad .0166724 .00000$
VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG .0166724 .00000
VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG . 01667 . 01667.0000
VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG
$\begin{array}{lll}.01667 & .01667 & 24.00000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lrrr}\text { VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG } & .01667 & .01667 & 24.00000 \\ \text { VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE }\end{array}$

VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG .01667 . 24.00000

| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |

PEAK FLOW AND STAGE (END-OF-PERIOD) SUMMARY FOR MULTIPLE PLAN-RATIO ECONOMIC COMPUTATIONS
FLOWS IN CUBIC FEET PER SECOND, AREA IN SQUARE MILES TIME TO PEAK IN HOURS

| OPERATION | STATION | AREA | PLAAN |  | RATIOS APPLIED TO PRECIPITATION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | RATIO 1 1.00 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { RATIO } 2 \\ .99 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { RATIO } 3 \\ .98 \end{array}$ | RATIO 4 .97 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMN4 | . 233 | 1 | FLOW | 2.58 | 2.48 | 2.38 | 2.28 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 15.05 | 15.07 | 15.03 | 15.07 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | ROUT-3 | . 233 | 1. | ELOW | 2.58 | 2.48 | 2.38 | 2.28 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 15.20 | 15.20 | 15.22 | 15.23 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMN7 | . 063 | 1 | FLOW | . 17 | . 17 | . 16 | . 15 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 23.98 | 23.88 | 24.00 | 23.88 |
| * 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | $\mathrm{CP}-\mathrm{N} 1$ | . 296 | 1 | FLOW | 2.58 | 2.48 | 2.38 | 2.28 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 15.20 | 15.20 | 15.22 | 15.23 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | ROUT-4 | . 296 | 1 | FLOW | 2.57 | 2.47 | 2.37 | 2.28 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 15.50 | 15.50 | 15.52 | 15.53 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMN2 | . 042 | 1 | FLOW | 7.58 | 7.40 | 7.21 | 7.03 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.33 | 12.33 | 12.33 | 12.33 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMN10 | . 010 | 1 | FTOW | 3.72 | 3.62 | 3.53 | 3.44 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.07 | 12.07 | 12.07 | 12.07 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | CP-N2 | . 052 | 1 | FLOW | 8.37 | 8.17 | 7.97 | 7.77 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.30 | 12.30 | 12.32 | 12.32 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | $\mathrm{CP}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | . 348 | 1 | FLOW | 8.37 | 8.17 | 7.97 | 7.77 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.30 | 12.30 | 12.32 | 12.32 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMN-12 | . 010 | 1 | FIOW | 2.92 | 2.85 | 2.77 | 2.70 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.13 | 12.13 | 12.13 | 12.13 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | $\mathrm{CP}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | . 358 | 1 | FLOW | 9.92 | 9.68 | 9.44 | 9.20 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.27 | 12.27 | 12.27 | 12.27 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMN5A | . 059 | 1 | FLOW | 8.28 | 8.00 | 7.73 | 7.46 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.28 | 12.28 | 12.30 | 12.30 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMN5B | . 077 | 1 | FLOW | . 87 | . 82 | . 79 | . 76 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.43 | 14.93 | 14.95 | 14.97 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | CP-N5 | . 146 | 1 | FLOW | 8.92 | 8.55 | 8.18 | 7.83 |
|  |  |  |  | TTME | 12.30 | 12.30 | 12.30 | 12.30 |
| ROUTED to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | DP-A | .146 | 1 | FLOW | 2.23 | 2.18 | 2.14 | 2.10 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 15.75 | 15.83 | 15.68 | 15.63 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK StAges | IN FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | STAGE | . 56 | . 55 | . 54 | . 53 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 15.92 | 15.85 | 15.77 | 15.67 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | RTE-1 | . 146 | 1 | FLOW | 2.23 | 2.18 | 2.14 | 2.10 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 16.13 | 15.97 | 16.07 | 16.02 |



|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.37 | 12.37 | 12.37 | 12.37 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 42-IN | . 343 | 1 | FLOW | 37.82 | 37.12 | 36.42 | 35.72 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.63 | 12.63 | 12.63 | 12.63 |
|  |  |  | ** | Peak stages | IN FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | StAGE | 5114.89 | 5114.86 | 5114.82 | 5114.79 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.63 | 12.63 | 12.63 | 12.63 |
| DIVERSION TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | OFLO | . 343 | 1 | FLOW | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | DV-42 | . 343 | 1 | FLOW | 37.82 | 37.12 | 36.42 | 35.72 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.63 | 12.63 | 12.63 | 12.63 |
| Routed to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | ROUTE2 | . 343 | 1 | FLOW | 37.77 | 37.07 | 36.37 | 35.68 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.75 | 12.77 | 12.77 | 12.77 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GH5 | . 097 | 1 | FLOW | 23.97 | 23.41 | 22.84 | 22.28 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.22 | 12.22 | 12.22 | 12.22 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GP2 | . 097 | 1 | FLOW | 15.36 | 15.02 | 14.68 | 14.34 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.37 | 12.37 | 12.37 | 12.37 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK Stages | In Feet | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | Stage | 5153.95 | 5153.92 | 5153.89 | 5153.86 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.37 | 12.37 | 12.37 | 12.37 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GH4 | . 027 | 1 | FLOW | 6.29 | 6.14 | 5.98 | 5.82 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GH3 | . 052 | 1 | FLOW | 10.30 | 10.03 | 9.77 | 9.51 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.25 | 12.25 | 12.25 | 12.25 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GH2 | . 035 | 1 | FLOW | 7.43 | 7.23 | 7.04 | 6.85 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| 4 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GCP1 | . 211 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FLOW } \\ & \text { TIME } \end{aligned}$ | 36.58 12.25 | 35.70 12.25 | 34.82 12.25 | 33.95 12.25 |
| *ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GP3 | . 211 | 1 | fLow | 23.91 | 23.23 | 22.54 | 21.86 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.50 | 12.52 | 12.52 | 12.52 |
|  |  |  | ** | peak stages | In Feet | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | STAGE | 5130.35 | 5130.31 | 5130.27 | 5130.23 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.50 | 12.52 | 12.52 | 12.52 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GH1 | . 008 | 1 | FLOW | 3.38 | 3.31 | 3.25 | 3.18 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.15 | 12.15 | 12.15 | 12.15 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GHCP2 | . 219 | 1 | FLOW | 24.65 | 23.94 | 23.24 | 22.53 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.50 | 12.50 | 12.50 | 12.50 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | ROUTE1 | . 219 | 1 | FLOW | 23.43 | 22.76 | 22.09 | 21.43 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.75 | 12.75 | 12.77 | 12.77 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | NVHS | . 116 | 1 | FLOW | 54.60 | 53.74 | 52.87 | 52.00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | HS+GH | . 335 | 1 | FLOW | 57.75 | 56.72 | 55.71 | 54.69 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | PNT1 | . 678 | 1 | FLOW | 73.94 | 72.64 | 71.35 | 70.07 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.22 | 12.22 | 12.22 | 12.22 |
| Routed to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | DETSCH | . 678 | 1 | FLOW | 39.29 | 38.55 | 37.82 | 37.09 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 13.95 | 13.97 | 13.98 | 14.00 |
|  |  |  | ** | Peak stages | IN FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | Stage | 98.75 | 98.70 | 98.66 | 98.62 |
|  |  |  |  | TTME | 13.95 | 13.97 | 14.00 | 14.02 |
| DIVERSION TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | DV-GVD | . 678 | 1 | FLOW | . 33 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 13.95 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | TOGMS | . 678 | 1 | FLOW | 39.00 | 38.55 | 37.82 | 37.09 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 13.67 | 13.97 | 13.98 | 14.00 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | ESTATE | 1.044 | 1 | FLOW | 39.00 | 38.55 | 37.82 | 37.09 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 13.67 | 13.97 | 13.98 | 14.00 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT+ GMN3 $\begin{array}{llllllll} \\ +\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 15.08 | 15.10 | 15.12 | 15.13 |


| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| + | GMN1 | . 104 | 1 | ELOW | 14.07 | 13.64 | 13.23 | 12.81 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.32 | 12.32 | 12.32 | 12.32 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | $\mathrm{CP}-\mathrm{N} 10$ | . 382 | 1 | ELOW | 14.61 | 14.08 | 13.57 | 13.08 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.33 | 12.33 | 12.33 | 12.33 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMS-3 | . 200 | 1 | FLOW | 2.42 | 2.30 | 2.22 | 2.13 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.58 | 14.98 | 15.00 | 15.02 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | RCAL-1 | . 000 | 1 | FLOW | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | CP-N11 | . 200 | 1 | FLOW | 2.42 | 2.30 | 2.22 | 2.13 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.58 | 14.98 | 15.00 | 15.02 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | CP-N12 | . 582 | 1 | FLOW | 16.07 | 15.33 | 14.63 | 13.96 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.35 | 12.35 | 12.35 | 12.35 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | RCL-2 | . 000 | 1 | FLOW | 9.34 | 9.09 | 8.84 | 8.59 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.22 | 12.22 | 12.22 | 12.22 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMS-4 | . 054 | 1 | FLOW | 13.35 | 13.04 | 12.72 | 12.41 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.22 | 12.22 | 12.22 | 12.22 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | CP-N13 | . 054 | 1 | FLOW | 22.69 | 22.13 | 21.56 | 21.00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.22 | 12.22 | 12.22 | 12.22 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | CP-N14 | . 636 | 1 | FLOW | 36.10 | 34.98 | 33.88 | 32.81 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.25 | 12.25 | 12.25 | 12.25 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | CP-N15 | 1.680 | 1 | FLOW | 57.38 | 56.26 | 55.00 | 53.75 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 14.35 | 14.15 | 14.17 | 14.20 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | TOTAL | 2.038 | 1 | FLOW | 64.73 | 63.01 | 61.33 | 59.69 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.28 | 12.28 | 12.28 | 12.28 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | DB-EST | 2.038 | 1 | FLOW | 61.61 | 60.28 | 58.89 | 57.51 |
| * |  |  |  | TIME | 14.63 | 14.62 | 14.65 | 14.68 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK STAGES IN FEET ** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | STAGE | 5090.77 | 5090.70 | 5090.63 | 5090.55 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 14.60 | 14.58 | 14.63 | 14.65 |

## 100-YEAR PROPOSED CONDITIONS

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |



| LS | 77 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |



```
POND2FROM NORTHSTAR MODEL
POND2FROM
```

        B2RCNAME POND2
            \(\begin{array}{ccccc}\text { B2RCNAME } & \text { POND2 } & & \\ 0 & 0 & 0.0 & 0 & 22\end{array}\)
    GMS-2 FORMERLY WATERSHED D IN NVHS MODEL BY ODYSSEY
        WATERSHED D MODIFIED DUE TO NORTHSTAR RANCH
            .142
            77
    NRCP1 COMBINE WATERSHEDS D AND NR1
    RDG-1
B3SHED B3 FROM NORTHSTAR MODEL.
B3SHED B3 FROM NORTHSTAR MODEL
.04
78
NP-3
POND $D$ DETENTION POND 3FROM NORTHSTAR RANCH STUDY
$\begin{array}{rrrrrr}1 & \text { FLOW } & 0.0 & 0.0 & & \\ 0.149 & 0.2974 & 0.338 & 0.378 & 0.428 & 0.478 \\ 67 & 68 & 69 & 70 & 71 & 72\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{rrrcr}6.0 & 68 & 69 & 70 & 71 \\ 0.0 & 0.5287 & 6.94466 & 9.127010 .8801843 .77214 \\ 67 & 68 & 39 & 70 & 71\end{array}$
NR-1
B1FROM NORTHSTAR MODEL
.063
87

|  |
| :---: |


| KK | PONDICNAME B1R |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| KM | COMBINE B3 AND B1 AT POND 1 |  |  |  |
| HC | 2 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| KK | NP-1 |  |  |  |
| KM | POND 1 |  |  |  |
| RS | 1 | FLOW | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| SA | 0.1449 | 0.3968 | 0.501 | 0.6159 |
| SE | 36 | 38 | 40 | 42 |
| SQ | 0.0 | 3.6571526 .1869282 .85167 |  |  |
| SE | 36 | 38 | 40 | 42 | EEC-1 INPUT

$\qquad$

```
GMS1
FORMERLYPART OF BASIN \(C\) IN NVHS STUDY BY ODYSSEY
073
        \(26 \quad 75\)
```

    NRCP2COMBINE NRCP1, \(C\), AND NP1 AT INLET PIPE TO NVHS DET BASIN
        3
    
DV-42 DIVERT FLOW OVERTOPPING E. GOLDEN VALLEY DRIVE
$\begin{array}{rrrrr}\text { OFLO } & & & & \\ 0 & 40 & 260 & 673 & 1130 \\ 0 & 0 & 200 & 598 & 1040\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{cccccc}\text { ROUTE2 } & \text { ROUTE FLOW TO HIGH SCHOOL DETENTION BASIN } \\ 2320 & 0.006 & 0.025 & \text { TRAP } & 4\end{array}$
GH5 START GOLDEN HIGHLANDS MODEL RUNOFF EROM GH5
$.097 \quad 80$
GP2POND GP2 ON GOLDEN HIGHLANDS
OUTLET IS $30-$ INCH RCP
$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrr}1 & \text { STOR } & 0 & & & & & & & \\ .042 & .326 & .381 & .438 & 0.5 & & & & \\ 5152 & 5154 & 5156 & 5158 & 5160 & 10 & 16 & 29 & 37 & 45 \\ 0 & 7 & 10 & 50 & 56 & 60 \\ 5152 & 5153.25 & 5153.5 & 5154 & 5155 & 5156 & 5157 & 5158 & 5159 & 5160\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{rr}\text { GH4 } & \\ .027 & 79\end{array}$
.17 79
GH3
.052
78.4
78
HEC-1 INPUT
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(***) RUNOFE ALSO COMPUTED AT THIS LOCATION


MODEL TO DETERMINE FLOW RATES FOR GOLDEN MESA SOUTH ENLARGED POND B TO 2 ACRES
PROPOSED CONDITIONS MODEL
00 YR 24 HR GRECIP.DAI
OU YR 24 HR PRECIP

$\qquad$
*** ERROR *** SPECIFIED START AND END DATES RESULT IN TOO MANY TIME PERIODS

| 13 IO | OUTPUT CONTROL | VARIABLES |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IPRNT | 5 | PRINT CONTROL |
|  | IPLOT | 0 | PLOT CONTROL |
|  | QSCAL | 0. | HYDROGRAPH PLOT SCALE |
| IT | HYDROGRAPH TIME | DATA |  |
|  | NMIN | 1 | MINUTES IN COMPUTATION INTERVAL |
|  | IDATE | 10 | STARTING DATE |
|  | ITIME | 0000 | STARTING TIME |
|  | NQ | 2000 | NUMBER OF HYDROGRAPH ORDINATES |
|  | NDDATE | 20 | ENDING DATE |
|  | NDTIME | 0919 | ENDING TIME |
|  | ICENT | 19 | CENTURY MARK |

## COMPUTATION INTERVAL $\quad .02$ HOURS TOTAL TIME BASE -33.32 HOURS

## ENGLISH UNITS

## DRAINAGE AREA <br> SQUARE MILES

PRECIPITATION DEPTH
, ENGTH, ELEVATION
STORAGE VOLUME
SURFACE AREA
TEMPERATURE

INCHES
FEET
CUBIC FEET PER SECOND
ACRE-EEET
ACRES
DEGREES FAHRENHEIT

JP MULTI-PLAN OPTION NPLAN 1 NUMBER OF PLANS

JR MULTI-RATIO OPTION $\begin{array}{llll}\text { RATIOS OF PRECIPITATION } & \\ 1.00 & .99 & .98 & .97\end{array}$

VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG
VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG $.01667 \quad .01667$ 24.00000
VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG . $01667 \quad .01667 \quad 24.00000$
VALUE EXCEEDS TABIE IN LOGLOG . $01667 \quad .01667 \quad 24.00000$
VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG $.01667 \quad .01667 \quad 24.00000$
VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG $.01667 \quad .01667 \quad 24.00000$
VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG $.01667 \quad .01667 \quad 24.00000$
VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG .01667 $24.01667 \quad .0000$
VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG $.01667 \quad .01667$ 24.00000
VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG .01667 24.00000
VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG $.01667 \quad .01667$ 24.00000
VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG $.01667 \quad$ 24.00000
VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG $.01667 \quad .01667 \quad 24.00000$
VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG $.01667 \quad .01667 \quad 24.00000$
VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG .01667 24.00000



| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTED TO } \\ & + \end{aligned}$ | DP-B | . 337 | 1 | FLOW | 55.07 | 53.87 | 52.68 | 51.51 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.73 | 12.73 | 12.73 | 12.73 |
|  |  |  | ** | * PEAK STAGES STAGE TIME | $\begin{gathered} \text { S IN FEET } \\ 3.42 \\ 12.73 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{rr}  \\ \text { T ** } \\ 3.35 \\ 12.73 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.28 \\ 12.73 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.21 \\ 12.73 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { HYDROGRAPH AT } \\ & + \end{aligned}$ | GMN11 | . 029 | 1 | FLOW | 33.34 | 32.79 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 32.20 | 32.24 12.20 | 31.70 12.20 |
| $\begin{array}{r} 2 \text { COMBINED AT } \end{array}$ | CP-N9 | . 366 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FLOW } \\ & \text { TIME } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60.88 \\ & 12.60 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59.59 \\ & 12.60 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.31 \\ & 12.60 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57.03 \\ & 12.60 \end{aligned}$ |
| DIVERSION TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | DET-C | . 366 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FLOW } \\ & \text { TIME } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60.88 \\ & 12.60 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59.59 \\ & 12.60 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.31 \\ & 12.60 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57.03 \\ & 12.60 \end{aligned}$ |
| HYDROGRAPH AT | DIV-N | . 366 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FLOW } \\ & \text { TIME } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .00 \\ & .00 \end{aligned}$ | .00 .00 | .00 .00 | .00 .00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { HYDROGRAPH AT } \\ & + \end{aligned}$ | NR-2 | . 025 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FLOW } \\ & \text { TIME } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.38 \\ & 12.20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.01 \\ & 12.20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.63 \\ & 12.20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.27 \\ & 12.20 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTED TO } \\ & + \end{aligned}$ | NP-2 | . 025 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FLOW } \\ & \text { TIME } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.13 \\ 12.47 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.07 \\ 12.47 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.01 \\ 12.47 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.94 \\ 12.47 \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK STAGES STAGE TIME | $\begin{gathered} \text { IN FEET } \\ 59.15 \\ 12.47 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59.09 \\ & 12.47 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59.03 \\ & 12.47 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.97 \\ & 12.47 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTED TO } \\ & + \end{aligned}$ | B2R | . 025 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FLOW } \\ & \text { TIME } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.13 \\ 12.47 \end{array}$ | 6.07 12.47 | $\begin{array}{r} 6.01 \\ 12.47 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.94 \\ 12.47 \end{array}$ |
| HYDROGRAPH AT | GMS-2 | . 142 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ELOW } \\ & \text { TIME } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96.53 \\ & 12.37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 94.77 \\ & 12.37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 93.01 \\ & 12.37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 91.26 \\ & 12.37 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} 2 \text { COMBINED AT } \\ +\quad 1 \end{array}$ | NRCP1 | . 167 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FLOW } \\ & \text { TIME } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 102.57 \\ 12.37 \end{array}$ | 100.76 12.37 | $\begin{aligned} & 98.92 \\ & 12.37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97.07 \\ & 12.37 \end{aligned}$ |
| $+{ }^{\text {HYDROGRAPH AT }}$ | RDG-1 | . 040 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FLOK } \\ & \text { TIME } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42.29 \\ & 12.18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41.54 \\ & 12.18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40.79 \\ & 12.18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40.05 \\ & 12.18 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | NP-3* | . 040 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FLOW } \\ & \text { TIME } \\ & \text { PEAK STAGES } \\ & \text { STAGE } \\ & \text { TIME } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.11 \\ 12.60 \\ \\ \text { IN FEET } \\ 69.74 \\ 12.60 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9.10 \\ 12.60 \\ * * \quad \\ 69.68 \\ 12.60 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9.10 \\ 12.55 \\ \\ 69.61 \\ 12.60 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9.10 \\ 12.57 \\ 69.55 \\ 12.60 \end{array}$ |
| $+{ }_{+}+\quad+$ | NR-1 | . 063 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FLOW } \\ & \text { TIME } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 89.00 \\ & 12.20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 87.78 \\ & 12.20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 86.56 \\ & 12.20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 85.34 \\ & 12.20 \end{aligned}$ |
| $+2 \text { COMBINED AI }$ | POND1 | . 103 | 1 | FLOW TIME | $\begin{aligned} & 98.02 \\ & 12.20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96.80 \\ & 12.20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95.57 \\ & 12.20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 94.35 \\ & 12.20 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTED TO } \\ & +\quad \end{aligned}$ | NP-1 | . 103 | ** | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FLOW } \\ & \text { TIME } \\ & \text { PEAK STAGES } \\ & \text { STAGE } \\ & \text { TIME } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 63.86 \\ 12.37 \\ \text { IN FEET } \\ 41.33 \\ 12.37 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 63.02 \\ 12.37 \\ * * \\ 41.30 \\ 12.37 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 62.17 \\ & 12.37 \\ & \\ & 41.27 \\ & 12.37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61.32 \\ & 12.37 \\ & \\ & 41.24 \\ & 12.37 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { HYDROGRAPH AT } \\ & + \end{aligned}$ | GMS 1 | . 073 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FLOW } \\ & \text { TIME } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51.89 \\ & 12.30 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50.89 \\ & 12.30 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49.90 \\ & 12.30 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48.90 \\ & 12.30 \end{aligned}$ |
| + 3 COMBINED AT | NRCP2 | . 343 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FLOW } \\ & \text { TIME } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 215.89 \\ 12.35 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 212.26 \\ 12.35 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 208.60 \\ 12.35 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 204.96 \\ 12.35 \end{array}$ |
| + ROUTED TO | 42-IN | . 343 | 1 $* *$ 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FLOW } \\ & \text { TIME } \\ & \text { PEAK STAGES I } \\ & \text { STAGE } \\ & \text { TTME } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 201.21 \\ 12.43 \\ \text { IN FEET } \\ 5115.73 \\ 12.43 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 197.78 \\ 12.43 \\ * * \\ 5115.72 \\ 12.43 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 194.37 \\ 12.45 \\ \\ 5115.70 \\ 12.43 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 190.97 \\ 12.45 \\ \\ 5115.69 \\ 12.43 \end{array}$ |
| DIVERSION TO | OFLO | . 343 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ELOW } \\ & \text { TIME } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 146.55 \\ 12.43 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 143.43 \\ 12.43 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 140.34 \\ 12.45 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 137.24 \\ 12.45 \end{array}$ |
| $+\quad$ HYDROGRAPH AT | DV-42 | . 343 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FLOW } \\ & \text { TIME } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54.66 \\ & 12.43 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54.34 \\ & 12.43 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54.03 \\ & 12.45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53.72 \\ & 12.45 \end{aligned}$ |


| ROUTED TO | ROUTE2 | . 343 | 1 | FLOW | 54.57 | 54.26 | 53.95 | 53.64 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 12.55 | 12.55 | 12.55 | 12.55 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\rightarrow$ - | GH5 | . 097 | 1 | FLOW | 105.33 | 103.57 | 101.81 | 100.05 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| + | GP2 | . 097 | 1 | FLOW | 48.61 | 48.17 | 47.72 | 47.29 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.45 | 12.45 | 12.45 | 12.43 |
|  |  |  | ** | peak stages | IN FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | Stage | 5157.72 | 5157.63 | 5157.54 | 5157.46 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.45 | 12.45 | 12.45 | 12.43 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GH4 | . 027 | 1 | FLOW | 28.96 | 28.46 | 27.96 | 27.47 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GH3 | . 052 | 1 | FLOW | 48.71 | 47.86 | 47.01 | 46.16 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.23 | 12.23 | 12.23 | 12.23 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GH2 | . 035 | 1 | FLOW | 35.92 | 35.29 | 34.65 | 34.02 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| 4 Combined at |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GCP1 | . 211 | 1 | FLOW | 152.29 | 149.87 | 147.47 | 145.07 |
|  |  |  |  | tIME | 12.23 | 12.23 | 12.23 | 12.23 |
| ROUTED to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GP3 | . 211 | 1 | FLOW | 79.33 | 78.46 | 77.59 | 76.72 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.60 | 12.60 | 12.60 | 12.60 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK Stages | In feer | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | StAGE | 5134.93 . | 5134.85 | 5134.76 | 5134.67 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.60 | 12.60 | 12.60 | 12.60 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GH1 | . 008 | 1 | FLOW | 12.47 | 12.28 | 12.10 | 11.92 |
|  |  |  |  | time | 12.13 | 12.13 | 12.13 | 12.13 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GHCP2 | . 219 | 1 | FLOW | 81.34 | 80.45 | 79.56 | 78.57 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.55 | 12.55 | 12.55 | 12.55 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | ROUTEI | . 219 | 1 | FLOW | 80.11 | 79.22 | 78.34 | 77.46 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.72 | 12.72 | 12.72 | 12.72 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - | NVHS | . 116 | 1 | FLOW | 174.48 | 172.23 | 169.97 | 167.71 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| ABINED AT | HS+GH | . 335 | 1 | FLOW | 202.51 | 199.52 | 196.53 | 193.53 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.23 | 12.23 | 12.23 | 12.23 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PNT1 | . 678 | 1 | FLOW | 240.17 | 236.82 | 233.46 | 230.07 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.25 | 12.25 | 12.25 | 12.25 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | DETSCH | . 678 | 1 | FLOW | 145.75 | 143.19 | 140.63 | 138.07 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.78 | 12.78 | 12.80 | 12.82 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK Stages | IN FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | STAGE | 100.39 | 100.37 | 100.34 | 100.32 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.78 | 12.78 | 12.80 | 12.82 |
| DIVERSION TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | DV-GVD | . 678 | 1 | FLOW | 90.11 | 88.32 | 86.53 | 84.75 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.78 | 12.78 | 12.80 | 12.82 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | TOGMS | . 678 | 1 | FLOW | 55.65 | 54.87 | 54.10 | 53.32 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.78 | 12.78 | 12.80 | 12.82 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | EState | 1.044 | 1 | FLOW | 55.65 | 54.87 | 54.10 |  |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.78 | 12.78 | 12.80 | 12.82 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GMN3 | . 278 | 1 | FLow | 73.36 | 71.22 | 69.10 | 66.99 |
|  | * |  |  | time | 12.50 | 12.50 | 12.50 | 12.50 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GMN1 | . 104 | 1 | FLOW | 75.89 | 74.47 | 73.06 | 71.65 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.30 | 12.32 | 12.32 | 12.32 |
| 2 COMBINED AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CP-N10 | . 382 | - | FLow | 136.83 | 133.48 | 130.15 | 126.85 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.38 | 12.38 | 12.38 | 12.38 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GMS-3 | . 200 | 1 | FLOW | 65.33 | 63.52 | 61.73 | 59.95 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.42 | 12.42 | 12.42 | 12.42 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | RCAL-1 | .000 | I | FLOW | 146.55 | 143.43 | 140.34 | 137.24 |

## 10-DAY MODEL

EXISTING AND PROPOSED CONDITIONS

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS HYDROLOGIC ENGINEERING CENTER 609 SECOND STREET DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616 (916) 756-1104

| X | X |  | x xxxx |  |  | x |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| X | X | X | X | X |  | XX |
| X | X | I | x |  |  | x |
| 8000000 |  | x00x | X |  | 8xx8x | X |
| X | X | x | x |  |  | X |
| X | X | X | X | x |  | X |
| X | X | xxxxxax |  |  |  | $x \times x$ |

THIS PROGRAM REPLACES ALL PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF HEC-1 KNOWN AS HEC1 (JAN 73), HEC1GS, GECIDB, AND HECIKW.
THE DEFINITIONS OF VARIABIES -RTIMP- AND -RTIOR- HAVE CHANGED FROM THOSE USED WITH THE 1973 -STYLE INPUT STRUCTURE. THE DEFINITION OF -AMSKK- ON RM-CARD MAS CHANGED WITH REVISIONS DATED 28 SEP 81. THIS IS THE FORTRANT7 VERSION NEW OPTIONS: DAMBREAK OUTFLON SUBAERGENCE, SINGLE EVENT DAMAGE CALCULATION, DSS:WRITE STAGE FREQUENCY, DSS:READ TTME SERIES AT DESIRED CALCULATION INTERVAL LOSS RATE:GREEN AND AMPT INEILTRATION KINEMATIC WAVE: NEW FINITE DIFFERENCE ALGORITMM
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MODEL TO DETERMINE FLOW RATES FOR GOLDEN MESA NORTHAND SOUTH PROPOSEDAND
EXISTING CONDITIONS MODEL
TO FIND 10 DAY RUNOFF VOLUMES
MODEL NAME GMN10.DAT
100 YR10 DAY PRECIPITATION


*** ERROR *** SPECIFIED START AND END DATES RESULT IN TOO MANY TIME PERIODS


PEAK ELOW AND STAGE (END-OF-PRRIOD) SUMMARY FOR MULTIPLE PLAN-RATIO ECONOMIC COMPUTATIONS FLONS IN CUBIC FEET PER SECOND, AREA IN SQUARE MILES TIME TO PEAK IN HOURS


** NORMAI END OF HEC-1 ***

## APPENDIX D <br> HYDRAULIC CALCULATIONS

Outlet consists of 42"pipe that goes to NVHS detention basin and weir flow over Golden Valley Road towards Golden Mesa
Overflow modeled as a weir with 100 ft width and $\mathrm{C}=2.0$
Weir $\mathrm{Q}=\mathrm{CLH}^{\wedge} 3 / 2$

| Elev, | Area, ac | Culvert Q | Weir Q | Total Q |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5113 |  | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| 5114 | 0.255 | 20 | 0 | 20 |
| 5115 |  | 40 | 0 | 40 |
| 5116 | 2.207 | 60 | 200 | 260 |
| 5117 |  | 75 | 598 | 673 |
| 5118 | 3.296 | 90 | 1040 | 1130 |

Note: Areas based on 2 ft topo contours

## ANALYSIS OF NVHS OUTLET

Outlet consistsof a $12^{\prime \prime}$ RCP at elev. 94.09, a 36" RCP at elev. 95.9, and overtopping at elev 99 Overtopping modeled as a weir at elev. 99, 20 ft wide, $\mathrm{C}=3.0$

| Elev. | Area, Ac | $12^{\text {¹ }} \mathrm{Q}$ | $36^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{Q}$ | Weir Q | Total Q |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 93.59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 95 | 0.7163 | 2.2 | 0 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 96 | 2.0073 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 97 | 2.4015 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 13 |
| 98 | 2.521 | 7.8 | 19 | 0 | 26.8 |
| 99 | 2.6358 | 8.5 | 35 | 0 | 43.5 |
| 100 | 2.7 | 8.5 | 35 | 60 | 103.5 |
| 101 | 2.71 | 8.5 | 35 | 168 | 211.5 |

## CULVERTS AT ESTATES ROAD EXISTING CONDITIONS

$18^{\prime \prime}$ and $36^{\prime \prime}$ RCPs at elev. 5087, weir flow over Estates at 5092
Weir lengths based on survey of road, $\mathrm{C}=$
Elev. Area, Ac 18" Q $36^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{Q}$ Weir Q Total Q

| 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 88 | 0.005 | 4 | 7.5 | 0 | 11.5 |
| 89 |  | 9 | 19 | 0 | 28 |
| 90 | 0.25 | 12 | 35 | 0 | 47 |
| 91 |  | 16 | 50 | 0 | 66 |
| 92 | 5.401 | 18 | 60 | 0 | 78 |
| 93 |  | 20 | 72 | 147 | 239 |
| 94 | 14.262 | 20 | 78 | 10472 | 10570 |

Capacity ffoldon Valley Road
East Bound Lave

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { width }=21 \mathrm{ft} \\
& \text { depth }=0,5 \mathrm{ft}(h t \text { of center curb) } \\
& \text { slope: } \Delta h=2 \mathrm{ft} L=137,5 \mathrm{ft} \\
& s=2 / 137,5=.0145
\end{aligned}
$$

Roughness, $\mathrm{n}=$ or
wetter Permute, $P=0.5+0.5+21=22 f+$
Area $, A=0,5(21,0)=10,5 f+{ }^{2}$
Hyde. Ralus, $R=A / P=10.5 / 22=0.48 f t$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& R^{2 / 3}=(.48)^{2 / 3}=0.61 \\
& S^{1 / 2}=(.045)^{1 / 2}=0.12 \\
& V=1.42 / \pi R^{2 / 3} S^{1 / 2}=1.013(.61)(12)=114.6(.07) \\
& V=8.0 f+/ \sec \\
& Q=A V=(10.5)(8.0)=84 \quad \text { of s }
\end{aligned}
$$

West Bound have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& w h+h=40 f t \\
& d e p t h=0.5 f t \\
& s l o p e=.0145
\end{aligned}
$$

Roughness, $n_{1}=, 013$
witted Pervert $p=0.5+0.5+40=41 f+$
Area, $A=0.5(41)=20.5 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$
Hid Radws, R=A/P=20.5/41=0.5

$$
\begin{aligned}
& R^{2 / 3}=(15)^{2 / 3}=0.63 \\
& S^{1 / 2}=0.12
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& V=1.4 \% 1 / 163)(.12)=(1416)(1070) \\
& V=8.7+1500 \\
& D=A V=(20.5)(8.1+a)=178 \mathrm{cts}
\end{aligned}
$$

Teter Q

$$
Q=84+178=269 \text { cfs }
$$

Fhow duERTES $N$ ON EStATES
Ave. wath $=44 f+$

## APPENDIXE <br> SEDIMENTATION ANALYSIS

K FACTORS FOR GOLDEN MESA NORTH

| BASIN | K | FRACTION OF AREA | K | FRACTION OF AREA |  | FRACTION OF AREA | K | FRACTION OF AREA | K | FRACTION OF AREA | K | FRACTION of AREA | FINAL <br> K VALUE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GMN 1+3 | 0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.15 | 0 | 0.17 | 0.33 | 0.28 | 0.57 | 0.32 | 0 | 0.22 |
| GMN2+4+7 | 0 |  | 0.1 | 0.275 | 0.15 |  | 0.17 | 0.535 | 0.28 | 0.098 | 0.32 |  | 0.15 |
| GMN 5A | 0 |  | 0.1 | 0.81 | 0.15 |  | 0.17 | 0.016 | 0.28 | 0.169 | 0.32 |  | 0.13 |
| GMN5B | 0 | 0.09 | 0.1 | 0.18 | 0.15 |  | 0.17 | 0.59 | 0.28 | 0.136 | 0.32 |  | 0.16 |
| GMN 6 | 0 |  | 0.1 | 1 | 0.15 |  | 0.17 |  | 0.28 |  | 0.32 |  | 0.10 |
| GMN 8 | 0 |  | 0.1 | 0.01 | 0.15 |  | 0.17 | 0.87 | 0.28 | 0.12 | 0.32 |  | 0.18 |
| GMN 9 | 0 |  | 0.1 | 0.23 | 0.15 |  | 0.17 | 0.22 | 0.28 | 0.544 | 0.32 |  | 0.21 |
| GMN10+12 | 0 |  | 0.1 |  | 0.15 |  | 0.17 |  | 0.28 | 1 | 0.32 |  | 0.28 |
| GMN 11 | 0 |  | 0.1 |  | 0.15 |  | 0.17 |  | 0.28 | 1 | 0.32 |  | 0.28 |

MODIFIED UNIVERSAL SOIL LOSS EQUATION FOR GOLDEN MESA WATERSHED GMN-9
$Y=$ Sediment yield in tons for a given storm $V=$ runoff volume for storm in acre-feet $Q=$ Peak flow rate in cfs
$\mathrm{K}=$ soil erodibility factor
L=length factor

## $Y=95(\mathrm{VQ}){ }^{.56} \mathrm{KLSCP}$

weighted K is
$\mathrm{L}=365$ feet
$(365)^{.5}\left(.0076+.53^{*} .03+7.6^{*}(.03)^{2}\right)$
$\mathrm{C}=$ Cover factor
$\mathrm{P}=$ Support pract
From NRCS webite

The average annual water yield is 100 mm or 0.33 ft (Wolman and Riggs, 1990)
$V$ and $Q$ will be determined for the $2,10,25,50$ and 100 year storms of 24 hour duration
5-NLNפ
SISATVN甘 โ-כヨH

HEC-1 ANALYSIS

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Return Pd } \\
\mathrm{yr} \\
\\
2 \\
10 \\
25 \\
50 \\
100
\end{gathered}
$$

For GMN-9, the average water yield is ( 0.33 ft$)^{*}(97.45$ acres $)=32.2$ ac- ft
$Y=((32.2 *(0.01 * 5.8)+(0.02 * 3.9)+(0.04 * 2.5)+(0.1 * 1.0)+(0.5 * 0.1))) /((0.01 * 8.2)+(0.02 * 6.2)+(0.04 * 4.5)+(0.1 * 2.6)+(0.5 * 0.6))$
 Soil is decomposed granite (dg)
Density of dg is about $4,000 \mathrm{lb} /$ cubic
or 2 tons/ cubic yard
MODIFIED UNIVERSAL SOIL LOSS EQUATION FOR COLINA ROSA OFFSITE WATERSHED GMN-11
$Y=$ Sediment yield in tons for a given storm

## $Y=95(\mathrm{VQ}){ }^{56} \mathrm{KLSCP}$

$V=$ runoff volume for storm in acre-feet
$Q=$ Peak flow rate in cfs
$\mathrm{K}=$ soil erodibility factor
L=length factor
$\mathrm{S}=$ slope steepness factor
$\mathrm{C}=$ Cover factor
$\mathrm{P}=$ Support
From NRCS webite
 Then KLSCP $=0.002$
and
$Y=(95)(0.002)\left((\mathrm{VQ})^{.56}\right)=0.19(\mathrm{VQ})^{.56}$
The average annual water yield is 100 mm or 0.33 ft (Wolman and Riggs, 1990)
$V$ and $Q$ will be determined for the $2,10,25,50$ and 100 year storms of 24 hour duration

|  | HEC-1 ANALYSIS |  | GMN 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Return Pd <br> yr | Q <br> cfs | V, <br> $\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ | $(\text { VQ })^{56}$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.450 |
| 10 | 8.2 | 1.4 | 3.923 |
| 25 | 16.3 | 2.2 | 7.423 |
| 50 | 24.6 | 2.9 | 10.911 |
| 100 | 35.4 | 3.7 | 15.333 |

For GMN 11, the average water yield is ( 0.33 ft$)^{*}(18.6$ acres $)=6.1 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$
Average annual yield: Eq. 1313 in the Manual
$Y=\left(\left(6.1^{*}(.01 * 2.9)+(.02 * 2.1)+(.04 * 1.4)+\left(.1^{*} 0.7\right)+(.5 * 0.1)\right)\right) /\left((.01 * 3.7)+(.02 * 2.9)+\left(.04^{*} 2.2\right)+\left(.1^{*} 1.4\right)+(.5 * .4)\right)=$

Density of dg is about $4,000 \mathrm{lb} /$ cubic yard
or 2 tons/ cubic yard Therefore about 0.4 cubic yards of sediment are eroded per year
MODIFIED UNIVERSAL SOIL LOSS EQUATION FOR GOLDN MESA OFFSITE WATERSHED

> 5B
> $Y=95(\mathrm{VQ}){ }^{.56} \mathrm{KLSCP}$
$Y=$ Sediment yield in tons for a given storm $V=$ runoff volume for storm in acre-feet $Q=$ Peak flow rate in cfs
$\mathrm{K}=$ soil erodibility factor L=length factor
$\mathrm{S}=$ slope steepness factor
C=Cover factor

0.005
The average annual water yield is 100 mm or 0.33 ft (Wolman and Riggs, 1990)
$V$ and $Q$ will be determined for the $2,10,25,50$ and 100 year storms of 24 hour duration

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Return Pd } \\ \quad \mathrm{yr} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | HEC-1 ANALYSIS |  |  | 5B |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ppt depth inches | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Q} \\ \mathrm{cfs} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{V} \\ \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft} \end{gathered}$ | (VQ) $)^{56}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} Y \\ \text { tons } \end{gathered}$ |
| 2 |  | 0.29 | 0.23 | 0.220 |  | 0.11 |
| 10 |  | 3.9 | 1.2 | 2.373 | 1 | 1.14 |
| 25 |  | 11.3 | 2.1 | 5.891 |  | 2.83 |
| 50 |  | 19.6 | 2.9 | 9.607 |  | 4.61 |
| 100 |  | 31 | 3.9 | 14.661 |  | 7.04 |
|  |  |  | 10.33 |  |  |  |

For 5B, the average water yield is ( 0.33 ft$)^{*}(49.07$ acres $)=16.2$ ac- ft
$Y=((16.2 *(.01 * 7.04)+(.02 * 4.61)+(.04 * 2.83)+(.1 * 1.14)+(.5 * .11))) /((.01 * 3.9)+(.02 * 2.9)+(.04 * 2.1)+(.1 * 1.2)+(.5 * .23))=$ Soil is decomposed granite (dg)
Density of dg is about $4,000 \mathrm{lb} /$ cubic yard or 2 tons/ cubic yard
In the $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ year event about 3.5 cubic yards are eroded.
MODIFIED UNIVERSAL SOIL LOSS EQUATION FOR GOLDEN MESA OFFSITE WATERSHED

## 5A

## $Y=95(\mathrm{VQ}){ }^{56} \mathrm{KLSCP}$

$Y=$ Sediment yield in tons for a given storm $V=$ runoff volume for storm in acre-feet
$\mathrm{Q}=$ Peak flow rate in cfs K=soil erodibility factor
L=length factor
$\mathrm{S}=$ slope steepness factor
C=Cover factor
$P=$ Support practice factor
0.13
From NRCS webite
> . 13
> 0.013 Figs 1305, 1306 and 1307 in Manual 1 No tillage factors

[^2]| $\begin{gathered} \text { Return Pd } \\ \mathrm{yr} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | HEC-1 ANALYSIS |  |  | 5A |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ppt depth inches | $\underset{\mathrm{cfs}}{\mathrm{Q}}$ | $\mathrm{v}$ | (va) $)^{56}$ | $\begin{gathered} y \\ t \end{gathered}$ |
| 2 |  | 2.8 | 0.8 | 1.57 | 0.754 |
| 10 |  | 14.4 | 2.4 | 7.27 | 3.490 |
| 25 |  | 25.3 | 3.6 | 12.51 | 6.005 |
| 50 |  | 36.4 | 4.6 | 17.59 | 8.445 |
| 100 |  | 50.5 | 5.8 | 24.06 | 11.551 |
|  |  |  | 17.2 |  |  |

For 5A, the average water yield is ( 0.33 ft$)^{*}(44.46 \mathrm{acres})=14.7 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$
Average annual yield: Eq. 1313 in the Manual
$Y=\left(\left(14.7^{*}(.01 * 11.6)+(.02 * 8.45)+(.04 * 6.0)+(.1 * 3.49)+(.5 * .75)\right)\right) /((.01 * 5.8)+(.02 * 4.6)+(.04 * 3.6)+(.1 * 2.4)+(.5 * .8))=$ $Y=3.04$ TONS/YEAR
Soil is decomposed granite ( dg )
Density of dg is about $4,000 \mathrm{lb} /$ cubic yard or 2 tons/cubic yard
Therefore about 1.5 cubic yards of sediment are eroded per year
In the $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ year event about 5.78 cubic yards are eroded.
MODIFIED UNIVERSAL SOIL LOSS EQUATION FOR GOLDEN MESA WATERSHED GMN-6
$Y=$ Sediment yield in tons for a given storm $V=$ runoff volume for storm in acre-feet
$\mathrm{Q}=$ Peak flow rate in cfs
$K=s o i l ~ e r o d i b i l i t y ~ f a c t o r ~$ L=length factor
$S=$ slope steepness factor C=Cover factor
$\mathrm{P}=$ Support practice factor

> From NRCS webite
> 0.1

> 1 No tillage factors
$\mathrm{S}=.15 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$


[^3]| $\begin{gathered} \text { Return Pd } \\ \mathrm{yr} \end{gathered}$ | HEC-1 ANALYSIS |  | GMN-6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Q} \\ \mathrm{cfs} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{V}, \mathrm{f} \\ \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft} \end{gathered}$ | (va) $)^{56}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{r} \\ \text { tons } \end{gathered}$ |
| 2 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 0.490 | 0.140 |
| 10 | 5 | 0.5 | 1.670 | 0.476 |
| 25 | 8.4 | 0.7 | 2.697 | 0.769 |
| 50 | 11.7 | 0.9 | 3.737 | 1.065 |
| 100 | 15.9 | 1.1 | 4.965 | 1.415 |

[^4]MODIFIED UNIVERSAL SOIL LOSS EQUATION FOR COLINA ROSA OFFSITE WATERSHED GMN-8
$Y=$ Sediment yield in tons for a given storm $V=$ runoff volume for storm in acre-feet
$Q=$ Peak flow rate in cfs
$K=$ soil erodibility factor
L=length factor
$Y=95(\mathrm{VQ}){ }^{.56} \mathrm{KLSCP}$
$S=$ slope steepness factor
$C=$ Cover factor
$P=$ Support practice factor
K:
$\mathrm{L}=65$ feet
$\mathrm{S}=.031 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$
$(65)^{5}\left(.0076+.031 * .53+7.6^{*}(.031)^{2}\right)$
$8.1^{*}(.0076+0.116+.007)=$
$\mathrm{C}=(.56)(.1)(.23)=$
0.002
$Y=(95)(0.002)\left((\mathrm{VQ})^{.56}\right)=0.19(\mathrm{VQ}){ }^{.56}$
The average annual water yield is 100 mm or 0.33 ft (Wolman and Riggs, 1990)
$V$ and $Q$ will be determined for the $2,10,25,50$ and 100 year storms of 24 hour duration

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Return Pd } \\ \quad y r \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ | HEC-1 ANALYSIS |  | 8 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Q} \\ \mathrm{cfs} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{V}, \\ \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft} \end{gathered}$ | (VQ) ${ }^{56}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Y} \\ \text { tons } \end{gathered}$ |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |
| 10 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.112 | 1 | 0.021 |
| 25 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.305 |  | 0.058 |
| 50 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 0.913 |  | 0.173 |
| 100 | 4.4 | 0.7 | 1.878 |  | 0.357 |
|  |  | 1.6 |  |  |  |

For GMN-8, the average water yield is ( 0.33 ft ) $*(17.4$ acres $)=5.7 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$

$Y=\left(\left(5.7^{*}\left(.01^{*} .36\right)+\left(.02^{*} .17\right)+\left(.04^{*} 0.06\right)+\left(.1^{*} .021\right)+\left(.5^{*} 0\right)\right)\right) /\left(\left(.01^{*} 0.7\right)+\left(.02^{*} .5\right)+\left(.04^{*} .3\right)+\left(.1^{*} .1\right)+\left(.5^{*} 0\right)\right)=$ $$
0.729 \text { tons/year }
$$

Soil is decomposed granite $(\mathrm{dg})$
Soil is decomposed granite (dg)
Density of dg is about $4,000 \mathrm{lb} /$
or 2 tons/ cubic yard
Therefore about 0.3 cubic yards of sediment are eroded per year
In the 100 year event about 0.2 cubic yards are eroded.
MODIFIED UNIVERSAL SOIL LOSS EQUATION FOR GOLDEN MESA WATERSHED GMN-3+1
> $Y=$ Sediment yield in tons for a given storm $V=$ runoff volume for storm in acre-feet

> Q=Peak flow rate in cfs
> $\mathrm{K}=$ soil erodibility factor
> L=length factor
> $\mathrm{S}=$ slope steepness factor
> C=Cover factor
> $P=$ Support practice factor
$Y=95(\mathrm{VQ}){ }^{.56} \mathrm{KLSCP}$

### 0.22

From NRCS webite
$\mathrm{Y}=(95)^{*}(.007)^{*}(\mathrm{VQ})^{.56} \quad \mathrm{Y}=.67 *(\mathrm{VQ})^{.56}$
The average annual water yield is 100 mm or 0.33 ft (Wolman and Riggs, 1990)
$V$ and $Q$ will be determined for the $2,10,25,50$ and 100 year storms of 24 hour duration

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { HEC-1 ANALYSIS } \\
& \text { Return Pd } \\
& \text { خ } \quad \text { 윽웅 }
\end{aligned}
$$

For GMN3 +1 , the average water yield is ( 0.33 ft$)^{*}(238.07 \mathrm{acres})=78.6 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$
Average annual yield: Eq. 1313 in the Manual
$Y=\left(\left(78.6^{*}(0.01 * 33.1)+(0.02 * 21.6)+(0.04 * 12.8)+(0.1 * 5.11)+(0.5\right.\right.$
 Density of dg is about $4,000 \mathrm{lb} /$ cubic yard
or 2 tons/ cubic yard
上 Liver .
$Y=\left(\left(78.6^{*}(0.01 * 33.1)+(0.02 * 21.6)+(0.04 * 12.8)+(0.1 * 5.11)+(0.5 * 0.7)\right)\right) /\left(\left(0.01^{*} 17.9\right)+\left(0.02^{*} 13.3\right)+(0.04 * 9.2)+\left(0.1^{*} 5.3\right)+(0.5 * 0.9)\right)$
Therefore about 7.8 cubic yards of sediment are eroded per year
In the 100 year event about 16.5 cubic yards are eroded.
MODIFIED UNIVERSAL SOIL LOSS EQUATION FOR GOLDEN MESA WATERSHEDS
From NRCS webite GMN-2+4+7

## $\widehat{Y}=95(\mathrm{VO})^{.56} \mathrm{KLSCP}$

$Y=$ Sediment yield in tons for a given storm $V=$ runoff volume for storm in acre-feet Q=Peak flow rate in cfs K=soil erodibility factor
L=length factor
$S=$ slope steepness factor C=Cover factor
$\mathrm{P}=$ Support practice factor
0.15

The average annual water yield is 100 mm or 0.33 ft (Wolman and Riggs, 1990) $V$ and $Q$ will be determined for the $2,10,25,50$ and 100 year storms of 24 hour duration

HEC-1 ANALYSIS GMN 2+4+7


$$
\circ \stackrel{n}{i} \quad-\hat{\sim}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Return Pd } \\
\text { yr } \\
2 \\
10 \\
25 \\
50 \\
100
\end{gathered}
$$

For $2+4+7$, the average water yield is ( 0.33 ft )*(214.9acres) $=70.9 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$
Average annual yield: Eq. 1313 in the Manual
$\mathrm{Y}=\left(\left(70.9^{*}\left(.01^{*} 11.4\right)+(.02 * 7.4)+(.04 * 4.3)+(.1 * 1.8)+(.5 * 0.3)\right)\right) /($


Soil is decomposed granite (dg)
Density of dg is about $4,000 \mathrm{lb} /$
or 2 tons/ cubic yard
Therefore about 2.7 cubic yards of sediment are eroded per year
In the 100 year event about 5.6 cubic yards are eroded.

HEC-1 ANALYSIS GMN 10+12
>



$$
\begin{gathered}
\tau 乙 \\
9 \tau \\
\tau \tau \\
\angle \\
\tau \\
\\
\text { sf } \\
0
\end{gathered}
$$

For GMN 11, the average water yield is ( 0.33 ft$)^{*}(12.6$ acres $)=4.2 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$
Average annual yield: Eq. 1313 in the Manual
$Y=\left(\left(4.2 *(.01 * 1.6)+(.02 * 1.2)+(.04 * 0.9)+\left(.1^{*} 0.5\right)+(.5 * 0.2)\right)\right) /\left((.01 * 2.1)+(.02 * 1.7)+(.04 * 1.4)+\left(.1^{*} 0.9\right)+(.5 * .6)\right)=$ 0.631 tons/year
Soil is decomposed granite ( dg )

Soil is decomposed granite (dg)
Density of dg is about $4,000 \mathrm{lb} /$ cubic yard or 2 tons/ cubic yard Therefore about 0.3 cubic yards of sediment are eroded per year In the 100 year event about 0.75 cubic yards are eroded.
MODIFIED UNIVERSAL SOIL LOSS EQUATION FOR COLINA ROSA OFFSITE WATERSHED GMN-10+12

## $Y=95(\mathrm{VQ}){ }^{.56} \mathrm{KLSCP}$

$Y=$ Sediment yield in tons for a given storm $V=$ runoff volume for storm in acre-feet $Q=$ Peak flow rate in cfs $\mathrm{K}=$ soil erodibility factor
L=length factor
$\mathrm{S}=$ slope steepness factor
C=Cover factor
$P=$ Support practice factor
$0.28 \quad$ From NRCS webite
Eq 1308 in Manual
0.15
0.013 Figs 1305,1306 and 1307 in Manual
1 No tillage factors $(100)^{.5}\left(.0076+.012^{*} .53+7.6^{*}(.012)^{2}\right)$ 10* $(.0076+0.006+.001)=$
K :
Then KLSCP=
0.001
$Y=(95)(0.001)\left((\mathrm{VQ})^{.56}\right)=0.095(\mathrm{VQ})^{.56}$
The average annual water yield is 100 mm or 0.33 ft (Wolman and Riggs, 1990)
$V$ and $Q$ will be determined for the $2,10,25,50$ and 100 year storms of 24 hour duration

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS HYDROLOGIC ENGINEERING CENTER 609 SECOND STREET DAVIS, CAIIFORNIA 95616 (916) 756-1104

| X | X | xxxxxxx | xxxxx |  |  | X |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| X | X | X | x | X |  | XX |
| X | X | X | X |  |  | X |
| xxxxxx |  | xxxx | X |  | 2xxxx | x |
| X | X | X | X |  |  | X |
| X | X | X | x | X |  | X |
| X | X | Xxxxxxx |  |  |  | XXX |

THIS PROGRAM REPLACES ALL PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF HEC-1 KNOWN AS HEC1 (JAN 73), HEC1GS, HEC1DB, AND HEC1KW.
THE DEFINITIONS OF VARIABLES -RTIMP- AND -RTIOR- HAVE CHANGED FROM THOSE USED WITH THE 1973-STYLE INPUT STRUCTURE THE DEFINITION OF -AMSKK- ON RM-CARD WAS CHANGED WITH REVISIONS DATED 28 SEP 81. THIS IS THE FORTRAN77 VERSION NEH OPTIONS: DAMBREAK OUTFIOW SUBMERGENCE, SINGLE EVENT DAMAGE CALCULATION, DSS:WRITE STAGE EREQUENCY, NEW OPTIONS: DAMBREAK OUTFIOW SUBMERGENCE , SINGLE EVENT DAMAGE CALCULATION, DSS:WRITE STAGE KINEMATIC FAVE: NEW FINITE DIFFERENCE ALGORITHM
*DDIAGRAM
MODEL TO DETERMINE FLOW RATES FOR GOLDEN MESA NORTH
EXISTING CONDITIONS MODEL
MODEL FOR USE IN CALCULATING SOIL LOSS
MODEL NAME GMN2S.DAT
2 YR2A HR PRECIP

****************************************************************************)

15
15
2880
15
5
PREC 1



信
DARF AREA (SQ. MI.)
$\begin{array}{lr}\text { DARF } & \text { AREA (SQ. } \\ 1.00 & 0-2 \\ 0.99 & 2.1-8\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}0.98 & 8.1-8 \\ 0.16\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}0.97 & 16.1-29 \\ 0.96 & 29.1-43\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}0.97 & 16.1-29 \\ 0.96 & 29.1-43 \\ 0.95 & 43.1-63\end{array}$
$0.95 \quad 43.1-63$
********************************************************************************)
$\begin{array}{cccc}\text { ************************************* } \\ \text { PREC } 1.0 & 0.99 & 0.98 & 0.97\end{array}$


BEGIN NIMBUS 90 MODEL - SP R1. 705
NO MODIFICATIONS M ADE
*********************************************************************************)

| KK | GMN5B | RUNOFF | FROM WATERSHED | GMN5B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| BA | .077 | 1 | 0 | .127 | .239 | .399 | .526 | .643 | .943 | 1.29 |

    5B-VOL
    | STOR | 0 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 2 |


| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

HEC-1 INPUT $\quad$ PAGE 2

LINE
ID. $\qquad$ .4. $\qquad$
GMN5A RUNOFF FROM WATERSHED GMN5A
.069
74
5A-VOL

LINE

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 옹ㅇㅇㅇ․ |  | $\stackrel{\ominus}{\bullet}$ |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ |  |


| $10+12 V$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | STOR | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |  |

HEC-1 INPUT
PAGE 3

$$
4+7+2 \quad \text { RUNOFF FROM } \mathrm{GMN} 4+\mathrm{GMN} 7+\mathrm{GM} 2
$$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
.33 & 63
\end{array}
$$

$$
472 \mathrm{VOL}
$$



MODEL TO DETERMINE FLOW RATES FOR GOLDEN MESA NORTH
EXISTING CONDITIONS MODEL
MODEL FOR USE IN CALCULATING SOIL LOSS
MODEL NAME GMN2S.DAT
2 YR24 HR PRECIP

*************************************************************************)

*** ERROR *** SPECIFIED START AND END DATES RESULT IN TOO MANY TIME PERIODS
14 IO



*** 2 ERROR(S) DETECTED BY HEC-1 ***


| $*$ |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| $*$ |  |
| $*$ | U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS |${ }^{*}$


| x | X | XXXXXXXX | xXxxx |  |  | X |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| x | x | x | x | X |  | XX |
| X | X | X | x |  |  | X |
| XXXXXXX |  | xXxx | x |  | xxxxx | X |
| X | X | x | x |  |  | x |
| X | X | X | X | x |  | X |
| X | X | XXXXXXXX |  |  |  | xXX |

THIS PROGRAM REPLACES ALL PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF HEC-1 KNOWN AS HEC1 (JAN 73), HEC1GS, HEC1DB, AND HEC1KW.
HE DEFINITIONS OF VARIABLES -RTIMP- AND -RTIOR- HAVE CHANGED FROM THOSE USED WITH THE 1973-STYLE INPUT STRUCTURE THE DEFINITION OF -AMSKK- ON RM-CARD WAS CHANGED WITH REVISIONS DATED 28 SEP 81. THIS IS THE FORTRAN77 VERSION NEW OPTIONS: DAMBREAK OUTFLOW SUBMERGENCE, SINGLE EVENT DAMAGE CALCULATION, DSS:WRITE STAGE FREQUENCY DSS:READ TIME SERIES AT DESIRED CALCULATION INTERVAL LOSS RATE:GREEN AND AMPT INFILTRATION KINEMATIC WAVE: NEW FINITE DIFFERENCE ALGORITHM

$\qquad$
GMN5A RUNOFF FROM WATERSHED GMN5A
.069
$5 \mathrm{~A}-\mathrm{VOI}$
1
1
0
0
0
$\begin{array}{rr}\text { STOR } & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 2\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 & 5 & 6\end{array}$
GMN6 RUNOFF FROM GMN6
.012
127
ธVOL

| GVOL |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | STOR | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 2 |

○ $\omega \hookleftarrow$
1
4जOVに
1
6
0
6
GMN8RUNOFF FROM GMN 8
.027
.12
54
8 -VO
$\begin{array}{rrr}1 & \text { STOR } & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 2\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 & 5 & 6\end{array}$
GMIN9 RUNOFF FROM GMN9 UNDEVELORED
65
.31
$9-\mathrm{VOL}$
1
$\begin{array}{rlllll}\text { STOR } & 0 & & & & \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6\end{array}$
10+12 RUNOFF FROM GMN10+GMN 12
79
HEC-1 INPUT
PAGE 3

```
            STOR 
4+7+2 RUNOFF FROM GMN4+GMNN7+GM2
            6 3
1.01
            STOR
                TOR 
                NOFF FROM GMN3 + GMN1
            63
                                    0.82
            STOR 
            GMN11 RUNOFF FROM GMN11
GMN UNDEVELOPED
                PED
            70
11-VOL
            STOR
                0
                    WOWH
                    のロのッ
```


SCHEMATIC DIAGRAM OF STREAM NETWORK
(V) ROUTING
(--->) DIVERSION OR PUMP FLOW
(.) CONNECTOR
(<---) RETURN OF DIVERTED OR PUMPED FLOW

| 17 | GMN5 |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | V |
| 22 | V |
| $23-\mathrm{VOL}$ |  |


| GMN5A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5A-VOL of |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\cdot$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| . | GMN6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| . | V |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| . | v |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| . | 6VOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| . | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| . | - | GMN8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| . | . | V |  |  |  |  |  |
| - | . | V |  |  |  |  |  |
| . | - | 8-VOL |  |  |  |  |  |
| - | - | . |  |  |  |  |  |
| . | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| . | . | - | Gan9 |  |  |  |  |
| . | - | - | V |  |  |  |  |
| . | - | , | V |  |  |  |  |
| . | - | - | 9-VOL |  |  |  |  |
| - | $\cdot$ | . | . |  |  |  |  |
| - | - | - | . |  |  |  |  |
| - | - | . | . | 10+12 |  |  |  |
| . | - | . | . | V |  |  |  |
| . | - | . | . | V |  |  |  |
| - | - | . | - | $10+12 \mathrm{~V}$ |  |  |  |
| . | - | - | . | - |  |  |  |
| - | - | - | . | . |  |  |  |
| . | - | . | . | - | $4+7+2$ |  |  |
| - | . | . | . | . | V |  |  |
| - | . | - | . | . | V |  |  |
| - | . | - | . | . | 472 VOL |  |  |
| - | - | - | . | - | . |  |  |
| - | . | - | . | . | . |  |  |
| - | - | - | - | . | . | $3+1$ |  |
| - | . | - | . | . | . | V |  |
| - | - | - | - | . | . | V |  |
| - | . | . | . | . | . | $3+1 \mathrm{VOL}$ |  |
| - | - | - | - | . | . | . |  |
| - | - | - | - | . | . | . |  |
| - | . | - |  | . | . | . | Gmill |
| - | - | - | - | . | . | . | V |
| - | - | - | , | . | . | . | V |
|  | . | - | , | . | . | . | 11-VOI |



```
    U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
        HYDROLOGIC ENGINEERING CENTER
            609 SECOND STREET
        IS, CALIFORNIA }9561
            (916) 756-1104
```

MODEL TO DETERMINE FLOW RATES FOR GOLDEN MESA NORTH
EXISTING CONDITIONS MODEL
MODEL FOR USE IN CALCULATING SOIL LOSS MODEL NAME GMNIOS.DAT
10 YR24 HR PRECTP
10 YR2 4 HR PREC


*** ERROR *** SPECIFIED START AND END DATES RESULT IN TOO MANY TIME PERIODS

14 IO | OUTPUT CONTROL VARIABLES |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| IPRNT | 5 |
| IPLOT PRINT CONTROL | 0 |
| OSCAI. PLOT CONTROL | 0. |
|  |  |

HYDROGRAPH TIME DATA

*** WARNING *** UNIT HYDROGRAPH TRUNCATED FROM 305 TO 300 INTERVAIS
*** WARNING *** UNIT HYDROGRAPH TRUNCATED FROM 305 TO 300 INTERVALS


PEAK FLOW AND STAGE (END-OF-PERIOD) SUMMARY FOR MULTIPLE PLAN-RATIO ECONOMIC COMPUTATIONS FLOWS IN CUBIC FEET PER SECOND, AREA IN SQUARE MILES TIME TO PEAK IN HOURS


*** NORMAL END OF HEC-1 ***



| x | X | xx0xxxx | XXXXXX |  |  | x |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| X | X | X | x | X |  | XX |
| X | X | X | x |  |  | x |
| XXXXXX |  | XXXX | X |  | xxxxx | X |
| X | X | x | x |  |  | X |
| X | X | X | X | X |  | X |
| X | X | XXXXXXXX |  |  |  | Xxx |

THIS PROGRAM REPLACES ALL PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF HEC－1 KNOWN AS HECI（JAN 73），HEC1GS，HEC1DB，AND HEC1KM
THE DEFINITIONS OF VARIABLES－RTIMP－AND－RTIOR－HAVE CHANGED FROM THOSE USED WITH THE I973－STYIE INPUT STRUCTURE HE DEFINITION OF－AMSKK－ON RM－CARD WAS CHANGED WITH REVISIONS DATED 28 SEP 81．THIS IS THE FORTRAN77 VERSION NEM OPTIONS：DAMBRKAK OUTFLOW SUBMERGENCE，SINGLE EVENT DAMAGE CALCULATION，DSS：WRITE STAGE FREQUENCY， DSS：READ TIME SERIES AT DESIRED CALCULATION INTERVAI LOSS RATE：GREEN AND AMPT IMFILTRATION KINEMATIC WAVE：NEW FINITE DIFFBRENCE ALGORITMM

HEC－1 INPUT
PAGE 1

$\qquad$
MODEL TO DETERMINE FLOW RATES FOR GOLDEN MESA NORTH
EXISTING CONDITIONS MODEL
MODEL FOR USE IN CALCULATING SOIL LOSS
MODEL NAME GMN25S．DAT
25 YR24 HR PRECIP
DATE：MAR 2017 ＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊
＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊

12880
1
15
15
5
PREC
1

信


| KK | GMN5B | RUNO | FROM | RSHED | CMN5B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BA | ． 077 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PH | 1 | 0 | ． 279 | ． 527 | ． 879 | 1.01 | 1.12 | 1.55 | 2.22 | 3.1 |  |  |
| LS |  | 64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UD | 0.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| KK | 5B－VOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RS | 1 | STOR | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SA | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SE | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SQ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SE | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Eme－1 | InPut |  |  |  |  |  | PAge | 2 |
| ID． |  | 2 | 3. | 4. | ． 5. | ． 6. | ． 7. | ． 8. | ．． 9 | ． 10 |  |  |
| KK | GMIN5A | RUNOE | FROM | RSHED | GMNSA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BA | ． 069 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LS |  | 74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UD | ． 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| KK | 5A-vOL |
| :--- | ---: |
| RS | 1 |
| SA | 1 |
| SE | 0 |
| SQ | 0 |
| SE | 0 |


| 1 | STOR | 0 |
| :---: | ---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 2 |

1
3
0
3 .012 .09
onown
nontr
GMN6 RUNOFF FROM GPN6

| GVOL |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | STOR | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 2 |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 1 \\
3 & 4 \\
0 & 0 \\
3 & 4
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1 \\
& 6 \\
& 0 \\
& 6
\end{aligned}
$$

## GMNBRUNOFF FROM GMN 8

.027
54
.12

| 8-VOL |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | STOR | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 2 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& 1 \\
& 2 \\
& 0 \\
& 2
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1 \\
& 3 \\
& 0 \\
& 3
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 1 \\
4 & 5 \\
0 & 0 \\
4 & 5
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { GMN9 } \\
& .152
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
.152 \quad 65
$$

$$
65
$$

9-VOI

$$
\begin{array}{rr}
1 & \text { STO } \\
1 &
\end{array}
$$

| STOR | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
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SCHEMATIC DIAGRAM OF STREAM NETWORK
(v) ROUTING (--->) DIVERSION OR PUMP FLOW
(.) CONNECTOR (<---) RETURN OF DIVERTED OR PUMPED FLOW

## GMM5SB

$\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{V}$
5B-voL

GMN11


11-voL

(***) RUNOFF ALSO COMPUTED AT TEIS LOCATION 1*****************************************


MODEL TO DETERMINE FLOW RATES FOR GOTDEN MESA NORTH
EXISTING CONDITIONS MODEL
MODEL FOR USE IN CALCULATING SOIL LOSS
MODEL NAME GMN25S.DAT
25 YR24 HR PRECIP
DATE: MAR 2017 **ぁ******************************************

*** ERROR *** SPECIETED START AND END DATES RESULT IN TOO MANY TIME PERIODS
14 TO
OUTPUT CONTROL VARIABLES

| IPRNT | 5 | PRINT CONTROL |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| IPLOT | 0 | PLOT CONTROL |
| QSCAL | 0. | HYDROGRAPH PLOT SCALE |

HYDROGRAPH TIME DATA


|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.12 | 12.12 | 12.12 | 12.12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 6VOL | . 012 | 1 | FLOW | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK STAGES | IN FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | Stage | . 73 | . 72 | . 70 | . 69 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 24.47 | 24.47 | 24.48 | 24.48 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMN8 | . 027 | 1 | FLOW | . 37 | . 32 | . 30 | . 29 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.35 | 12.37 | 17.82 | 17.90 |
| ROUTED To |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 8-VOL | . 027 | 1 | FLOW | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  | ** | Peak stages | IN FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | Stage | . 28 | . 27 | . 26 | . 25 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 24.62 | 24.63 | 24.63 | 24.63 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMN9 | . 152 | 1 | FLOW | 21.43 | 20.61 | 19.80 | 19.01 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.38 | 12.38 | 12.38 | 12.38 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 9-VOL | . 152 | 1 | FLOW | . 00 | .00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK Stages | IN FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | STAGE | 4.48 | 4.36 | 4.24 | 4.13 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 25.55 | 25.55 | 25.53 | 25.55 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | $10+12$ | . 020 | 1 | FLOW | 11.62 | 11.40 | 11.17 | 10.95 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.22 | 12.22 | 12.22 | 12.22 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | $10+12 \mathrm{~V}$ | . 020 | 1 | FLOW | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK Stages | IN FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | Stage | 1.35 | 1.32 | 1.30 | 1.27 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 24.92 | 24.92 | 24.92 | 24.90 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | $4+7+2$ | . 330 | 1 | FLOW | 15.87 | 15.18 | 14.51 | 13.85 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 13.22 | 13.22 | 13.23 | 13.23 |
|  | 472 VOL | . 330 | 1 | FLOW | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK StAges | IN FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | STAGE | 8.36 | 8.12 | 7.89 | 7.66 |
|  |  |  |  | time | 28.95 | 28.95 | 28.95 | 28.95 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 3+1 | . 372 | 1 | FLOW | 20.89 | 19.98 | 19.09 | 18.21 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 13.00 | 13.00 | 13.02 | 13.02 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | $3+1 \mathrm{VOL}$ | . 372 | 1 | FLOW | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK STAGES | IN FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | STAGE | 9.42 | 9.15 | 8.89 | 8.63 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 28.02 | 28.03 | 28.05 | 28.03 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMN11 | . 053 | 1 | FLOW | 16.28 | 15.84 | 15.39 | 14.95 |
|  |  |  |  | TTME | 12.23 | 12.23 | 12.23 | 12.23 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 11-VOL | . 053 | 1 | FLOW | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  | ** | peak stages | IN FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | STAGE | 2.18 | 2.13 | 2.08 | 2.03 |
|  | $*$ |  |  | TIME | 24.97 | 24.97 | 24.97 | 24.95 |


| X | X | xxxxxxx | Xxxxx |  |  | X |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| x | X | X | X | x |  | XX |
| X | X | X | x |  |  | X |
| xxxaxx |  | XXXX | X |  | xXXXX | x |
| X | X | x | X |  |  | X |
| X | X | x | X | x |  | X |
| X | X | 2xx8xxx |  |  |  | xxx |

THIS PROGRAM REPLACES ALL PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF HEC-1 KNOWN AS HEC1 (JAN 73), GECIGS, HECIDB, AND HECIKW.
THE DEFINITIONS OF VARIABLES -RTIMP- AND -RTIOR- HAVE CHANGED FROM THOSE USED WITH THE 1973-STYLE INPUT STRUCTURE THE DEFINITION OF -AMSKK- ON RM-CARD WAS CHANGED WITH REVISIONS DATED 28 SEP 81. THIS IS THE FORTRAN77 VERSION NEW OPTIONS: DAMBREAK OUTFLOW SUBMERGENCE , SINGLE EVENT DAMAGE CALCULATION, DSS:WRITE STAGE FREQUENCY, DSS:READ TIME SERIES AT DESIRED CALCULATION INTERVAL LOSS RATE:GREEN AND AMPT INEILTRATION KINEMATIC WAVE: NEW FINITE DIFFERENCE ALGORITHM
-

HEC-1 INPUT
PAGE
$=$

| $\begin{array}{r} \text { GMN5B } \\ .077 \end{array}$ | RUNOFE | FROM | WATERSHED | GMA5 5 B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0 | . 344 | . 65 | 1.08 | 1.19 | 1.29 | 1.71 | 2.49 | 3.52 |  |
|  | 64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5B-vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | STOR | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | HEC-1 | INPYT |  |  |  |  |  | PAGE |

ID.
*DDIAGRAM
MODEL TO DETERMINE FLON RATES FOR GOLDEN MESA NORTH
EXISTING CONDITIONS MODEL
MODEL FOR USE IN CALCULATING SOIL LOSS
model name gmaios.dat
50 YR24 HR PRECIP
DATE:MAR 2017 *********************************************

**************************************************
2880
$\begin{array}{rr}* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * z * * * * * * * * ~ \\ 1 & 2880 \\ 15 & \\ 5 & \end{array}$
PREC
**************************************************************************



DARF AREA (SQ. MI.)
$\begin{array}{lr}1.00 & 0-2\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lr}1.99 & 2.1-8 \\ 0.98 & 8.1-16\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lr}0.98 & 8.1-16 \\ 0.97 & 16.1-29\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}0.97 & 16.1-29 \\ 0.96 & 29.1-43\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lr}16.1-29 \\ 0.95 & 43.1-63\end{array}$
0.94 63.1-98

$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { PREC } & 1.0 & 0.99 & 0.98 & 0.97\end{array}$


BEGIN NIMBUS 90 MODEL - SP R1. 705
NO MODIFICATTONS M ADE
0.23

PAGE 2
D.

| GMN5A | RUNOFF FROM WATERSHED GMA5A |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| .069 | 74 |  |
| .24 |  |  |
| 5A-VOL |  |  |
| 1 | STOR | 0 |


| 606in 0 in |  | $H 60$ ¢ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | HぃO |
| - |  | H- |
| $m o m$ |  | Hm 0 m |
| NON | \% | O-NON |
|  | 若 |  |
| HOH |  |  |
| 000 |  | $\hat{E}^{H-1} 000$ |
|  |  |  |
| Mn¢m |  |  |

## GMN8RUNOFF FROM GMN 8

 .02754
8-vo

| 1 | STOR | 0 |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |GMN9 RUNOFE FROM GMNG URDEVETOPED
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| STOR | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

$10+12$ RUNOFF FROM GMN10 + GMN-12
HEC-1 INPUT
$\qquad$

| KK | $10+12 V$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| RS | 1 | STOR | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  |
| SA | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| SE | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| SQ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SE | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| KK | $4+7+2$ | RUNOFF | FROM | GMN4+GMN7+GM2 |  |  |  |

(<---) RETURN OF DIVERTED OR PUMPED FLOW


> GMN11 V V $11-\mathrm{VOL}$
(***) RUNOFF ALSO COMPUTED AT THIS LOCATION 1*****************************************

* FLOOD HYDROGRAPH PACKAGE (HEC-1) JUN 1998 AND FEB 2010

1998 AND FEB
VERSION 4.1R
RGMHEC2000 WWW.HEC-1.COM
RUN DATE 10SEP17 TIME 19:37:46
$\qquad$

* U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS HYDROLOGIC ENGINEERING CBNTER 609 SECOND STREET DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616 (916) 756-1104


## MODEL TO DETERMINE FLOW RATES FOR GOLDEN MESA NORTH

EXISTING CONDITIONS MODEL
MODEL FOR USE IN CALCULATING SOIL LOSS
MODEL NAME GMNIOS.DAT
50 YR24 HR PRECIP
DATE:MAR 2017 *********************************************

6. *** ERROR *** SPECIFIED START AND END DATES RESULT IN TOO MANY TTME PERIODS

14 IO

| OUTPUT CONTROL VARIABLES |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| IPRNT | 5 |  |
| IPLOT | 0 | PRINT CONTROL CONTROL |
| QSCAI | 0. | HYDROGRAPH PLOT SCAIE |

IT
HYDROGRAPH TTIME DATA

| NMIN |  | 1 | MINUTES IN CCMPUTATION INTERVAL |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| IDATE | 1 | 0 | STARTING DATE |
| ITIME | 0000 | STARTING TIME |  |
| NQ | 2000 | NUMEER OF HYDROGRAPH ORDINATES |  |
| NDDATE | 2 | 0 | ENDING DATE |
| NDTIME | 0919 | ENDTNG TTME |  |
| ICENT | 19 | CENTURY MARK |  |

COMPUTATION INTERVAL .02 HOURS
TOTAL TIME BASE 33.32 HOURS

| DRAINAGE AREA | SQUARE MILES |
| :---: | :---: |
| PRECIPITATION DEPTH | INCHES |
| LENGTH, ELEVATION | FEET |
| FLOW | CUBIC FEET PER SECOND |
| STORAGE VOLTME | ACRE-FEET |
| SURFACE AREA | ACRES |
| TEMPERATURE | DEGREES FAHRENHEIT |
| MULTI-PLAN OPTION NPLAN | 1 NUMBER OE PLANS |
| MULTI-RATIO OPTION |  |
| RATIOS OF PREC | ITATION |
| 1.00 .99 | . 98 . 97 |


| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCBEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { *** WARNING *** } & \text { UNIT HYDROGRAPH TRUNCATED FROM } 305 \text { TO } 300 \text { INTERVALS } \\
\text { *** WARNING *** } & \text { UNIT HYDROGRAPH TRUNCATED FROM } 305 \text { TO } 300 \text { INTERVALS } \\
\text { *** WARNING *** } & \text { UNIT HYDROGRAPH TRUNCATED FROM } 305 \text { TO } 300 \text { INTERVALS } \\
\text { *** WARNING *** } & \text { UNIT HYDROGRAPH TRUNCATED FROM } 305 \text { TO } 300 \text { INTERVALS }
\end{array}
$$

| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |

PEAK-FLOW AND STAGE (END-OF-PERIOD) SUMMARY FOR MULTIPLE PLAN-RATIO ECONOMIC COMPUTATIONS FLOMS IN CUBIC FEET PER SECOND, AREA IN SQUARE MILES TIME TO PEAK IN HOURS

| OPERATIOR | STATION | AREA | PLAN |  | RATIOS APPLIED TO PRECIPITATION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | RATIO 1 | RATIO 2 | RATIO 3 | RATIO 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 | . 99 | . 98 | . 97 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $+$ | Gan5b | . 077 | 1 | FLOW | 19.64 | 18.99 | 18.35 | 17.71 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.28 | 12.28 | 12.28 | 12.28 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 5B-VOL | . 077 | 1 | FLOW | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK Stages | IN FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | Stage | 2.94 | 2.86 | 2.79 | 2.72 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 25.15 | 25.15 | 25.17 | 25.17 |
| GYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GM5A | . 059 | 1 | FLOW | 36.35 | 35.58 | 34.82 | 34.06 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.28 | 12.28 | 12.28 | 12.28 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 5A-VOL | . 069 | 1 | FLOW | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK STAGES | IN FBBT | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | STAGE | 4.61 | 4.52 | 4.43 | 4.35 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 25.20 | 25.20 | 25.20 | 25.20 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMN6 | . 012 | 1 | ELOW | 11.71 | 11.49 | 11.27 | 11.05 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.12 | 12.12 | 12.12 | 12.12 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 6VOL | . 012 | 1 | FLOW | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK STAGES | IN FEET |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | STAGE | $.93$ | $\text { . } 91$ | -89 | - 8.88 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 24.47 | 24.47 | 24.47 | 24.47 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | gmas | . 027 | 1 | FLOW | 1.66 | 1.53 | 1.39. | 1.27 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.23 | 12.23 | 12.23 | 12.25 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 8-VOL | . 027 | 1 | FLOM | . 00 | . 00 | -00 | . 00 |


|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { स* } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | PEAK STAGES Stage TIME | $\begin{gathered} \text { IN FRET } \\ .46 \\ 24.62 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} * * \\ .44 \\ 24.62 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} .43 \\ 24.62 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} .41 \\ 24.62 \end{array}$ |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMN9 | . 152 | 1 | FLOw | 35.92 | 34.81 | 33.71 | 32.61 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.38 | 12.38 | 12.38 | 12.38 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 9-VOL | . 152 | 1 | ELOM | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  | ** | Peak stages | IN FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | STAGE | 6.18 | 6.03 | 5.88 | 5.73 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 25.55 | 25.55 | 25.53 | 25.53 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $+$ | $10+12$ | . 020 | 1 | FLOW | 15.96 | 15.67 | 15.39 | 15.10 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | $10+12 \mathrm{~V}$ | . 020 | 1 | FLOW | . 00 | .00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK Stages | IN FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | Stage | 1.69 | 1.66 | 1.63 | 1.60 |
|  |  |  |  | TINE | 24.90 | 24.90 | 24.90 | 24.90 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | $4+7+2$ | . 330 | 1 | FLOW | 27.84 | 26.84 | 25.86 | 24.90 |
|  |  |  |  | TTME | 13.15 | 13.17 | 13.17 | 13.17 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 472VOL | . 330 | 1 | ELOW | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  | ** | PGAK Stages | IN FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | Stage | 11.77 | 11.47 | 11.17 | 10.87 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 28.93 | 28.93 | 28.95 | 28.93 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | $3+1$ | . 372 | 1 | FLOW | 37.00 | 35.69 | 34.39 | 33.10 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.95 | 12.95 | 12.95 | 12.97 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | $3+1 \mathrm{VOL}$ | . 372 | 1 | FLOW | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
| * | - |  | ** | PEAK Stages | IN FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | STAGE | 13.26 | 12.92 | 12.59 | 12.25 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 28.03 | 28.03 | 28.03 | 28.03 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | QM211 | . 053 | 1 | FLOW | 24.57 | 23.97 | 23.38 | 22.79 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.23 | 12.23 | 12.23 | 12.23 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 11-VOL | . 053 | 1 | ELOW | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK STAGES | IN FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Stage | 2.88 | 2.82 | 2.76 | 2.70 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 24.95 | 24.95 | 24.95 | 24.97 |


| X | x | xxxxxxxx | XxxxX |  |  | X |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| x | X | X | x | x |  | xx |
| X | X | X | X |  |  | X |
| XxX000 |  | xxxx | X |  | XXXXXX | X |
| X | X | X | x |  |  | X |
| X | x | X | X | x |  | X |
| X | X | XXXXXXXX |  |  |  | XXX |

THIS PROGRAM REPLACES ALL PREVIOUS VERSIONS OE HEC-1 KNOWN AS HECI (JAN 73), HEGGS, HECIDB, AND HEC1KW.
THE DEFINITIONS OF VARIABLES -RTIMP- AND -RTIOR- HAVE CHANGED FROM THOSE USED WITH THE 1973-STYLE INPUT STRUCTURE THE DEFINITION OF -AMSKK- ON RM-GARD WAS CHANGED WITH REVISIONS DATED 28 SEP 81. THIS IS THE FORTRANT7 VERSION NET OPTIONS: DAMBREAK OUTFLOW SUBMERGENCE , SINGLE EVENT DAMAGE CALCULATION, DSS:WRITE STAGE FREOUENCY DSS:READ TIME SERIES AT DESIRED CALCULATION INTERVAL LOSS RATE:GREEN AND AMPT INEILTRATION KINEMATIC WAVE: NEW FINITE DIFFERENCE ALGORITHM

## HEC-1 INPUT



```
GMN5A RUNOFF FROM WATERSHED GMN5A
        .069
            .24
    7 4
```

5A-VOL
$\begin{array}{lrr} & 1 & \text { STOR } \\ & 1 & 1\end{array}$

- 1


(***) RUNOFF ALSO COMPUTED AT THIS LOCATION *****************************************

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS HYDROLOGIC ENGINEERING CENTER 609 SECOND STREET DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616 (916) 756-1104

MODEL TO DETERMINE FLOV RATES FOR GOLDEN MESA NORTH
EXISTING CONDITIONS MODEL
MODEL FOR USE IN CALCULATING SOIL LOSS
MODEL NAME GMN100S.DAT
100 YR24 HR PRECIP


*** ERROR *** SPECIFIED START AND END DATES RESULT IN TOO MANY TIME PERIODS
14 IO

| OUTPUT CONTROL VARIABIES |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| IPRNT | 5 | PRINT CONTROL |
| IPLOT | 0 | PLOT CONTROL |
| QSCAL | 0. | HYDROGRAPE PLOT SCALE |

IT
HYDROGRAPH TIME DATA
NMIN 1 MINUTES IN COMPUTATION INTEERVAL
IDATE 1 STARTING DATE
ITTME $\quad 0000$ STARTING TIME
NQ 2000 NUMBER OF HYDROGRAPH ORDINATES
NDDATE 20 ENDING DATE
NDTIME 0919 ENDING TTME
ICENT 19 CENTURY MARK
COMPUTATION INTERVAL .02 HOURS
TOTAL TIME BASE 33.32 HOURS

| DRAINAGE AREA | SQUARE MILES |
| :--- | :--- |
| PRECIPITATION DEPTH | INCHES |
| LENGTH, ELEVATION | FEET |
| ELOW | CUBIC FEET PER SECOND |
| STORAGE VOLUME | ACRE-FEET |
| SURFACE AREA | ACRES |
| TEMPERATURE | DEGREES FAHRENHEIT |

JP
MULTI-PLAN OPTION
NPLAN
1 NUMBER OF PLANS

JR
MULTI-RATIO OPTION

| RATIOS OF PRECIPITATION |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1.00 | .99 | .98 | .97 |


| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABIE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| VALUE EXCBEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |

*** MARNING *** UNIT HYDROGRAPH TRUNCATED FROM 305 TO 300
*** TARNING *** UNIT HYDROGRAPH TRUNCATED FROM 305 TO 300 INTERVALS
** WARNING *** UNIT HYDROGRAPH TRUNCATED FROM 305 TO 300 INTERVAIS
** HARNING *** UNIT HYDROGRAPH TRUNCATED FROM 305 TO 300 INTERVALS
** WARNING *** UNIT HYDROGRAPH TRUNCATED EROM 305 TO 300 INTERVALS

| VAIUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VAIUE EXCEEDS TABLE IN LOGLOG | .01667 | .01667 | 24.00000 |

I

IOWS IN CUBIC FEET PER SECOND, AREA IN SQUARE MILES TIME TO PEAK IN HOURS

| OPERATION | STATION | AREA | PLAN |  | RATIOS APPLLIED TO PRECIPITATIO |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | RAmio 1 | RATIO 2 | RATIO 3 | RATIO 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 | . 99 | . 98 | . 97 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | gan ${ }^{\text {g }}$ | . 077 | 1 | FLOW | 30.89 | 30.02 | 29.15 | 28.29 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.28 | 12.28 | 12.28 | 12.28 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 5B-VOL | . 077 | 1 | FLOW | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK STAGES | IN FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | STAGE | 3.92 | 3.83 | 3.74 | 3.65 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 25.15 | 25.15 | 25.15 | 25.15 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMN5A | . 069 | 1 | FLOW | 50.46 | 49.48 | 48.49 | 47.51 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.28 | 12.28 | 12.28 | 12.28 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 5A-VOL | . 069 | 1 | FLOw | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  | ** | PEAK STAGBS | IN FRET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | STAGE | 5.79 | 5.69 | 5.58 | 5.47 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 25.20 | 25.20 | 25.18 | 25.18 |
| HYDROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | CMN6 | . 012 | 1 | FLOW | 15.92 | 15.64 | 15.36 | 15.07 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | 12.12 | 12.12 | 12.12 | 12.12 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 勺VOL | . 012 | 1 | FLOM | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  |  | TIME | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  |  |  | ** | PRAK STAGES | In FEET | ** |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | Stage | 1.14 | 1.12 | 1.11 | 1.09 |
|  |  |  |  | Thes | 24.47 | 24.47 | 24.47 | 24.47 |
| HYOROGRAPH AT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | GMN8 | . 027 | 1 | FLOT | 4.38 | 4.13 | 3.89 | 3.65 |
|  |  |  |  | THE | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.20 |
| ROUTED TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + | 8-VOL | . 027 | 1 | FLOIF | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |



## APPENDIX F

| Reach | River Sta | Profile | Q Total | Min ChEl | W.S. Elev | Crit W.s. | Eg. Elev | E.G. Slope | Vel Chinl | Flow Area | Top Width | Froude \# Chil |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | (cfs) | (ft) | (i) | (i) | (fi) | (flut) | (fls) | (sq fi) | (fi) |  |
| 1 | 2000 | PF 1 | 960.00 | 5097.27 | 5101.32 |  | 5101.89 | 0.003972 | 6.07 | 158.23 | 57.55 | 0.64 |
| 1 | 1967 | PF 1 | 960.00 | 5097.23 | 5101.06 |  | 5101.73 | 0.004990 | 6.58 | 145.94 | 55.81 | 0.72 |
| 1 | 1917 | PF1 | 960.00 | 5097.00 | 5100.76 | 5100.21 | 5101.47 | 0.005390 | 6.76 | 142.01 | 55.25 | 0.72 |
| 1 | 1867 | PF 1 | 960.00 | 5096.73 | 5099.94 | 5099.94 | 5101.07 | 0.010396 | 8.52 | 112.72 | 50.83 | 1.01 |
| 1 | 1852 | PF 1 | 960.00 | 5094.23 | 5098.27 |  | 5098,84 | 0.004012 | 6.09 | 157.67 | 57.47 | 0.65 |
| 1 | 1822 | PF 1 | 960.00 | 5094.11 | 5098.15 |  | 5098.72 | 0.004012 | 6.09 | 157.67 | 57.47 | 0.65 |
| 1 | 1722 | PF 1 | 960.00 | 5093.71 | 5097.74 |  | 5098.32 | 0.004034 | 6.10 | 157.36 | 57.43 | . 65 |
| 1 | 1622 | PF 1 | 960.00 | 5093.31 | 5097.33 |  | 5097.91 | 0.004090 | 6.13 | 156.60 | 57.32 | . 65 |
| 1 | 1522 | PF 1 | 960.00 | 5092.91 | 5096.89 |  | 5097.49 | 0.004245 | 6.21 | 154.54 | 57.03 | 0.67 |
| 1 | 1422 | PF 1 | 960.00 | 5092.51 | 5096.40 |  | 5097.04 | 0.004687 | 6.43 | 149.21 | 56.28 | 0.70 |
| 1 | 1372 | PF 1 | 960.00 | 509231 | 5096.09 | 5095.52 | 5096.79 | 0.005298 | 6.72 | 142.87 | 55.37 | 0.74 |
| 1 | 1322 | PF 1 | 960.00 | 5092.05 | 5095.26 | 5095.25 | 5096.39 | 0.010416 | 8.52 | 112.65 | 50.82 | 1.01 |
| 1 | 1307 | PF 1 | 960.00 | 5089.25 | 5094.72 |  | 5094.95 | 0.001032 | 3.90 | 247.87 | 68.89 | 0.35 |
| 1 | 1207 | PF 1 | 960.00 | 5088.85 | 5094.65 |  | 5094.85 | 0.000780 | 3.58 | 271.50 | 71.58 | 0.31 |
| 1 | 1107 | PF 1 | 960.00 | 5088.45 | 5094.61 |  | 5094.77 | 0.000593 | 3.30 | 297.34 | 74.41 | 0.27 |
| 1 | 1052 | PF 1 | 960.00 | 5088.42 | 5094.59 | 5091.21 | 5094.74 | 0.000483 | 3.09 | 316.70 | 74.46 | 0.25 |
| 1 | 1040 |  | Cuiver |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1007 | PF 1 | 960.00 | 5088.26 | 5092.67 |  | 5093.04 | 0.002025 | 4.85 | 198.06 |  |  |
| 1 | 907 | PF1 | 960.00 | 5087.86 | 5092.40 |  | 5092.81 | 0.002482 | 5.13 | 18708 | 60.38 | 0.47 |
| 1 | 807 | PF 4 | 960.00 | 5087.46 | 5092.21 |  | 5092.57 | 0.002048 | 4.79 | 20024 | 61.41 | 0.52 |
| 1 | 707 | PF 1 | 960.00 | 5087.06 | 5092.07 |  | 5092.38 | 0.001581 | 4.44 | 200.24 | 63.10 | 0.47 |
| $\dagger$ | 637 | PF 1 | 960.00 | 5087.02 | 5092.26 | 5090.48 | 5092.27 | 0.000091 | 0.85 | 216.71 | 65.15 | 0.42 |
| 7 | 820 |  | Culvert |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1757.21 | 1648.46 | 0.10 |
| 1 | 597 | PF 1 | 960.00 | 5087.00 | 5090.65 | 5090.35 | 5090.86 | 0.004000 | 4.07 | 288.93 |  |  |

HEC-RAS Plan: Plan 12 River: GM South Reach: 1 Profle: PF 1

| Reach |  | River Sta | Profile | E.G.US. | W.S.US. | E.E.IC | E.G.OC | Min El Weir Flow | Q Culv Group | Q Weir | Delta WS | Culv Vel US | Guly vel DS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | (任 | (if) | (ii) | (f) | (值) | (cfs) | (cfs) | (in) | (iNS) | (fus) |
| 1 | 1040 | Culvert \#1 | PF1 | 5094.74 | 5094.59 | 5094.48 | 5094.74 | 5095.17 | \$60.00 |  | 1.92 | 9.39 | 9.06 |
| 1 | 020 | Culvert \#1 | PF 1 | 509227 | 5092.26 | 5091.36 | 5092.27 | 5091.70 | 54.41 | 893.23 | 1.61 | 7.70 | 7.70 |
| 1 | 620 | Culvert ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 2 | PF 1 | 509227 | 5092.26 | 5089.94 | 5092.28 | 5091.70 | 12.36 | 893.23 | 1.61 | 7.00 | 7.00 |








## PRELIMINARY SEWER REPORT



# Golden Mesa North PRELIMINARY SEWERAGE REPORT 

(COVERS GOLDEN MESA SOUTH)

## INTRODUCTION

Golden Mesa North is a proposed 116-unit single family residential subdivision located in Golden Valley on two parcels. APN 552-050-01 is approximately 99.5 acres and is located east of Estates Drive approximately 2800 feet north of E. Golden Valley Road. APN 552-092-19 is located east of Estates Road, West of Rain Dance Way, South of Indian Lane approximately 1190 feet north of E. Golden Valley Road. (Reference Figure 1 Vicinity Map). The proposed development is surrounded by undeveloped land to the North, single family homes to the east and west and undeveloped land to the south. This report will summarize proposed sewage flows and improvements.

The site slopes down from the north to the south toward Golden Valley Road. Currently no existing sewer facilities are immediately available adjacent to the proposed development with the exception of the existing sewer main within Golden Valley Road.

Proposed peak design flow requirements were determined using 350gpd/unit with a peaking factor of 3.0 . Resulting peak flow is therefore $121,800 \mathrm{gpd}$ for the 116 proposed residences. In addition to this determined flow the proposed flows based on a previous Tentative Map submitted to Washoe County for Golden Mesa South, the 35 acre parcel located directly south of Golden Mesa North, have been added in resulting in an additional flow of $61,950 \mathrm{gpd}$. This is based on the unit count of the previously submitted Tentative Map of 59 units (TM05-015). Flow calculations can be found below.

## FLOW CALCULATIONS

Average peak flows were determined to be 96,390 gallons per day based on the following Washoe County Department of Water Resources (WCDWR) design requirements:

```
Average Flow \(=350\) gallons/day
Peaking Factor \(=3.0\)
Zoning = Single Family Residential
Minimum Velocity \(=2.5\) feet/second
Peak Flow Calculation:
```

$Q_{P}=($ avg flow) (peaking factor) (\# of dwelling units)

$$
\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{p}}=(350)(3.0)(175)=183,750 \mathrm{gpd}
$$

It is anticipated that the minimum pipe slope on the proposed sewer mains will be $0.5 \%$ which yields a half full velocity of 2.65 fps meeting the County minimum half full velocity of 2.5 fps .

A sanitary sewage lift station will be required to get sewage into the existing sewer main in Golden Valley Road. The lift station will be located with the previously mentioned 35acre parcel. (See Figure 2 - Sewer Map). Sewage flows, once leaving the lift station, will flow in the existing 12" sewer main in Golden Valley Road, westerly to the existing Golden Valley lift station owned and operated by the City of Reno. Attached to this report is the sewer summaries prepared by Summit Engineering as well as the preliminary design report provided to Washoe County DWR for the design of the previous lift station planned to be built with the prior Golden Mesa North Development.

# GOLDEN MESA NORTH <br> SUBDIVISION 




## SEWER SUMMARY FOR GOLDEN MESA NORTH

Golden Mesa North will consist of 94 single family homes. The sewer system will consist of 4 inch laterals connecting to 8 inch mains within the streets and sewer easements. Peak flows are calculated using $280 \mathrm{gpd} / \mathrm{unit}$ and a peaking factor of 3 , resulting in $280 \times 94 \times 3=78,960$ gpd or 0.12 cfs.

All flows are carried to a proposed lift station at the corner of Golden Valley Road and Estates Road. Minimum slope on the proposed sewer is $0.5 \%$. The lift station pumps flows to an existing manhole at the intersection of Golden Valley Road and Estates Road. From this manhole an existing 12 inch sewer main carries the flows westerly along Golden Valley Road to the existing Golden Valley lift station owned by the City of Reno.

Capacity calculations were performed on the proposed and existing sewer system. Results show the system has capacity for the 94 units proposed with Golden Mesa North, the 59 units approved in Golden Mesa South, and other nearby units currently utilizing septic systems that may wish to tie to the system in the future.


## SEWER SUMMARY

Golden Mesa South will consist of 59 single family homes. The sewer system will consist of 4 " laterals connecting to 8 " mains within the streets and sewer easements. Peak flows are calculated using $350 \mathrm{gpd} /$ unit and a peaking factor of 3 , resulting in 350 x $59 \times 3=61,950 \mathrm{gpd}$ or 0.10 cfs .

All flows are carried to a proposed lift station at the southwest corner of the development. Minimum slope on the proposed sewer is $0.4 \%$. The lift station pumps flows to an existing manhole at the intersection of Golden Valley Road and Estates Road. From this manhole an existing 12" sewer main carries the flows westerly along Golden Valley Road to the existing Golden Valley lift station owned by the City of Reno.

Capacity calculations were performed on the proposed and existing sewer system.
Results show the system has capacity for the 59 units proposed with Golden Mesa South, the 96 units approved in Golden Mesa North, and other nearby units currently utilizing septic systems that may wish to tie to the system in the future.

## GOLDEN MESA - SEWER LIFT STATION

## RE: Design Report

Date: July 27, 2006
To: Susan Hood, Washoe County Utilities
Ken Hendrix, R\&K Homes
Clint Thiesse, P.E. Summit Engineering
From: Gary K. Guzelis, P.E.

This Design Report is being submitted for your review, comment and approval. This Design Report relates to the engineering for the sewer lift station for the Golden Mesa Development.

Design requirements:

1. Peak hour flow rate of 162,750 gallons per day (113 gpm) was used for sizing the pumps and wet well. The peak flow was determined by using 350 gallons per day contribution from each dwelling unit per capita and 3 capita per dwelling unit. City of Reno
2. Based on the above peak flow rate, two 2.7 HP Gorman-Rupp pumps have been selected. The pumps were selected to operate at approximately 180 gpm @ 21' of head. One pump alone will be capable of pumping the peak flow rate with the second pump being on standby. The particular pumps selected come with impellors at full trim and are not upgradeable. The selected pumps will be capable of delivering capacity for 91 additional homes. Future upgrades beyond the additional 91 homes would require pump replacement which is estimated at $\$ 2500.00$ per pump in today's dollars.
3. The wet well will consist of a 60 " diameter manhole modified to accept the duplex pumps, level sensors and piping. The depth of the wet well will be approximately 24 '. The interior of the wet well will be epoxy coated to help protect against deterioration of the concrete. Transducers will be used for level sensing with a redundant high water alarm float for emergency.
4. Emergency storage is required by the County and was sized to contain 2 hours of peak design flow estimated at a volume of 13,500 gallons. Emergency storage will be accomplished using 15,000 gallon precast
concrete storage tank. Surface storage is not recommended due to the limited space and close proximity to the adjoining residences.
5. The force main will be 4"HDPE, inside diameter of 3.95" and a dimension ratio of 17. The force main is approximately 218' in length.
6. Back-up power will be required for the lift station and will be provided by a stand-by generator preliminarily sized at 50 KW . A 100 amp panel and 3 phase power will be required.
7. The site will need to be completely fenced to prevent unauthorized access to the lift station.
8. Pump cycle time @ peak flow with a 1.5' on to off level will be 7.2 minutes. (Reference attached supporting data).
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Presented herein are the results of Wood Rodgers＇geotechnical exploration，laboratory testing， and associated geotechnical design recommendations for a proposed single－family residential development to be located in Washoe County，Nevada．The development will include two phases；the north and south parcels will be referred to as Phase 1 and Phase 2，respectively． The proposed home sites are anticipated to be half to one acre lots with wood－framed，raised foundation or slab－on－grade homes．Public improvements will include paved roads， underground utilities，and drainage features．

Phase 1 soils generally consist of a silty sand surface layer capping moderately cemented clayey sand of moderate plasticity．Shallow bedrock was encountered in the northwest quadrant and was relatively excavatable to the depths indicated on the test pit logs （Approximately four to ten feet）．These soils should provide adequate structural support both in－ situ and if placed as structural fill；and therefore，standard spread foundations have been recommended．No geologic hazards have been mapped or identified within immediate proximity to the project．Groundwater was not encountered in any of our explorations and is anticipated to lie at a depth that would not influence construction activities or foundation support．

Phase 2 soils mostly resemble the various blends of silty sands and moderately cemented clayey sands from Phase 1；however，near surface clayey sands encountered to a depth of approximately two feet exhibit high plasticity and meet standard definitions for expansive soil． Therefore，a selective grading program which includes removal of these clayey surface soils from structural zones and／or stabilization by means of moisture conditioning and compaction have been recommended to allow the use standard spread foundations．In addition，Phase 2 contains a mound of undocumented fill just south of the center of the parcel．The fill materials were encountered in test pit number 7 （TP－7）to a depth of about six feet，and included sand， gravel，concrete and asphalt debris．This existing fill material will have to be removed and reworked prior to constructing overlying improvements．

Structural pavement sections have been developed for both off－site and on－site improvements． The Washoe County minimum structural pavement sections have been presented based on the granular nature of native subgrade soils．However，traffic volumes may be higher than the minimum section would allow and the presented sections should be evaluated once anticipated traffic volumes have been quantified．

This report has been prepared in consideration of the applicable provisions set forth in the International Residential Code（2012 IRC）and the amendments and modifications adopted by Washoe County．Public improvements are to be construction to County standards，and per the requirements of the 2012 Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction（2012 SSPWC， Orange Book）．

## 1．0 INTRODUCTION

Presented herein are the results of Wood Rodgers＇geotechnical exploration，laboratory testing， and associated geotechnical design recommendations for the proposed Moonlight Hills Estates development to be located in Washoe County，Nevada．The assessments and recommendations presented in this geotechnical report have been framed，in part，around the surface and subsurface conditions identified by our exploration program which was developed to be consistent with locally accepted industry practices regarding exploratory methods and geotechnical investigations for similar type projects．The proposed structures，topography， grading design，soils，and bedrock are all unique and therefore the engineering judgment employed by those in responsible charge of geotechnical design considerations，as defined by the State of Nevada，is considered the established and accepted standard of care for evaluation and analyses associated with this report．

This report has been prepared in accordance with the applicable provisions set forth in the International Residential Code（IRC，2012）and the amendments and modifications adopted by Washoe County．These documents establish the minimum level of structural integrity，life safety， fire safety and livability for inhabitants of dwelling units while considering affordability． Geotechnical considerations for public improvements have been formulated around the requirements of Washoe County＇s Public Works Design Guidelines and the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction．Performance standards around which our primary recommendations have been framed are based solely upon the requirements of the referenced documents；supplementary recommendations have been formulated to allow the builder the opportunity to weigh the benefit of higher performance standards against costs to achieve．Any expectations of performance inconsistent with，outside the purview of，or exceeding the requirements of the referenced documents are subjective，a function of materials，design， workmanship，and ownership and unless specifically stipulated or quantified herein are considered in excess to the scope and design standards of this report．

The objectives of this study were to：
1．Explore，test，and assess general soil，bedrock，and ground water conditions pertaining to preliminary design and construction considerations for the residential units associated with the planned development．
2．Provide recommendations associated with the design and construction of the project，as related to the identified geotechnical conditions，the stipulated design levels，and performance standards established herein．

The area covered by this report is shown in Figure 1 and on Plate A－1（Site Plan \＆Approximate Test Pit Locations）in Appendix A．Our study included field exploration，laboratory testing，and engineering analyses to identify the physical and mechanical properties of the various on－site materials．Results of our field exploration and testing programs are included in this report；and
in consideration of the stated design levels and performance standards form the basis for all conclusions and recommendations．

## 2．0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The overall site is located in area known as Golden Valley，Washoe County， Nevada．The overall property encompasses an area of approximately 135 ＋／－acres，entirely contained in Section 11，Township 20N，Range 19E， M．D．M．As shown in Figure 1，the development is divided into two phases； Phase 1 to the north includes 100 acres and Phase 2 to the south including 35 acres．The overall site is bound by Estates Road to the west，East Golden Valley Road to the south，several residential properties to the east，and Bureau of Land Management land to the north．Many dirt trails exist across both phases and were used for site access．

It is our understanding that the proposed improvements consist of constructing half to one－acre home sites incorporating typical wood－framed，raised foundation or slab－on－grade homes，paved roads，


Figure 1 －Site Plan \＆Approximate Test Locations underground utilities，and drainage features．Foundation loads have not been provided，but for the development of this report，are anticipated to be light to moderate（ 50 kips for column loads， 1 to $2 \mathrm{kips} / f 00 t$ for wall loads have been assumed）．

The planning and engineering is currently in the conceptual phase；however，the development will be phased for a balance of cut and fills with little or no required import．Maximum cuts and fills are anticipated to be on the order of 10 feet．Depending on final grading，structures may be founded entirely in cut，entirely in fill，or in a cut／fill combination．

## 3．0 SITE CONDITIONS

## 3．1 Phase 1

Phase 1 consists of undeveloped land located along the southern foothills of the Hungry Mountain Range．Existing ground elevations across Phase 1 vary from approximately 5，105
feet in the southwest portion of the site to approximately 5,245 in the northeastern portion of the property，for a total relief of approximately 140 feet．The site exhibits an overall slope of approximately 3.5 percent to the south－southwest．A rock outcrop knob is present in the northwest quadrant．Drainage is accomplished by sheet flow to the southwest and a roadside ditch along Estates Drive．Vegetation consists of abundant sagebrush in excess of 3 feet in height and native grasses．Utilities were not encountered on－site，however an existing utility easement is present to the north of the property along Tamara Drive．This easement includes an underground gas main and overhead transmission lines．Several dirt trails traverse the site and were used by Wood Rodgers for site access．

## 3．2 Phase 2

Phase 2 is also composed of undeveloped land；however，the site offers a relatively flatter topography than Phase 1，is crossed by two small ephemeral creeks and presents a stockpile of undocumented fill soils in the south－central portion of the property．The northern creek was dry during our investigation，but appears to originate near the northeast quadrant of the property and flows toward the culvert near the midpoint of the western property boundary at Estates Drive．The other creek is a natural drainage fed from a storm drain culvert discharging onto the property about 420 feet east of Estates Drive．The two creeks meet near the inlet to the culvert crossing Estates Drive．The undocumented fill stockpile appears as a mound near the center of the property；however construction debris was encountered to a depth of six feet．Vegetation consists of sagebrush and native grasses．Underground utilities were not encountered．

## 4．0 FIELD EXPLORATION

The property was explored in May 2015 by excavating a series of seven test pits using a Deere 310SJ rubber－tire backhoe．The approximate locations of the test pits are shown on Plate A－1－ Site Plan and Approximate Exploration Locations．The maximum depth of test pit advance extended to 10 feet below the existing ground surface．Two percoloation tests were prepared in accordance with Washoe County Health Department standards within the northwest quadrant of Phase 1．Due to the soil－bedrock profile encountered within TP－1 and TP－5，the initial soak period did not percolate more than one inch in the first 30 mintues，therefore the test was discontinued．

Wood Rodgers＇personnel examined and classified all soils in the field in general accordance with ASTM D 2488 （Description and Identification of Soils）．Bulk samples for index testing were collected from the test pit trench walls at specific depths in various soil horizons，were placed in sealed plastic bags，and were returned to our Reno，Nevada laboratory for testing．Additional soil classifications，as well as verification of the field classifications，were subsequently performed in accordance with ASTM 2487 （Unified Soil Classification System［USCS］）upon completion of laboratory testing as described below in the Laboratory Testing section．Logs of the test pits are presented as Plate A－2a through Plate A－2f．A USCS chart has been included as Plate A－3－Unified Soils Classification and Key to Soil Descriptions．

## 5．0 LABORATORY TESTING

All soil testing performed in the Wood Rodgers＇laboratory is conducted in accordance with the standards and methods described in Volume 4.08 （Soil and Rock；Dimension Stone；Geosynthetics） of the ASTM Standards．Samples of significant soil types were analyzed to determine their in－situ moisture contents（ASTM D 2216），grain size distributions（ASTM D 6913），plasticity indices（ASTM D 4318），and R－value（ASTM D 2844）．Results of laboratory testing are shown on Plate A－4a thru c－ Summaries of Test Data．The test results were used to classify the soils according the USCS（ASTM D 2487）and to verify the field logs，which were then updated as appropriate．Classification in this manner provides an indication of the soil＇s mechanical behavior and can be correlated with published charts to evaluate bearing capacity，lateral earth pressures，and settlement potential．

Table 1 －Summary of Test Data

| Test Hole | Depth （Ft．） | Moisture （\％） | \％Gravel $(+ \text { \#4)* }$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Sand } \\ \text { (\#4- } \\ \# 200) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \%Fines } \\ & (-\# 200) \end{aligned}$ | Liquid Limit | Plasticity Index | USCS ${ }^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ASTM Standard |  | D2216 | D6913 |  |  | D4318 |  | D2487 |
| TP－1 | 0－1 | 6.8 | 2 | 79 | 18.5 | NP | NP | SM |
| ${ }^{2} \mathrm{TP}-1$ | 4－9 | 5.1 | 3 | 68 | 28.3 | 24 | 11 | SC |
| ${ }^{2} \mathrm{TP}$－3 | 2－8 | 2.5 | 42 | 45 | 12.8 | 24 | 10 | SC |
| ${ }^{2} \mathrm{TP}$－6 | 0．5－2 | 12.0 | 0 | 62 | 38.3 | 43 | 32 | SC |
| TP－7 | 0－6 | 5.6 | 16 | 64 | 19.9 | NP | NP | SM |

${ }^{1}$ Since ASTM D2487 is limited by a maximum particle size of $3^{\prime \prime}$ ，the gradation test data presented is based on a maximum particle size of 3 ＂．
${ }^{2}$ Composite sample of subgrade material resulted in R－value of 44 ．

## 6．0 GEOLOGIC AND GENERAL SOIL AND GROUNDWATER CONDITIONS

Based on the Geologic Map of the Reno Area published by the Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology（Figure 2），the site is mapped in an area of granitic alluvium（ Qg ）mainly consisting of weathered granitic sand and Granodiorite （Mzgd）which exhibits rock outcrops．The Golden Valley Pit is about 2,000 feet to the east of the northern project boundary；this Pit offers a commercial source for bedding sand and structural fill materials．The soil units encountered in our explorations are reasonably consistent with the mapped geologic deposits，and typically consisted of loose to medium dense sands locally capping a layer of moderately cemented clayey sands and weathered bedrock to the depth explored．


Figure 2 －Geologic Map of the Reno Area（NBMG，1973）

Groundwater was not encountered in any of our explorations．Based on Nevada Division of Water Resources well data from 319 documented wells in the same Section，Township，and Range，an average groundwater depth near 90 feet was calculated．

## 7．0 DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## 7．1 General Information

The following definitions characterize terms utilized in this report：
－Fine－grained soil possesses more than 40 percent by weight passing the number 200 sieve and exhibits a plasticity index lower than 15.
－Clay soil possesses more than 40 percent passing the number 200 sieve and exhibits a plasticity index greater than 15.
－Granular soil does not meeting the above criteria and has a maximum particle size less than 6 －inches．

The recommendations provided herein，particularly under Site Preparation，Grading and Filling， Foundation Design，Site Drainage and Quality Control are intended to reduce risks of structural distress related to consolidation or expansion of native soils and／or structural fills．These recommendations，along with proper design and construction of the planned structure（s）and associated improvements，work together as a system to improve overall performance．If any aspect of this system is ignored or poorly implemented，the performance of the project will suffer．Any evaluation of the site for the presence of surface or subsurface hazardous substances is beyond the scope of this study．When suspected hazardous substances are encountered during routine geotechnical investigations，they are noted in the exploration logs and reported to the client．No such substances were identified during our exploration．

The exploratory test holes were advanced at the approximate locations shown on the exploration map．All excavations were backfilled upon completion of the field portion of our study．The backfill was compacted to the extent possible with the equipment on hand． However，the backfill was not compacted to the requirements presented herein under Grading and Filling．If structures，concrete flatwork，pavement，utilities or other improvements are to be located in the vicinity of any of the exploratory excavations，the backfill should be removed and re－compacted in accordance with the requirements contained in the soils report．Failure to properly compact backfill could result in excessive settlement of improvements located over test pits．

Structural areas referred to in this report include all areas of buildings，concrete slabs，asphalt pavements，as well as pads for any minor structures．All compaction requirements presented in this report are relative to ASTM D $1557^{1}$ ．

[^5]
## 7．2 Seismic Design Category

Per the 2012 International Residential Code amendments adopted by Washoe County，the residential buildings located on－site shall be assigned a seismic design category $D_{2}$ ．

## 7．3 Site Preparation

All vegetation should be stripped and grubbed from structural areas．A stripping depth of 0.3 to 0.5 feet is anticipated．Localized deeper areas may be required in areas of large brush．Some vegetation could be placed in non－structural fill areas at least 5 feet away from any structure footprint．Concentration of the vegetation must be avoided and the vegetation must be blended with a sufficient amount of soil since placing large concentrated layers of vegetation could lead to excessive settlement and subsequent surface depressions．

Surficial clayey soils present within the upper two to three feet of Phase 2 will exhibit considerable shrink－swell with changes in moisture content．Such soils are common，but sporadically distributed and must be identified during grading．Failure to recognize and properly mitigate expansive clayey soils will result in damage to improvements．Clayey soils should be separated from improvements by structural fill in order to decrease potential shrink－swell movements．The minimum separation is 2.0 feet for footings and floor slabs and 1.5 feet for asphalt pavements and exterior concrete．This separation may include aggregate base section， as applicable．The required separation may be achieved by any combination of site filling or over－excavation and replacement．Over－excavation may cease if clayey soils are penetrated and presence of granular soils

Clayey soils to be left in place and covered with fill must be scarified and moisture－conditioned to 2 to 4 percent over optimum for a minimum depth of 12 －inches．This requirement is in lieu of additional over－excavation and is critical to structure performance．This moisture level will significantly decrease the magnitude of shrink－swell movements in the upper foot of clayey soils． The high moisture content must be maintained by periodic surface wetting，or other methods， until the surface is covered by at least one lift of fill．

All areas to receive structural fill or structural loading should be densified for a minimum depth of 8 －inches to at least 90 percent relative compaction in accordance with ASTM D 1557．Prior to densification，soils should be moisture conditioned to plus or minus 3 percent of optimum． Higher moisture contents will be acceptable if the soil horizon is stable and density can be achieved in subsequent structural fill lifts．Scarification and moisture conditioning may be required to achieve the required soil moisture content recommendations．

## 7．4 Grading and Filling

Structural fill is defined as any material placed below structural elements，including；foundations， concrete slabs－on－grade，pavements，or any structure that derives support from the underlying soil．Granular and fine－grained soil generated on－site and free of vegetation，organic matter，and other deleterious material can be used as structural fill．If imported structural fill is required，it
should be reasonably free of vegetation，organic matter，and other deleterious material and meet the requirements of Table 2.

Table 2 －Guideline Specification for Imported Structural Fill

| Sieve Size（ASTM D6913） | Percent by Weight Passing |
| :---: | :---: |
| 6 Inch | 100 |
| 4 Inch | $90-100$ |
| $3 / 4$ Inch | $70-100$ |
| No．40 | $15-70$ |
| No．200 | $5-30$ |
| Maximum Liquid Limit（ASTM D4318） | 40 |
| Maximum Plasticity Index | 10 |

Adjustments to the recommended limits presented in Table 2 can be provided to allow the use of other granular，non－expansive material，including rock fills．Any such adjustments must be made and approved by the geotechnical engineer，in writing，prior to importing fill to the site． Rock fills must consist of a 12－inch－minus，well－graded soil，placed and compacted in maximum 15 －inch thick lifts．A soil fill or 3 －inch minus rock fill is normally used for the final 12 inches of pad fills to facilitate fine grading，foundation excavations，and utility trenching．

Structural fill should be placed in maximum 12－inch thick（loose）level lifts or layers，moisture conditioned to within 3 percent of optimum，and densified to at least 90 percent relative compaction．Higher moisture contents are acceptable if the soil lifts are stable and required relative compaction can be attained in the soil lift and subsequent soil lifts．Where structural fills exceed 5 feet in thickness the minimum compaction requirement shall be increased to 95 percent．

The maximum fill differential beneath a building pad shall be limited to 5 feet；over－excavation and replacement of in－situ soils or extending foundations may be necessary to meet this requirement． Field density testing shall be performed at a rate of 1 test per 1，000 cubic yards of material placed， or 1 test per lift of fill，as a quality control measure during placement and compaction of fill soils．

## 7．5 Trenching and Excavation

All trenching should be performed and stabilized in accordance with local，state，and OSHA standards．Bank stability is the responsibility of the contractor，who is present at the site，able to observe changes in ground conditions，and has control over personnel and equipment．Based on the results of our exploration，it is our opinion that the bulk of the site soils appear to be predominately Type C，although variations exist．Deeper excavations in Phase 1 may encounter stable rock．

## 7．6 Foundations

Standard spread foundations are recommended for use on this project．Provided the foundation support soils have been prepared in accordance with the recommendations of this report，the bearing pressures presented in Table 3 can be utilized for design．

Table 3 －Allowable Foundation Bearing Pressures

| Loading Condition | Maximum Net Allowable Bearing <br> Pressure（PSF） |
| :--- | :---: |
| Dead Load Plus Full Time Live Load | 2,000 |
| Dead Load Plus Live Loads，Plus <br> Transient Wind or Seismic Loads | 2,750 |
| ${ }^{1}$ Net allowable bearing pressure is that pressure at the base of the footing in excess of the adjacent <br> overburden pressure． |  |

For frost protection，footings should all be set at least twenty－four（24＂）inches below adjacent outside or unheated interior finish grades，as required by code．Footings not located within frost prone areas should be placed at least 12 inches below surrounding ground or slab level for confinement．Regardless of loading，individual pad foundations and continuous spread foundations should be at least 18 and 12 inches wide，respectively，or as required by code．

Before placing reinforcement steel for foundations，the foundation subgrade should be inspected．If loose，soft，wet，or disturbed soils are encountered at the foundation subgrade， these soils should be removed to expose suitable foundation soils，and the resulting over－ excavation backfilled with compacted structural fill．The base of all excavations should be dry and free of loose materials at the time of concrete placement．

Total settlement for structures designed in accordance with the assumptions and recommendations presented in this report is anticipated to be on the order of $3 / 4$ inch，or less． Differential settlement between foundations with similar loads and sizes is anticipated to be $1 / 2$ of the total settlement．If larger footings or heavier column loads are planned，bearing capacity recommendations and anticipated settlements should be updated accordingly．

## 7．7 Lateral Loads and Retaining Structures

Lateral loads，such as wind or seismic，may be resisted by passive soil pressure and friction on the bottom of the footing．The recommended coefficient of base friction is 0.42 and has been reduced by a factor of 1.5 on the ultimate soil strength．Lateral earth pressures imposed on retaining walls are dependent on the relative rigidity and movement of the structure，soil type， and moisture conditions behind the wall．Recommended lateral earth pressures are presented in Table 4 －Lateral Earth Pressures．

Table 4 －Lateral Earth Pressures

| Condition | Active（psf／f） |  | Passive（psf／f） |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Static | Pseudo－ <br> Static | Static | Pseudo－ <br> Static |  |
|  | 40 | 60 | 350 | 275 | 60 |

The values presented in Table 4 assume wall backfill will be structural fill．Excessive pressures can be developed due to heavy compaction equipment during backfill placement．Therefore，all backfill behind any retaining structures should be screened to 6 ＂minus and shall be compacted to not less than 90 percent if only supporting slabs－on－grade．Due care must be exercised during compaction to avoid build－up of excessive pressures．The values presented in Table 4 do not take into account hydrostatic pressures or seismic forces．French drains，a drainage backfill geotextile such as Mirafi 140 N ，or a pre－manufactured drain system such as Tensar ${ }^{\circledR}$ DC1200 may be used if hydrostatic pressure buildup is possible．

## 7．8 Slope Stability and Erosion Control

Stability of cut and filled surfaces involves two separate aspects．The first concerns true slope stability related to mass wasting，landslides or the enmasse downward movement of soil or rock．Cut and fill slopes，with gradients of $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$（horizontal to vertical）or flatter，are suitable for the project soils．

The second aspect of stability involves erosion potential and is dependent on numerous factors involving grain size distribution，cohesion，moisture content，slope angle and the velocity of the water or wind on the ground surface．Erosion protection should be in accordance with Washoe County Public Works Design Standards．

Temporary（during construction）and permanent（after construction）erosion control will be required for all disturbed areas．The contractor shall prevent dust from being generated during construction in compliance with all applicable city，county，state and federal regulations，and shall submit an acceptable dust control plan to Washoe County prior to starting site preparation or earthwork．The project specifications should include an indemnification by the contractor of the owner and engineer for any dust generation during the construction period．The owner will be responsible for mitigation of dust after his acceptance of the project．

## 7．9 Site Drainage

Adequate surface drainage must be constructed and maintained away from the structures． The permanent finish slopes away from the structure should be sufficient to allow water to drain away quickly from and prevent any ponding of water adjacent to the structure．All runoff should be collected within permanent drainage paths that can convey water off the property． A system of roof gutters and downspouts is recommended to collect roof drainage and direct it away from the foundations．

Foundation and stem wall backfill should be densified to at least 90 percent relative compaction．Compacting the backfill material decreases permeability and reduces the amount of irrigation and storm water available to enter under floor areas．

## 7．10 Concrete Slabs

A 6 －inch minimum thickness of compacted（ $95 \%$ minimum per ASTM D1557）Type 2，Class B aggregate base course should underlie concrete slabs－on－grade．All dedicated and public easement improvements shall be constructed in accordance with the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction．The decision to incorporate a moisture vapor retarder or barrier is a function of the overlying floor treatments and／or equipment and should be based on a case by case basis．However，in no instance should concrete be placed directly on the barrier without additional consideration to curing practices．

Western Nevada is a region with absorptive aggregates and exceptionally low relative humidity． As a consequence，concrete flatwork will shrink and curl in a manner which is not typical of other US regions．Proper sub－grade preparation and placement of reinforcement are imperative．Typical joint spacing，regionally，is on 10 to 12 foot centers．Cracking that occurs within the slab on grade will often reflect through overlying improvements even if adequate substrate preparation has occurred．

All concrete placement and curing shall be performed in accordance with procedures outlined by the American Concrete Institute．Special considerations should be given to concrete placed and cured during hot or cold weather conditions．Proper control joints and reinforcing should be provided to minimize any damage resulting from shrinkage．

## 7．11 Concrete Sulfate Exposure Level

The native soils presented sodium sulfate levels in the negligible category．Therefore，it is our opinion sulfate exposure is not applicable，Class S0（ACI 318，Table 4．2．1），should govern when considering concrete requirements．Soil corrosivity laboratory test results are presented on Plate A－5 in Appendix A．

## 7．12 Asphaltic Concrete

The minimum structural pavement section for local streets within Washoe County consists of 3 inches of Type II asphaltic concrete with a sand seal（or Type 3 asphaltic concrete with a fog seal）overlying 6 inches of Type II，Class B aggregate base．Based on the granular nature of subgrade soils and our composite R －Value tests，the minimum structural section can be used for the streets within the development providing roadbed has been prepared as discussed in the Site Preparation portion of this report．Roadway improvements specific to major roads should be addressed separately and based on projected traffic data．

All roadway construction shall be in accordance with the approved plans and the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction．We recommend Type 3 plantmix bituminous pavement be used in the surface lift of all pavement sections．The Contractor should submit a pavement mix design to the Owner，for approval，at least 5 working days prior to paving．When pavement is placed directly adjacent to concrete flatwork，the finish compacted grade of the pavement be at least $1 / 2$ of an inch higher than the edge of adjacent concrete surface to allow adequate compaction of the pavement without damaging the concrete．

## 7．13 Asphalt Design Life

Maintenance is mandatory to long－term pavement performance．Maintenance refers to any activity performed on the pavement that is intended to preserve its original service life or load－ carrying capacity．Examples of maintenance activities include patching，crack or joint sealing， and seal coats．If these maintenance activities are ignored or deferred，premature failure of the pavement will occur．

The cost associated with proper maintenance is generally much less than the cost for reconstruction due to the premature failure of the pavement．Therefore，since pavement quality is an integral consideration in the formulation of our design recommendations，we strongly recommend the owner／project manager implement a pavement management program．

Premature failure of asphaltic concrete frequently occurs adjacent to poorly graded ponding areas and／or landscape areas．Failures may occur due to excessive precipitation，irrigation and landscaping water infiltrating into the subgrade soils causing subgrade failure．As such，in areas where saturation of the subgrade soils beneath asphaltic pavement may occur，we strongly recommend the owner／project manager install a subdrain system to eliminate the potential for saturation of subgrade soils．The subdrain system should discharge into a permanent drainage area that will not impede drainage flow to cause the system to back－up and／or clog．Appropriate maintenance procedures should be implemented to ensure the subdrain system does not plug and allow for proper drainage of surface and subsurface water beneath paved areas．Subdrain location and configuration should be evaluated once final grading and landscaping plans have been prepared．If the ultimate traffic exceeds the anticipated levels，it may be necessary to reevaluate and overlay the pavement at some time in the future．

## 8．0 CONSTRUCTION OBSERVATION AND TESTING SERVICES

The recommendations presented in this report are based on the assumption that the contractors perform their work as required by the project documents and that owner／project manager provides sufficient field－testing and construction review during all phases of construction．Prior to construction，the owner／project manager should schedule a pre－job conference including，but not limited to，the owner，architect，civil engineer，the general contractor，earthwork and materials subcontractors，building official，and geotechnical engineer．It is the owner＇s／project manager responsibility to set－up this meeting and contact all responsible parties．The conference will allow parties to review the project plans，specifications，and recommendations
presented in this report，and discuss applicable material quality and mix design requirements． All quality control reports should be submitted to the owner／project manager for review and distributed to the appropriate parties．

During construction，Wood Rodgers Incorporated should have the opportunity to provide sufficient on－site observation of site preparation and grading，over－excavation，fill placement， foundation installation，and paving．Compaction testing and continuous observation of fill placement should be performed while placing fill and backfill．These observations would allow us to document that the geotechnical conditions are as anticipated and that the contractor＇s work meets with the criteria in the approved plans and specifications．Verification of horizontal and vertical control must be provided by whoever was responsible for establishing those boundaries and constructing associated improvements．

## 9．0 STANDARD LIMITATION CLAUSE

This report has been prepared in accordance with generally accepted local geotechnical practices．The analyses and recommendations submitted are based upon field exploration performed and the conditions encountered as discussed in our report．This report does not reflect soils variations that may become evident during the construction period，at which time re－ evaluation of the recommendations may be necessary．We recommend our firm be retained to perform construction observation in all phases of the project related to geotechnical factors to document compliance with our recommendations．The owner／project manager is responsible for distribution of this geotechnical report to all designers and contractors whose work is related to geotechnical factors．

It is the contractor＇s responsibility for the grading and construction of the designed improvements．This responsibility includes the means，methods，techniques，sequence，and procedures of construction and safety of construction at the site．All construction shall conform to the requirements of the most recently adopted version of the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction and the requirements of Washoe County．Failure to inspect the work shall not relieve the contractor from his obligation to perform sound and reliable work as described herein and as described in the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction．

All plans and specifications should be reviewed by the design engineer responsible for this geotechnical report，to determine if they have been prepared in accordance with the recommendations contained in this report，prior to submitting to the building department for review．It is the owner＇s／project manager responsibility to provide the plans and specifications to the engineer．

This report has been prepared to provide information allowing the architect and engineer to design the project．The owner／project manager is responsible for distribution of this report to all designers and contractors whose work is affected by geotechnical aspects．In the event of changes in the design，location，or ownership of the project after presentation of this report，our
recommendations should be reviewed and possibly modified by the geotechnical engineer．If the geotechnical engineer is not accorded the privilege of making this recommended review，we can assume no responsibility for misinterpretation or misapplication of our recommendations or their validity in the event changes have been made in the original design concept without our prior review．The engineer makes no other warranties，either expressed or implied，as to the professional advice provided under the terms of this agreement and included in this report．

This report was prepared by Wood Rodgers，Inc．for the benefit of Moonlight Hills Estates，LLC． The material in it reflects Wood Rodgers＇best judgment in light of the information available to it at the time of preparation．Any use which a third party makes of this report，or any reliance on or decisions to be made based on it，are the responsibility of such third parties．Wood Rodgers＇ accepts no responsibility for damages，if any，suffered by any third party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this report．
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## CONSOLIDATION OF SEDIMENTARY ROCKS

Usually determined from unweathered samples．Largley dependent on cementation．

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathbf{U}=\text { unconsolidated } & \mathbf{M}=\text { moderately consolidated } \\
\mathbf{P}=\text { poorly consolidated } & \mathbf{W}=\text { well consolidated }
\end{array}
$$

## BEDDING OF SEDIMENTARY ROCKS

| Splitting Property | Thickness | Stratification |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Massive | Greater than 4.0 ft. | Very thick－bedded |
| Blocky | 2.0 to 4.0 ft. | Thick－bedded |
| Slabby | 0.2 to 2.0 ft. | Thin－bedded |
| Flaggy | 0.05 to 0.2 ft. | Very thin bedded |
| Shaly or platy | 0.01 to 0.05 ft | Laminated |
| Papery | Less than 0.01 ft. | Thinly laminated |

FRACTURING

| Intensity | Size of Pieces in Feet |
| :--- | :--- |
| Very little fractured | Greater than 4.0 |
| Occasionally fractured | 1.0 to 4.0 |
| Moderately fractured | 0.5 to 1.0 |
| Closely fractured | 0.1 to 0.5 |
| Intensely fractured | 0.005 to 0.1 |
| Crushed | Less than 0.005 |

## HARDNESS

1．Soft－Reserved for plastic material alone
2．Moderately soft－can be gouged deeply or carved easily with a knife blade
3．Moderately hard－can be readily scratched by a knife blade；scratch leaves a heavy trace of dust and is readily visible after the powder has been blown away
4．Hard－can be scratched with difficulty；scratch produces little powder and is often faintly visible
5．Very Hard－cannont be scratched with a knife blade；leaves a metallic streak

## STRENGTH

1．Plastic－very low strength
2．Friable－crumbles easily by rubbing with fingers
3．Weak－An unfractured specimen of such material will crumble under light hammer blows
4．Moderately Strong－Specimen will withstand a few heavy hammer blows before breaking
5．Strong－Specimen will withstand a few heavy hammer blows，and will yeild with difficulty only dust and small flying fragments
6．Very Strong－Specimen will resist heavy ringing hammer blows and will yeild with difficulty only dust and small flying fragments

## WEATHERING

The physical and chemical disintegration and decomposition of rocks and minerals by natural processes such as oxidation， reduction，hydration，solution，carbonation，freezing，and thawing

D．Deep－Moderate to complete mineral decomposition；extensive disintegration；deep and thorough discoloration， many fractures，all extensively coated or filled with oxides，carbonates and／or clay silt
M．Moderate－Slight change or partial decomposition of minerals；little disintegration；cementation little to unaffected； Moderate to occasionally intense discoloration；Moderately coated features
S．Slightly－No megascopic decomposition of minerals；little or no effect on normal cementation；Slight and inter－ mittent，or localized discoloration；Few stains on fracture surfaces
F．Fresh－Unaffected by weathering agents；No disintegration or discoloration；Fractures usually less numerous than joints
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| Subgrade |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Weight (pcf) | 120.2 | 117.6 | 113.0 |
| Moisture (\%) | 13.9 | 15.4 | 16.6 |
| Foot Pressure (psi) | 250 | 250 | 190 |
| Exudation Pressure (psi) | 731 | 377 | 226 |
| Expansion Pressure (psf) $^{\text {R-Value }}$ 300psi Exudation | 110 | 92 | 70 |

## LABORATORY REPORT

DATE：
May 27， 2015

CLIENT：
Wood Rodgers
5440 Reno Corporate Dr Reno，NV 89511

CLIENT PRO．JECT： 3056

Sampled By：Client
Date Sampled：－－
Time Sampled；－－

L．ABORATORY NO：R15－0238
PAGE： 1 of 1

POF：

Submitted By：Casey Engels
Date Received：05／26／15
Time Received： 0900

| Sample ID： | Test | Result | Unit | MRL | Method | Date | Analyst |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TP－4＠1＇－10＇ | Sulfate | ＜0．01 | \％ | 0.01 | SM4500E | 05／27／15 | LB |
|  | Sodium | $<0.01$ | \％ | 0.01 | ASTM D2791A | 05／27／15 | LB |
|  | Sodium Sulfate | $<0.01$ | \％ | 0.01 | Calculation | 05／27／15 | 1．B |
| TP－3＠2＇－8＊ | Sulfate | $<0.01$ | \％ | 0.01 | SM4500E | 05／27／15 | LB |
|  | Sodium | $<0.01$ | \％ | 0.01 | ASTM D2791A | 05／27／15 | LB |
|  | Sodium Sulfate | $<0.01$ | \％ | 0.01 | Calculation | 05／27／15 | LB |

Note：The results for each constituent denote the percentage（\％）for that particular element which is soluble in a $1: 5$（soil to water）extraction ratio and corrected for dilution．

|  | CHEMICAL TEST | Geotechnical Investigation MOONLIGHT HILLS ESTATES WASHOE COUNTY，NEVADA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ルロロロ ロロロローロー <br> 5440 Reno Corporate Drive，Reno，NV 89511 <br> Phone 775．823．4068 Fax 775．823．4066 |  | Project No．： 3228.004 PLATE <br> Date： $06 / 05 / 15$ A－5 |
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SECTION B[B

$\xrightarrow{5}=\underbrace{-25}$

Horiz. SCALE: $1^{\prime \prime}=50^{\circ}$



[^0]:    Precipitation frequency (PF) estimates in this table are based on frequency analysis of partial duration series (PDS).
    umbers in parenthesis are PF estimates at lower and upper bounds of the $90 \%$ confidence interval. The probability that precipitation frequency estimates for a given duration and average recurrence interval) will be greater than the upper bound (or less than the lower bound) is $5 \%$. Estimates at upper bounds are not checked against probable maximum precipitation (PMP) estimates and may be higher than currently valid PMP values.
    Please refer to NOAA Atlas 14 document for more information.

[^1]:    HS+GHCOMBINE FLOW EROM GOLDEN HIGHLANDS \& HIGH SCHOOL

[^2]:    Then KLSCP $=\quad 0.005$
    and
    $Y=(95)(0.005)\left((\mathrm{VQ})^{.56}\right)=0.48(\mathrm{VQ})^{.56}$
    The average annual water yield is 100 mm or 0.33 ft (Wolman and Riggs, 1990)
    $V$ and $Q$ will be determined for the $2,10,25,50$ and 100 year storms of 24 hour duration

[^3]:    Then KLSCP=
    0.003

    The average annual water yield is 100 mm or 0.33 ft (Wolman and Riggs, 1990)
    $V$ and $Q$ will be determined for the $2,10,25,50$ and 100 year storms of 24 hour duration

[^4]:    For GMN-6, the average water yield is ( 0.33 ft )* 7.93 acres) $=2.6 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$
    $\mathrm{Y}=\left(\left(2.6^{*}\left(.01^{*} 1.41\right)+\left(.02^{*} 1.07\right)+\left(.04^{*} .77\right)+\left(.1^{*} .48\right)+\left(.5^{*} 14\right)\right)\right) /\left(\left(.01^{*} 1.1\right)+\left(.02^{*} 0.9\right)+\left(.04^{*} .7\right)+\left(.1^{*} .5\right)+\left(.5^{*} .2\right)\right)=$ 1.00 tons/year
    Soil is decomposed granite (dg)

    Density of dg is about $4,000 \mathrm{lb} /$ cubic yard or 2 tons/ cubic yard Therefore about 0.5 cubic yards of sediment are eroded per year In the $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ year event about $\mathbf{0 . 7}$ cubic yards are eroded.

[^5]:    1 －Relative compaction refers to the ratio（percentage of the in－place density of a soil divided by the same soil＇s maximum dry density）as determined by the ASTM D 1557 laboratory test procedure．Optimum moisture content is the corresponding moisture content of the same soil at its maximum dry density．

