ATTACHMENT 13

LETTER S FROM NEIGHBORS

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
FOR PRINTING 2-SIDED DOCUMENTS

From: Kari Koonmen
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2016 10:20 AM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov; mishijima@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Subject: Stratford School at Partridge Avenue - FEIR Comments

Dear Members of the City of Sunnyvale Planning Commission,

I am writing to urge you to **deny the use permit** for the Stratford School to use the property known as the Raynor Park Activity Center as a private middle school with priority use of Raynor Park fields and to stop the sale of Raynor Activity Center.

I am requesting this denial because feasible mitigation measures for the **Lawrence Expressway/Benton Street (#11) Intersection** have not been addressed in the FEIR - Final Transportation Impact Analysis. The analysis states "The Project's impact would be **significant and unavoidable due to lack of feasible mitigation measures**" at the **Lawrence Expressway/Benton Street (#11) Intersection**. For those Birdland homeowners/residents who drive through that intersection multiple times a day and more importantly during the peak hours, the use permit should be denied and the EIR should not be approved nor certified until feasible mitigation measures are found to reduce the significant impact of the Project.

Sincerely,

Kari Koonmen

From: annie liu
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 5:11 PM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Subject: Stratford FEIR

Dear Sunnyvale Planning Commission,

As a 30 plus year resident and contributor of Birdland and our community, I am writing in to join in expressing the concerns over the flaws of the Stratford School Final EIR (FEIR) and believe the Straford School at Partridge Avenue should be rejected.

By now you would have received a number of emails from our neighbors and residents noting and even explaining in-detail the reasons to reject this project.

Here are my main reasonst:

Risks of safety and congestion: criticism on the limitations of the FEIR traffic analysis in noting spillovers, especially with Dunford; overflow of students outside of Birdland area; congestion on all major roads that already experience back-up (Wolfe, Homestead and Lawrence Expressway). The high level of congestion just for students intended for Straford jeopardizes the safety of the children and families trying to attend Laurelwood and Peterson. We already experience traffic risks without Stratford, thus this additional school is added concern.

It is not reasonable and proper planning to utilize this space for a private school of Stratford's size. Please take heed and reject this project.

Thank you,
Annie Liu
Birdland resident

From: John G
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 4:31 PM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Cc: John Grambow
Subject: Stratford School Project

To Sunnyvale Planning Commission,

Please vote against the Stratford School Project. We have too much traffic in our neighborhood already. We don't need more. This extra traffic plus the future Apple traffic is too much for the neighborhood to bear. We live on Lorne Way between Quail and Peacock. Many cars speed down this street now, making it very dangerous. Please don't shove this issue down our throats like the Apple Project was. Talk about neighborhood blight ... have you seen that ugly monstrosity (The Spaceship) that we have to face everyday now? Cupertino planners had to have their heads in space to approve a project like that so close to a residential area. Have some compassion for the people that live in Birdland. Dump the Stratford deal. You are supposed to be working for us, not against us.

Regards,
John Grambow
Lorne Way, Sunnyvale

From: Yunhong Li
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 3:29 PM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Subject: Stratford/Raynor Park Activity Center

Dear members of the Sunnyvale Planning Commission,

I'm writing to express my concern after reviewing the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) regarding the Stratford/Raynor park school site project.

I have expressed my concern about the traffic congestion in a previous email and it's included in the FEIR. And I'm not convinced by the response in the FEIR. Here I want to point out a particular modeling flaw in the report.

On page 2-44, response to Comment F-5, there is a calculation of how long the queue may be and its impact on traffic. After reading the reasoning behind the analysis, I found the modeling has flaw and the conclusion is wrong.

The modeling oversimplifies the scenario by dividing the cars in groups of 8. Each group exits in 90 seconds, and the next group of 8 cars moves in, and magically there is no overhead between groups. This is far from realistic, cars don't appear/disappear in groups, and the overhead between groups can't be ignored.

A more realistic model can be established by looking at the rate of cars coming in and exiting per minute and monitoring the cars
accumulated over time.

(1) Quoted from the FEIR, "an estimated 312 trips during the AM peak period". Assuming 312 trips over 20 minutes, the cars coming in at rate of 312/20=15.6 cars/minute.
(2) Quoted from the FEIR, "Assuming each group of eight cars takes 90 seconds to drop-off", so the cars exit at a rate of 8/90*60=5.33 cars/minute.
(3) So for each minute, there is about 15.6-5.33=10 more cars accumulated at the school site. It only take about 8 minutes to use up all 80 parking space, the queue will then spill over onto Dunford.

And from common sense, the assumption that 8 cars exit in 90 seconds is too optimistic, once the queue spill over onto Dunford, the exit rate could be reduced even further.

Finally, I want to emphasize that there are three other schools nearby (Laurelwood, Petterson, Appleseed), they all add traffic to Dunford during peak AM hours.

As shown above, the FEIR draw its conclusion on the queue spill over issue based on a flawed modeling. The additional traffic introduced by the new school site will have a significant impact on our neighborhood, and potentially increases chances of traffic accidents. I strongly suggest the planning commission to reject this project proposal before the traffic concern is addressed.

Thank you,
Yunhong Li (Karmen Court)

From: Wee Lee L
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 10:46 AM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov; mishijima@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Subject: Stratford School at Partridge Ave FEIR

Dear honorable members of the Sunnyvale Planning Commission,

1 I am writing to highlight serious flaws in the Stratford School Final EIR (FEIR) that necessitates your rejection of the FEIR and of the Stratford School at Partridge Avenue Project (project).

2 An overwhelming concern of the commenters is the safety and congestion issues brought on by project traffic . However, the FEIR's traffic analysis considers only the capacity issue of having additional cars coming through the neighborhood as a result of the project. Their analysis is based entirely upon the assumption that there will be no spillover onto Dunford Way from project traffic (see Page 2-43 & 2-44 of FEIR), but this assumption is highly unrealistic for two reasons :

(i) Unrealistically low proportion of total in-trips that arrive within peak 15 minutes

The FEIR estimates that 520 students will generate 312 in-trips and 281 out-trips in the morning, of which only 128 in-trips (41% of 312) are estimated to occur during the peak 15 minutes. Given the 80-20 rule that we see in many aspects of life (80% of sales generated by 20% of customers, 80% of data traffic consumed by 20% of users, etc), we would expect a much higher proportion of in-trips to arrive within the peak 15 minutes than the exceptionally low estimate of 41% used in the FEIR. Further, the equation used on page 2-44 of the FEIR to calculate number of cars in queue (that 9 minutes of queuing equates to 77 cars based on 9 minutes/15 minutes x 128 = 77) does not make sense. Instead, 80 cars are estimated to exit every 15 minutes (based on the FEIR's assumption that it takes 1.5 minutes for 8 cars to unload). The number of cars in queue should be the number of cars arriving in 15 minutes less the number of cars exiting in 15 minutes. If the number of cars in the queue exceeds the queue capacity on campus (estimated to be 80 cars), then traffic will spillover onto Dunford Way.

The following table shows a simple sensitivity analysis of the queue overflow onto Dunford Way for different % of in trips arriving within peak 15 minutes (assuming 312 in-trips in the morning) :

In-trips (60% of students)	312				
% of in-trips during peak 15 min	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%
Peak trips	125	156	187	218	250
Cars in queue (= Peak trips - 80 cars that can exit in 15 minutes)	45	76	107	138	170
Overflow onto Dunford (= Cars in queue - queue capacity of 80)	**0**	**0**	**27**	**58**	**90**

The response on Page 2-44 acknowledges the inherent uncertainty of vehicle queues but provides no analysis of how any spillover will affect their traffic analysis. As the sensitivity analysis shows, anything over 50% of estimated in-trips arriving in the peak 15 minutes will result in a spillover onto Dunford Way. Given the 80-20 rule, it is highly likely that the % of in-trips that occur during the peak 15 minutes will be much higher than 50%. If 80% of in-trips happen within the peak 15 minutes, there

will be 90 cars overflowing onto Dunford Way! Any spillover onto Dunford Way will completely invalidate all the traffic analysis in the FEIR.

(ii) Low number of in-trips for a school of 520 students

The FEIR estimates that the 520 students at the project will only generate 312 in-trips in the morning, based on data from Stratford sites at De Anza Elementary and San Jose Middle. The project is a middle school, which has 3 grades and thus much less likely to have multiple children per trip than De Anza Elementary School which has 6 grades. By including De Anza Elementary data, the estimated in-trips per student is likely to be biased on the low side. In addition, there is no comparison of the geographic distribution of students at De Anza Elementary and San Jose Middle School with the geographic distribution of students at the project. If a higher proportion of students walk/bike to the schools at De Anza Elementary and San Jose Middle than at the project, then the number of in-trips generated by the project will be further underestimated in the FEIR.

The following table shows a simple sensitivity analysis of the queue overflow situation if number of in-trips generated in the morning is 65%, 70% or 75% of students :

In-trips (65% of students)	**338**				
% of in-trips during peak 15 min	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%
Peak trips	135	169	203	237	270
Cars in queue (= Peak trips - 80 cars that can exit in 15 minutes)	55	89	123	157	190
Overflow onto Dunford (= Cars in queue - queue capacity of 80)	**0**	**9**	**43**	**77**	**110**
In trips (70% of students)	**364**				
% of in-trips during peak 15 min	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%
Peak trips	146	182	218	255	291
Cars in queue (= Peak trips - 80 cars that can exit in 15 minutes)	66	102	138	175	211
Overflow onto Dunford (= Cars in queue - queue capacity of 80)	**0**	**22**	**58**	**95**	**131**
In trips (75% of students)	**390**				
% of in-trips during peak 15 min	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%
Peak trips	156	195	234	273	312
Cars in queue (= Peak trips - 80 cars that can exit in 15 minutes)	76	115	154	193	232
Overflow onto Dunford (= Cars in queue - queue capacity of 80)	**0**	**35**	**74**	**113**	**152**

If the number of in-trips in the morning is only 65% of students instead of 60% of students, we will see an overflow onto Dunford even if only 50% of in-trips occur during the peak 15 minutes. In reality, we are likely to see a much more severe overflow situation given the 80-20 rule.

3 The FEIR did not respond to Comments F-6 and F-7 solely on the basis that there is no anticipated spillover onto Dunford, which the sensitivity analyses in paragraph 2 show is a very weak and unrealistic assumption and that in all likelihood, there will be significant spillover onto Dunford Way which invalidates the

traffic analysis of the FEIR for the entire neighborhood. In fact, the traffic backup will probably be worse that the sensitivity analyses show since the analyses do not account for the delays described below in paragraphs 4 through 6 below.

4 The project will cause traffic to be choked up on Partridge Ave, Dunford Way through to Wolfe Road and Dunford Way through to Lawrence Expressway. The traffic congestion will be made worse by cars that have left the school on Partridge Ave and want to go back eastward on Dunford Way towards Lawrence Expressway, or westward towards Wolfe Road. Parking restriction along Dunford Way between Norman Drive and Oriole Ave has been implemented, but all that does is to move the parked cars eastward along Dunford Ave, reducing the visibility of cars trying to turn onto Dunford Way from Partridge Ave. The road improvements highlighted on Page 2-7 in Master Response 2 and the mitigation measures (MM 3.14.5 a & b) do nothing to address the fact that there will be more traffic brought into the neighborhood than the roads can safely accommodate. The congestion will cascade through Glenbar Ave, Parrot Ave, Peacock Ave, Oriole Ave and Inverness Way as cars try to exit the project to the south due to the logjam at Partridge Ave and Dunford Way.

5 Given this scenario, it is not unexpected if cars from the west on Dunford Way will try to turn right from Dunford Way onto Partridge Ave so as to drop off their students on Partridge Ave across the school, creating a hazardous situation for these students as they meet cars traveling north on Partridge Ave after exiting the campus. Likewise, cars coming from the east on Dunford Way can expect long delays waiting to turn left into the Dunford driveway and are likely to be tempted to drop their students off on Dunford Way itself, creating an even more dangerous situation for their students.

6 All this traffic will put at even greater risk the safety of students walking or biking to Laurelwood Elementary School or Peterson Middle School from within the neighborhood. This is not a hypothetical concern. Many commenters have witnessed near misses from existing traffic in the area and are deeply concerned that it is not a matter of if, but when, someone will be injured or worse if the project is allowed to proceed. Your consideration of the project needs to be based on realistic projections of its impact, but the FEIR's traffic analysis is completely invalid due to its unrealistic assumptions.

7 Additionally, the FEIR did not address the air quality issues raised in Comments F-1 and F-3 on the basis that their analysis is what is legally required. I am sure that it was completely legal for the authorities in Flint, MI to change their source of their water supply, but look at the tragedy that has occurred as a result! In this case, I would contend that what the law requires is insufficient – it does not make sense that we do not investigate the cumulative impact of the project on the air quality of the neighborhood, especially since it is a residential area with a park where young children and families gather and play.

8 At the end of the day, Raynor School was built to serve students living in Birdland, not students who commute from elsewhere. Furthermore, Raynor School probably was not built to serve 520 students (or for that matter, 416 students per Alternative 2). The unalterable fact remains that the school is not situated in an area with roads that can safely accommodate a school with 520 students mostly commuting from outside the neighborhood and no mitigation, save for busing all of the students from some central location outside the

neighborhood, can ensure their safety or the safety of those who live in the neighborhood. The traffic analysis of the FEIR is based on unrealistic assumptions and the traffic impact of the project will be much worse than the FEIR has projected. Further, the air quality of the neighboring park will be adversely impacted. A private school serving students commuting from elsewhere cannot be safely accommodated on this site and I strongly urge your rejection of the project.

Sincerely,
Wee-Lee Lim
Birdland homeowner and resident

From: Diwakar
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 10:16 AM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Cc: mishijima@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Subject: Act Jan 25 - Deny Permit for Stratford School and Stop Sale of Raynor Activity Center

Hello,

I live on Lochinvar Ave, Benton Ct Intersection in Birdland with 2 Kids - 1 going to Laurelwood 5th grade and another going to Appleseed. My Older one bikes to school and will be biking to Peterson starting next year.

Over last couple of years - there has been a huge increase in Traffic on Lochinvar, Inverness and all roads connecting Wolfe and Lawrence Expy. Besides increase in Traffic, there has been an exponential increase in Speeding and bad driving incidences, which really really scares me with a boy biking to school every day. Most of these drivers take short cuts thru the Birdland to beat Wolfe/Lawrence Traffic.

Selling Raynor Park to a Private Middle School is further going to worsen this situation. It will result in a multi-fold increase in Parents dropping/picking up Kids, many of them in a hurry - cutting corners and jeopardizing neighborhood kids walking/biking to Schools.

Both my boys love to go to Raynor Park and play in evenings and sometime in after noon. This is the only park in this entire neighborhood - it would be a loss to lose the park to Private Use.

Where are the neighborhood kids supposed to go for playing?

Giving a Private School priority Use over a Public Park is wrong. Public Parks are for the neighborhood - not for commercial uses. Please listen to the thousands of residents around Raynor Park.

Thanks
Diwakar
Benton Ct, Sunnyvale.

From: Preeti Sharma
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 8:57 AM
To: City Sunnyvale
Cc: Carol Shariat; Shahid Abbas; PlanningCommission AP; Carla Ochoa; Kevin McGee; Paul Zwolinski; Diwakar
Subject: Understanding the traffic calming study and process.

I would like to share my experience in initiating a traffic calming request with the city. A traffic study for Lochinvar was recently done and we were informed that it "does not qualify" for traffic calming measures. Since then I have exchanged multiple emails trying to understand the traffic calming process. I was told that the study now considered complete so I am reaching out to a wider audience with my questions in hopes of getting some answers:

1. Question:
No data was shared for the traffic calming study. If there is a study there should be associated data. Some absolute numbers were given without any associated data.

Reason I ask this:
It takes a lot if citizen effort and initiative to get the traffic calming request going. Sharing the numbers gives us insight. Appendix E in the document below is a very basic example of the kind of data that we will benefit from knowing :

http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/speedmgt/ref_mats/fhwasa09028/resources/Neighborhood%20Traffic%20Calming%20Program%20Guide%20-%20City%20of%20Alexandria%20VA.pdf
It would be ideal to have data/analysis on a city webpage for anyone to see.

2. Question:
About the "non residential parts of the street the traffic calming document mentions "
Staff can work with you to identify other actions if your street does not meet this basic criterion.
"
but no one spoke with us about how best to address this and the request is considered closed.

Reason I ask this:
So to extrapolate this for the neighborhood , I am not aware of a way engage the city in discussion for any street that is not "residential" e.g. Inverness, Dunford etc. Filling out traffic calming requests for a non residential street does not work but we need to know what WILL work.

3. Question:
There were 2 probes placed on Lochinvar. At what distance from the near end of the streets where the probes were placed ?

Reason I ask this:
Now surely someone should know this since this calculation was done at some point in the study (this is an assumption I am making)

The probes were placed close to street ends where vehicles approach either from a ~90 deg turn or a full-stop. Reaching 32/35 mph at those points is barely a possibility for many V4 sedans WITH the intent. Not all speeding is intentional. In fact it can be argued that most is not. Either way a impartial study cannot be conducted with an assumption of intent either way.
What is the intent of these measurements ? To measure the highest speed on a street the probes would be closer to street center. It is unclear why 2 probes and why toward street ends. Need to understand what exactly is being measured (certainly not highest speeds on the street).
It is important to understand why the speed needs to be 32 (to count as speeding) toward the ENDS of the street as opposed to the CENTER of the street, given that 32 is already above the speed limit by > 5 mph on a 25 mph street. This would imply speeds toward the center of the streets would be closer to 40 mph or more.

4. Question:
The traffic calming study was done 7 days a week and the results were averaged out .
What is the difference between weekday and weekend traffic ?
What are the standard deviation values (weekdays vs weekend) ?
For what standard deviation values are averages considered to be good measures w.r.t traffic safety ?

Reason I ask this:

The risk to human safety cannot be averaged out. Neither is my perception averaged out. Most people walk in the evenings/kids walk to the park etc.. and if that is "high traffic time" the odds of getting hit are greatly increased at that hour.

The same issue is w.r.t time of the day . school traffic is very high in the mornings and evenings. So traffic patterns are very different 7:30 - 9:30 and 4:30 - 6:30 are much higher than the rest of the day.

I think we as a neighborhood will benefit from understanding the data and the criterion better. That way we can match perceptions to data and hopefully next time we ask for a traffic study, we have a match of data with human perceptions.

I am looking for ways to get these questions answered.

Regards.

Preeti.

From: Galen Davis
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 7:36 AM
To: Tappan Merrick
Cc: PlanningCommission AP; yahoogroups; yahoogroups
Subject: Re: [PNFS] Raynor Field usage by Little league

Maybe I'm reading it wrong, but it sounds like the baseball field will be released at 3:00 PM. This looks like the same field access Metro has at Braly. Can someone point out if I'm misreading this?

Thanks,

Galen Davis

From: Barbara Fritschen
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 4:00 AM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Subject: Vote AGAINST Permit for Stratford to build on Raynor Park Activity Center Property

To the Members of the Sunnyvale Planning Commission:

We urge you to DENY the permit allowing Stratford to build on the Raynor Park Activity Center at 1500 Partridge Avenue, Sunnyvale. Over the past twenty years, we have seen the traffic increase at an alarming rate through our neighborhood.

We live at the corner of Lochinvar and Vireo, and in 2000, twice within two months, a car crashed into our house to avoid another speeding car. We have since witnessed several near misses as we have watched the traffic through our neighborhood become increasingly worse over the past 15 years.

Lochinvar is one of the main thoroughfares to Raynor Park from Lawrence Expressway, and the traffic passing through with the daily delivery of 300+ students to Stratford would only add to the congestion in our neighborhood.

Additionally, our 12-year-old daughter walks to Peterson Middle School everyday, and she witnesses the heavy and sometimes dangerous traffic on Dunford Way as she attempts to cross the street safely each morning and afternoon.

With the new Apple Campus looming on the horizon, traffic cutting through our neighborhood is bound to get worse. Allowing Stratford to build a commuter school at Raynor will only contribute to this already messy and dangerous problem.

Please, we implore you to vote NO on the permit allowing Stratford to build at Raynor Activity Center. PLEASE help us control traffic and growth in our already too-congested neighborhood!

Thank you very much,

Barbara and Dan Fritschen
1604 Vireo Avenue

From: Suhas Mehta
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 3:23 AM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Subject: NO to Stratford in the Birdland community

Respected planning commissioners,

As a member of the Birdland community, I, too, see a big growth of vehicular traffic on the inside streets of this community. Traffic that fully abides by the driving rules are fine. But there is always a bunch of bad apples who want to bypass the traffic on Lawerence and use the inner roads as expressway. The School will add to this traffic making the neighborhood roads unsafe for our kids.

Additionally, it is very wrong that the only public park in the neighborhood will go away to this school. Such an exclusivity to Stratford will eventually drive the kids away from the park activities that they enjoy today. The city, by voting for this exclusivity will be responsible for the lost physical activities in the youth of this neighborhood that may likely cause other I'll health effects.

I request you to reconsider your decision for giving away Stratford this exclusivity and count my vote against it.

Regards,
Suhas & Reemu on Wood Duck Ave.

From: Esther Lew
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 11:54 PM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Subject: Raynor Park & Stratford

Dear Sunnyvale Planning Commission,

I am writing to voice my concern and objection to approving a permit/sale to Stratford building a school at Raynor Park.

With 300+ children planned to attend this school, I would anticipate almost as much cars coming through the neighborhood. With parents eager and rushed to drop off their student to this school, our own neighborhood children will be at risk. We already have had too many close calls with inattentive and drivers to our neighborhood school.

Let's us not forget the Apple Campus that is being built down the road from Raynor Park. While we are told that the amount of employees that will be in that campus will not affect our neighborhood. But let's review all the road work that is being done and being proposed on Wolfe Road. While it may be able to take up a bit of the traffic, but let's be realistic, many people will be driving through our neighborhood to access that campus.

Our neighborhood is being impacted negatively by both projects. We not only lose our freedom to use our neighborhood park whenever we want to, but we are also going to be bombarded by many cars that want to get to those "campuses" as well.

Also, I am fearful for our neighborhood children and families who walk or bike to school, park or friend's house. What would it take for someone to take notice and think that this is a bad idea, a child that is hit by a car?

Please do not approve any permits that will negatively affect our usage and safety of our neighborhood.

Also, for those us who had purchased our homes before any of these projects, we didn't sign up for these changes.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,
-- Esther Lew

From: Ben-Li Sheu
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 9:13 PM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Subject: Oppose additional traffic endangering our neighborhood kids

Dear Sir or Madam,

We would like to voice our strong concern about too much traffic added to neighborhood near Raynor Park in Sunnyvale, and endangering our neighborhood kids. Over the last two years, we have seen significant increase of cars speeding in our neighborhood and there is no effective action to address this problem.

It can be foreseen that another public school will be needed in this area, and having a private middle school does not help with addressing the traffic problem.

Please vote to "DENY" sale of Raynor Park Activity Center to Stratford to build a private middle school.

Sincerely,

Ben-Li Sheu on Castleton Terrace, Sunnyvale

From: Meilin Yeo
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 9:01 PM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Subject: YES! Sale of Raynor Park Activity Center

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I am a Sunnyvale resident and part of the Birdland Yahoo group. I've been following developments since 2014 pertaining to Stratford School's acquisition of the Raynor Park Activity Center. I support the sale for the following reasons:

1. A well-maintained school attracts families to the neighborhood, increasing the desirability of the area. Schools are hubs of activity. The presence of parents, teachers, staff, security patrolling the grounds contribute to a safer environment in the neighborhood. A functioning school can deter vandalism, drug use, vagrants, and other shady activities that otherwise might occur in abandoned buildings. Moreover, Stratford's plans to develop and share some facilities are friendly.

2. From my experience with Stocklmeir Elementary School (with over 1000 students), Stratford Middle School Santa Clara, and Cupertino Middle School, Archbishop Mitty High School, I note that "congested" times typically occur during morning drop-off (lasting approximately one hour), and after-school pick-up (again, lasting one hour). Outside those times, the neighborhood streets are usually quiet. School events during the evenings and nights are also limited; on average, once per month in a school year. This is observable for both large public schools and small private schools. Traffic calming measures (e.g. crossing guards, parent-volunteers assisting with drop-off, pick-up procedures, etc.) are highly effective too. It is an exaggeration to claim that quality of life in Birdland will deteriorate for the worse because of the influx of traffic.

3. The majority of folks who use these streets live in the neighborhood; many are too familiar with the route that they are careless about the speed limit, make rolling stops, and less mindful of pedestrian crossings. I disagree that "outsiders" are totally at fault for speeding and dangerous driving. I drive by Laurelwood Elementary around 3:00pm daily, and note that rarely do drivers take safety risks; the majority drive responsibly.

4. The fault does not lie solely with drivers. Parents need to effectively teach their kids about road safety especially when riding a bicycle. I observe that some student bicyclists don't stop at intersections. Well, they use the road a bicyclists, however when they arrive at a crossing, they use the right of "pedestrians" by shooting across the street. They don't halt at the 4-way stop on Dunford + Peacock! Kudos to the daily car drivers who look out for such bikers.

5. Further, regarding the pedestrian safety, a few well placed lighted crossings will alleviate the situation, e.g. lighted crossing on Fremont Avenue in front of Fremont High School. I strongly encourage the Commission to install similar lights on Dunford + Quail without delay.

6. Tappan Merrick openly lead the charge against the sale of the building based on his agenda against members of the City Council in the run-up to his election bid. Neighbors jumped into the fray with misinformation and confusion-- especially regarding priority use, sale of Raynor Park, and rumors of park closure to the public and shutting out youth activities. Unfounded assertions about

Stratford's school schedule and anecdotal evidence are plentiful too. On the Yahoo message boards, several neighbors admit to taking things into their own hands, eg. flagging down drivers, confrontation by forcing other drivers to stop, which is just plain dangerous and vigilante. I do not support provocative, insular and anti-development behavior.

7. I see double-standards with regards to building developments in the surrounding areas. Nobody has the guts to take on monstrous, totally for-profit Apple but will pick on a relatively smaller private school.

A school in the neighbor positively impacts a neighborhood in the long run. Hence, I support the sale of the RPAC to Stratford School.

Sincerely,
Meilin Yeo

From: Marion Noble
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 7:07 PM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Subject: Opposition to Stratford Permit

Dear Committee,

I am opposed to the permit for Stratford to build a private middle school on the property of the former Raynor Park Activity Center. I am opposed to their being given priority use of sections of Raynor Park as well as fields.

Marion S. Noble
1054 Bluebird Ave.,
Santa Clara, CA, 95051

Sent from my iPhone

From: Vural Kalafat
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 6:51 PM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Subject: Strafford/Raynor activity center

I just wanted to let planning commission and City Council to know that I am totally against the "Sale" of that property.

Vural Kalafat
1550 Vireo Ave
Sunnyvale CA 94087

From: Carol Peluffo
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 6:47 PM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Subject: Strafford School

Good evening,

I am voicing my opinion that my family does not want Strattford School to move into the area by Raynor Park.
Peterson Middle School is too close to the location of this site.
I can barely back out of my driveway in the morning when parents are dropping off kids at Peterson.
The streets close to Laurelwood Elementary are horrible right now and we don't need another school that will cause more congestion and possible accidents.
Just say NO.

Thank you.
Carol Peluffo

From: Pam Fox Rollin
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 5:29 PM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Subject: Concerned about Raynor Park Activity Center

Hi!
Since I'm not able to be there 1/25, I'm writing this email.

While I haven't been involved in this issue to date, I've been reading about it with alarm. Raynor is vital to the health of this neighborhood... my kids have grown up at the park, played Little League on the fields, and done many activities there.

I can't imagine how it is appropriate to let a private school have not only the activity center but priority use of the park.
Kindly reconsider.

Pam
1599 Meadowlark Lane, Sunnyvale

Pam Fox Rollin
Executive Coach and Facilitator

From: Carol Colao
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 4:58 PM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Subject: Stratford / Raynor Activity Center

To Whom It Mary Concern,

I write this email in support of my neighbors in Birdland who are against the permit and sale of the Raynor Activity Center to Stratford.

Our neighborhood is already compromised in regard to traffic congestion and safety. I, personally, have been in close calls with motorists in such a rush, and speeding, that I've almost been hit when pulling into my driveway. Even with my blinker on well in advance they attempt to pass.

The backup of cars in front of my home has gotten significantly longer. This is bound to only worsen with hundreds of additional students being driven through our neighborhood making for more congestion and shorter tempers.

I ask that you hear my voice and those of others concerned with our safety.

Thank you,

Carol Colao
Quail Avenue

From: William Patton
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 3:23 PM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Subject: Stratford School

Dear Planning Commission:

Regarding the Stratford School at Partridge Avenue, we who live in the neighborhood have some serious concerns about the impact it will have on all residents here.

- We already have parents driving kids to Appleseed, Laurelwood and Peterson. These schools are close to each other and to the Stratford site. The daily traffic pileup is a dangerous one. Adding non-resident drivers, drivers who aren't interested in preserving this as a quiet, safe neighborhood, to this already noxious mix is a recipe for accidents with bicycles and pedestrians, many of whom are children.

- Already we have traffic diverted into the neighborhood because of very heavy traffic on the main arteries. By the time the new construction on all sides of us is finished, we will have very dangerous traffic conditions in our neighborhood without adding a school for people outside the neighborhood. Additionally, the many new apartments are being built in this area and the children will need a public school to attend. Unfortunately, since our current schools are already seriously impacted, the only land for a new school is the Raynor site. Having a private school on this land does nothing to help keep this neighborhood a real community.

- Stratford's additional, and most important, impact on our neighborhood will be its use of our neighborhood park. The entire park is paid for by taxpayers. It is NOT a private park. Anyone can use it at any time. A private entity cannot preempt the public. To offer priority use of a public space to a business is completely unacceptable in every respect and will have a serious negative impact on the residents of this neighborhood. We have not seen any plan for reimbursing residents for the loss of park use. Surely this is not legal and it most certainly is not ethical.We have always believed that the City of Sunnyvale was better than that.

We are confident that you will look at what a residential neighborhood needs to be for its residents, especially the children. We have many small children here. Their safety and their quality of life are surely the top priority for all of us.

Sincerely,

William and Barbara Patton
933 Exmoor Way
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

From: Dunnam
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 1:06 PM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Subject: Stratford School in "Birdland"

Dear Commissioners and City of Sunnyvale Elected Officials,

Please forgive my lack of sophistication in this matter. I can only speak from the heart as a resident of "Birdland" since 1982.

I have serious concerns regarding increased traffic in our neighborhood.

I want to share my perspective as a resident of Silicon Valley since birth and a homeowner on Thunderbird Avenue for 34 years.
I believe the cities that surround Birdland, i.e. Santa Clara and Cupertino have negatively impacted the quality of life here by building the Kaiser Homestead Campus (I am a member), Apple II Campus (I am a user) and the future mixed use complex at Kohls. It is becoming more and more difficult to navigate the roads in our sector of the city of Sunnyvale.
I am not a resident of the City of Cupertino or Santa Clara, but I am a resident of the City of Sunnyvale and I will feel betrayed by my Elected Officials and Planning Commissioners should they choose to approve the sale of Raynor Community Center to Stratford Schools at this time. Perhaps I am a moderate in that I would prefer the City of Sunnyvale wait until the impact of the Apple II traffic on our neighborhood is evaluated before making a decision on the sale of this property. I also do not support giving away our much needed "Birdland" park area to a private school (my kids went to private schools). Our neighborhood needs and uses this park!

Respectfully,

Kathie Dunnam

From: Pavan
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 1:04 PM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Subject: Startford School at Partridge Ave

Please do not approve the school on this site.

I'm a resident of Birdland for the past 16 years and with 2 kids(one just moved to high school and one moving into peterson next school year)

We are very active users of the Raynor park facilities and this new school will deprive our kids and future generations of the park use.

Also, as it is the traffic thru the internal roads has increased a lot and it is getting dangerous to cross the roads due to impatient drivers.

Please dont let some major incident happen as the new school will add more traffic to the neighborhood.

--
Thanks
Pavan

From: lmgentry
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 11:16 AM
To: PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Cc: lmgentry
Subject: Please consider building Stratford School at Raynor Park

Dear Sunnyvale Building Planning Committee: I have been a resident at Sunnyvale for over 15 years now. I reside very close to Raynor Park where you are thinking of building the Stratford Middle School. My main reason for being against the building of this school is the hazard of the roads that already exists. If we were to add another building that will introduce 300 plus more children that are traveling into this neighborhood with an already congested road plus the new Apple campus being built. Our neighborhood will be even more dangerous. I have 2 children, one that is a middle schooler that has to travel down the road on Quail to get to Peterson Middle School. I cannot count the countless times that she has almost been hit. Just yesterday, a weekend, I was at a stop down Dunford trying to make a left turn down Quail to go home. A BMW is speeding down Dunford not wanting to stop for a father with 2 small children on a tricycle. I had to angle my car to force the car to stop so that the family can cross. The man driving the BMW cursed at me and started to yell. This experience did not surprise me in the least bit, why? Because it happens DAILY. Not just weekends, but during the week. If we allow more congestion on the roads, we are jeopardizing the safety of the children that already resides here. How could we let this happen? I plead with you to reconsider building another building that allows for more traffic congestion.

Sincerely,

Linda Gentry
1029 Inverness Way
Sunnyvale CA 94087

From: Tappan Merrick
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2016 12:16 PM
To: PlanningCommission AP
Cc: yahoogroups; yahoogroups; Denise DeLange; yahoogroups; City Sunnyvale
Subject: Raynor Field usage by Little league

Dear Planning Commission,

Listed below is the entirety of the FEIR response regarding my inquiry as to field availability for Sunnyvale Metro Little League on, in particular, Wednesdays and Thursdays at Raynor Field. The only thing that Stratford School has allowed for is actual game playing times as published in Metro's annual Booster Books, not field usage times. These booster books are used to let parents and umpires know when to be at the fields on game days. Anyone who has children who have played in Little League already knows that teams are asked to be on the field at least one half hour in advance to warm their teams up on the actual diamonds (usually 15 minutes for each team). Many coaches ask their teams to show up a full hour in advance. Coaches are responsible for preparing the fields in advance (placing bases out, dragging the fields and chalking the base lines). This effort takes about 30 to 45 minutes, depending on the amount of assistance available. I know this because I was a Little League coach for 14 years.

If the City fails to protect this preparation and warm up time, Little League games will only last from 30 to 60 minutes until well into May when the sun stays up later. 30 to 60 minute games will result in all games being declared incomplete as teams will be unable to complete at least four innings, the minimum required length for a complete game to be recorded. Full games are usually planned for six innings.

Please require that Stratford release Raynor Field for community use no later than 4:30 PM.

The importance of Raynor to Metro Little League's financial survival is critical as the major league fund raisers have always been the snack shacks located at their fields. Now that Metro doesn't have a softball program, it is limited to Raynor's and Ponderosa Field's snack shacks. No other Metro fields have usable snack shacks, the proper field sizes, grass infields and adequate parking all together.

Please support Sunnyvale's (and your) children by requiring Stratford to relinquish their field use request by 4:30 PM Monday through Thursday from February 1 through June 30 of each year.

Sincerely,

Tappan G. Merrick
owner of 1091 Firth Court
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

Response to Comment K-17

The commenter states that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th paragraphs on page 3.12-3, which refers to sports field use by the Sunnyvale Metro Little League and American Youth Soccer Organization, are in error regarding time of use and that by March 1, teams start practice and will need the baseball diamond. The commenter continues and identifies the time frame that the fields are needed by the Little League prior to games. The commenter states that Stratford must release the baseball diamonds by 4:30 to allow for game preparation. Finally, the commenter states that the Draft EIR fails to address Field 3, used as a T-ball field, which is just east of the south parking lot and asks what plans are being made to replace this field.

The time of use for baseball games for the Little League were established using the game times listed on the Little League website. As stated in Section 3.12 Recreation under Impact 3.12-1, Stratford School would have priority use of a portion of Raynor Park on school days for Area 1 (baseball diamond) from 9:00 AM to 3:00 PM. Area 2 (proposed basketball court) priority hours would be from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM on regular school days. The Stratford School's after-hours uses are from 4:00 PM to 5:30 PM on Wednesdays and Thursdays, and 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM on Fridays during the months of February through May, and 4:00 PM to 5:00 PM on Thursdays and 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM on Fridays during the months of September through November.

After-school priority use hours by Stratford have been limited to avoid conflicts with existing user groups as much as possible. Schedule coordination with current athletic users and Stratford would lessen the displacement of sports teams, and would not cause increased usage of regional or other facilities that would lead to substantial degradation of those facilities.

The Draft EIR looks at impacts of the whole park, which would include Field 3, as defined by the commenter. Although some changes would take place to Field 3, as described in Section 2.0 Project Description of the Draft EIR, these changes would not require the replacement of Field 3. Comment noted and no changes necessary.

CITY OF SUNNYVALE
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
MEMORANDUM

January 22, 2016

To: Planning Commission

From: Department of Public Works

Subject: FINAL Response to County Comments on Stratford School EIR

The Final Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) for the Stratford School at Partridge Avenue (Project), which was included as Appendix I to the Project's Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR), analyzed 37 intersections to identify potentially significant environmental effects that would result due to the construction or operation of the Project. Of the 37 intersections, 17 are considered “neighborhood intersections” and 20 are ”regional intersections.” Of the twenty regional study intersections, four intersections are designated "CMP Intersections": 1. El Camino Real/Wolfe Road; 9. El Camino Real/Southbound Lawrence Expressway; 10. El Camino Real/Northbound Lawrence Expressway; and 16. Lawrence Expressway/Homestead Road.

Consistent with City of Sunnyvale policy and current practice, the TIA was prepared pursuant to the October 2014 Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines for the development of Traffic Impact Reports (TIA Guidelines). As required by the TIA Guidelines, the Lead Agency collects appropriate data and uses engineering methods to best reflect existing conditions and signal function in the preparation of the TIA. As explained in Section 1.5.1 of the TIA, the regional study intersections were analyzed using the appropriate jurisdiction's operations standards, including published CMP intersection information applied to CMP intersections.

The Notice of Preparation for the Project's EIR was published on April 20, 2015, and the Draft EIR was released on September 28, 2015. The TIA was also finalized in September of 2015 and released as part of the Draft EIR. At the time, the most recent VTA-published information for the CMP intersections was from 2012. In October of 2015, subsequent to the preparation of the TIA and the release of the Draft EIR, the VTA made CMP intersection information from 2014 available. During the comment period on the Draft EIR, the County requested that the TIA incorporate the 2014 CMP intersection traffic signal timing information.

As explained in Section 2.0 of the Final EIR, Response to Comment CSC-1, although the 2014 CMP intersection traffic signal timing information was not available until six months after the Notice of Preparation, and the County had not previously requested that the City consider such information during the EIR's scoping process, the City conducted a supplemental traffic analysis in response to the County's request and to provide additional information about the Project's potential effects on the environment. Specifically, 2014 CMP intersection information was substituted for the 2012 information for all CMP intersections in the TIA. Tables CSC-1A, CSC-1B, and CSC-1C in the Final EIR include the results of this supplemental analysis, which is being provided for informational purposes to the public and decision makers. As demonstrated in the Final EIR, accounting for 2014 CMP intersection information does not change any of the conclusions in the TIA or the Draft EIR: the intersection of Lawrence Expressway/Benton Street would be significantly and unavoidably impacted during the morning peak hour under cumulative plus Project conditions.

The County's comment on the Draft EIR also requested that the City apply County engineering assumptions related to signal timing to certain non-CMP expressway intersections in Sunnyvale. The City's methodology is to obtain data and develop signal timings and other appropriate factors for non-CMP intersections within Sunnyvale that maintains consistency with the VTA-published CMP data used for the CMP intersections in accordance with the TIA Guidelines. The City's process for analyzing non-CMP expressway intersections within Sunnyvale is to use the published CMP intersection information, and extrapolate from that to reflect conditions on non-CMP expressway intersections. City staff and consultants consistently use this methodology to prepare TIAs and EIRs in the City, and in-house and contract traffic engineers are satisfied that it provides consistent information and results. If the City were to apply the County request for modified signal timing assumptions on Lawrence Expressway, the analysis would be inconsistent with the VTA's published 2014 CMP intersection information. Despite the County's expressed preference, changing analysis methodologies is a process that must be analyzed and considered very carefully, and the City is not required to conduct this analysis at this time.

Although not required, the City conducted a second supplemental traffic analysis that substituted the County's preferred methodology for traffic signal timings for non-CMP and CMP intersections along Lawrence Expressway to satisfy the County's request. This information is being provided for informational purposes to the public and decision makers. Applying the County's requested methodology to the Lawrence Expressway intersections does not change any of the conclusions in the TIA or the Draft EIR. The intersection of Lawrence Expressway/Benton

Street would be significantly and unavoidably impacted during the afternoon peak hour as well as the morning peak hour under cumulative plus Project conditions. As shown by the second supplemental analysis, no additional intersections would be significantly impacted by the Project using the alternative methodology requested by the County. As discussed in Section 3.14 of the Draft EIR, additional through capacity on Lawrence Expressway is needed to improve operations at this location, however, there are no near-term plans to widen Lawrence Expressway. Furthermore, although the addition of a second eastbound left-turn lane from Benton Street onto northbound Lawrence Expressway would improve intersection operations, this movement is projected to only have 84 vehicles during afternoon peak hour conditions, which is far below the threshold for double left-turn lanes of 300 vehicles. As disclosed in the EIR, because of existing traffic volumes on Lawrence Expressway, and the project's additional traffic that does not meet the conditions for the addition of a second left turn lane, mitigation measures for this impact would not be feasible. Therefore the City would be required to adopt a statement of overriding considerations for the impact to the Lawrence Expressway/Benton Street intersection under either scenario. Accordingly, the use of the County's requested methodology would not change the impact conclusions in the TIA or EIR.

TABLE CSC-1A
INTERSECTION LEVELS OF SERVICE COMPARISION
FOR EXISTING, BACKGROUND AND CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS
(BASELINE SCENARIO)

Intersection		Peak Hour[2]	Existing Conditions			Existing plus Project Conditions		
			Delay[3]	LOS[4]	Delay[3]	LOS[4]	Δ in Crit. V/C[5]	Δ in Crit. Delay[6]
11	Lawrence Expressway/ Benton Street*	AM PM	50.3 39.7	D D	52.0 40.3	D D	0.023 0.015	0.6 0.6
16	Lawrence Expressway/ Homestead Road* (CMP)	AM PM	56.5 71.9	E E	56.8 72.2	E E	0.006 0.004	0.4 0.4
17	Lawrence Expressway/ Lochinvar Avenue*	AM PM	42.5 30.9	D C	42.8 31.1	D C	0.012 0.007	0.8 0.3
Intersection		**Peak Hour[2]**	**Background Conditions**			**Background plus Project Conditions**		
			Delay[3]	**LOS[4]**	**Delay[3]**	**LOS[4]**	**Δ in Crit. V/C[5]**	**Δ in Crit. Delay[6]**
11	Lawrence Expressway/ Benton Street*	AM PM	65.7 42.1	E D	66.9 42.6	E D	0.021 0.015	0.2 0.7
16	Lawrence Expressway/ Homestead Road* (CMP)	AM PM	71.8 74.7	E E	72.5 75.0	E E	0.006 0.004	1.1 0.4
17	Lawrence Expressway/ Lochinvar Avenue*	AM PM	52.3 34.6	D C	52.7 34.9	D C	0.012 0.007	0.8 0.4
Intersection		**Peak Hour[2]**	**Cumulative Conditions**			**Cumulative plus Project Conditions**		
			Delay[3]	**LOS[4]**	**Delay[3]**	**LOS[4]**	**Δ in Crit. V/C[5]**	**Δ in Crit. Delay[6]**
11	Lawrence Expressway/ Benton Street*	AM PM	**104.4** **104.5**	**F** **F**	**105.3** **104.1**	**F** **F**	**0.022** **0.015**	**-0.3** **-0.4**
16	Lawrence Expressway/ Homestead Road* (CMP)	AM PM	**105.0** **111.7**	**F** **F**	**105.8** **112.3**	**F** **F**	**0.005** **0.005**	**1.1** **1.1**
17	Lawrence Expressway/ Lochinvar Avenue*	AM PM	84.2 61.6	**F** E	**84.6** 62.0	**F** E	**0.008** 0.007	**0.6** 0.6

Notes:

* Regionally significant intersection

1. Signal = Signalized Intersection; SSSC = Side-Street Stop Controlled Intersection.
2. AM = morning peak hour (between 7:00 and 9:00 AM), PM = evening peak hour (between 4:00 and 6:00 PM).
3. Whole intersection weighted average control delay expressed in seconds per vehicle for signalized intersections.
4. LOS = Level of Service calculations conducted using the TRAFFIX level of service analysis software package, which applies the methodology described in the *2000 HCM*.
5. Change in critical volume-to-capacity ratio (V/C) between Cumulative and Cumulative Project Conditions.
6. Change in critical movement delay between Cumulative and Cumulative Project Conditions.

* Regionally significant intersection with LOS E threshold

Source: Fehr & Peers, January 2016.

Momoko Ishijima <mishijima@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

City of Sunnyvale - Public Notice for 1500 Partridge Avenue

Bodduna, Aruna <Aruna.Bodduna@rda.sccgov.org> Tue, Jan 19, 2016 at 1:46 PM
To: Momoko Ishijima <mishijima@sunnyvale.ca.gov>, Carol Shariat <cshariat@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

Hi Carol & Momoko,

County traffic staff says the FEIR still did not use the correct signal timing. I am attaching the mark-up for your use. Do either of you have time to have a quick chat about this? Please call me at 408-573-2462

Thanks,

Aruna

From: Joey Mariano [mailto:jmariano@sunnyvale.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 9:28 PM
To: Planning AP <planning@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Cc: Momoko Ishijima <mishijima@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: City of Sunnyvale - Public Notice for 1500 Partridge Avenue

[Quoted text hidden]

SCCSVUFRPS52_RDA_MFD_EYCopyRM_1056_001.pdf
530K

TABLE CSC-1A
EXISTING AND EXISTING PLUS PROJECT INTERSECTION LEVELS OF SERVICE
(BASELINE SCENARIO)

	Intersection	Version	Peak Hour[2]	Existing Conditions		Existing plus Project Conditions				
				Delay[3]	LOS[4]	Delay[3]	LOS[4]	Δ in Crit. V/C[5]	Δ in Crit. Delay[6]	Signal Warrant Met?[7]
9/10	El Camino Real/ Lawrence Expressway* (CMP)	Original	AM	27.4	C	27.5	C	0.004	0.0	N/A
			PM	31.5	C	31.6	C	0.002	0.1	
		Revised	AM	27.7	C	27.8	C	0.004	0.0	N/A
			PM	31.5	C	31.6	C	0.002	0.1	
11	Lawrence Expressway/ Benton Street*	Original	AM	38.3	D+	42.0	D	0.025	4.5	N/A
			PM	30.4	C	32.1	C-	0.014	2.1	
		Revised	AM	41.3	D	45.3	D	0.012	1.0	N/A
			PM	34.7	C-	36.1	D+	0.010	1.1	
16	Lawrence Expressway/ Homestead Road* (CMP)	Original	AM	51.7	D-	52.9	D-	0.008	2.6	N/A
			PM	52.1	D-	52.6	D-	0.005	0.7	
		Revised	AM	46.7	D	47.3	D	0.008	1.1	N/A
			PM	50.0	D	50.3	D	0.005	0.4	
17	Lawrence Expressway/ Lochinvar Avenue*	Original	AM	18.6	B-	18.8	B-	0.002	0.1	N/A
			PM	18.8	B-	19.0	B-	0.004	0.2	
		Revised	AM	33.6	C-	33.7	C-	0.006	25.7	N/A
			PM	30.7	C	30.8	C	0.001	0.0	

Notes:
1. Signal = Signalized Intersection; SSSC = Side-Street Stop Controlled Intersection.
2. AM = morning peak hour (between 7:00 and 9:00 AM), PM = evening peak hour (between 4:00 and 6:00 PM).
3. Whole intersection weighted average control delay expressed in seconds per vehicle for signalized intersections and all-way stop controlled intersections. Total control delay for the worst movement is presented for side-street stop-controlled intersections.
4. LOS = Level of Service calculations conducted using the TRAFFIX level of service analysis software package, which applies the methodology described in the *2000 HCM*.
5. Change in critical volume-to-capacity ratio (V/C) between Existing and Project Conditions.
6. Change in critical movement delay between Existing and Project Conditions.
7. Signal warrant based on CA MUTCD Warrant 3, Peak Hour Volume (Urban Area).

N/A = Not Applicable
Source: Fehr & Peers, September 2015.

MITIG8 - Existing (AM) Tue Jan 19, 2016 13:00:24 Page 1-1

URS Model 2040 Expressway Planning Study
Lawrence Expressway - Existing Conditions
AM Peak Hour

Level Of Service Computation Report
2000 HCM Operations Method (Base Volume Alternative)

Intersection #5619 LAWRENCE EXPWY(NS)/BENTON ST(EW) [HOV:AM 6-9 PM 3-7 CRD]

Cycle (sec):	190	Critical Vol./Cap.(X):	0.927
Loss Time (sec):	12	Average Delay (sec/veh):	81.0
Optimal Cycle:	203	Level Of Service:	F

Approach:	North Bound			South Bound			East Bound			West Bound		
Movement:	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R
Control:	Protected			Protected			Protected			Protected		
Rights:		Ovl			Ovl			Ovl			Ovl	
Min. Green:	21	119	119	20	119	119	22	26	26	25	28	28
Y+R:	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Lanes:	1 0	3	0 1	1 0	3	0 1	1 0	1	1 0	1 0	1	1 0
Volume Module: >> Count Date: 19 Sep 2013 << 8 : 00 - 9 : 00												
Base Vol:	155	4218	18	70	1950	212	93	96	147	241	283	308
Growth Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Initial Bse:	155	4218	18	70	1950	212	93	96	147	241	283	308
User Adj:	1.00	0.87	1.00	1.00	0.87	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PHF Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PHF Volume:	155	3670	18	70	1697	212	93	96	147	241	283	308
Reduct Vol:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reduced Vol:	155	3670	18	70	1697	212	93	96	147	241	283	308
PCE Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
MLF Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FinalVolume:	155	3670	18	70	1697	212	93	96	147	241	283	308
Saturation Flow Module:												
Sat/Lane:	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Adjustment:	0.92	1.00	0.92	0.92	1.00	0.92	0.92	1.00	0.92	0.92	1.00	0.92
Lanes:	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Final Sat.:	1750	5700	1750	1750	5700	1750	1750	1900	1750	1750	1900	1750
Capacity Analysis Module:												
Vol/Sat:	0.09	0.64	0.01	0.04	0.30	0.12	0.05	0.05	0.08	0.14	0.15	0.18
Crit Moves:		****		****				****		****		
Green/Cycle:	0.10	0.59	0.71	0.10	0.58	0.69	0.11	0.13	0.23	0.13	0.15	0.24
Volume/Cap:	0.86	1.09	0.01	0.41	0.51	0.17	0.49	0.39	0.36	1.09	1.02	0.72
Delay/Veh:	121.2	105	14.3	87.5	15.4	3.2	87.2	81.7	65.8	176.8	130	73.5
User DelAdj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
AdjDel/Veh:	121.2	105	14.3	87.5	15.4	3.2	87.2	81.7	65.8	176.8	130	73.5
LOS by Move:	F	F	B	F	B	A	F	F	E	F	F	E
HCM2kAvgQ:	10	85	1	4	13	1	6	6	8	22	22	20

Note: Queue reported is the number of cars per lane.

MITIG8 - Existing (PM) Tue Jan 19, 2016 13:00:57 Page 1-1

URS Model 2040 Expressway Planning Study
Lawrence Expressway - Existing Conditions
PM Peak Hour

Level Of Service Computation Report
2000 HCM Operations Method (Base Volume Alternative)

Intersection #5619 LAWRENCE EXPWY(NS)/BENTON ST(EW) [HOV:AM 6-9 PM 3-7 CRD]

Cycle (sec):	186	Critical Vol./Cap.(X):	0.817
Loss Time (sec):	12	Average Delay (sec/veh):	55.5
Optimal Cycle:	198	Level Of Service:	E

Approach:	North Bound			South Bound			East Bound			West Bound		
Movement:	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R
Control:	Protected			Protected			Protected			Protected		
Rights:		Ovl			Ovl			Ovl			Ovl	
Min. Green:	24	96	96	37	109	109	16	29	29	24	37	37
Y+R:	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Lanes:	1 0	3 0	1	1 0	3 0	1	1 0	1 1	0	1 0	1 1	0
Volume Module: >> Count Date: 10 Sep 2013 << 5:15-6:15 PM												
Base Vol:	104	2115	266	234	4072	23	58	160	13	133	99	159
Growth Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Initial Bse:	104	2115	266	234	4072	23	58	160	13	133	99	159
User Adj:	1.00	0.77	1.00	1.00	0.82	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PHF Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PHF Volume:	104	1629	266	234	3339	23	58	160	13	133	99	159
Reduct Vol:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reduced Vol:	104	1629	266	234	3339	23	58	160	13	133	99	159
PCE Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
MLF Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FinalVolume:	104	1629	266	234	3339	23	58	160	13	133	99	159
Saturation Flow Module:												
Sat/Lane:	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Adjustment:	0.92	1.00	0.92	0.92	1.00	0.92	0.92	1.00	0.92	0.92	1.00	0.92
Lanes:	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	1.84	0.16	1.00	1.00	1.00
Final Sat.:	1750	5700	1750	1750	5700	1750	1750	3492	284	1750	1900	1750
Capacity Analysis Module:												
Vol/Sat:	0.06	0.29	0.15	0.13	0.59	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.05	0.08	0.05	0.09
Crit Moves:	****				****			****		****		
Green/Cycle:	0.12	0.48	0.61	0.19	0.55	0.63	0.08	0.15	0.27	0.12	0.19	0.37
Volume/Cap:	0.49	0.59	0.25	0.72	1.06	0.02	0.41	0.31	0.17	0.63	0.28	0.24
Delay/Veh:	83.1	29.4	10.3	82.9	66.7	6.7	88.4	75.9	55.7	88.6	69.2	42.8
User DelAdj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
AdjDel/Veh:	83.1	29.4	10.3	82.9	66.7	6.7	88.4	75.9	55.7	88.6	69.2	42.8
LOS by Move:	F	C	B	F	E	A	F	E	E	F	E	D
HCM2kAvgQ:	6	18	4	13	71	0	4	5	4	9	5	7

Note: Queue reported is the number of cars per lane.

MITIG8 - Existing (AM) Tue Jan 19, 2016 12:59:44 Page 1-1

URS Model 2040 Expressway Planning Study
Lawrence Expressway - Existing Conditions
AM Peak Hour

Level Of Service Computation Report
2000 HCM Operations Method (Base Volume Alternative)

Intersection #5625 LAWRENCE EXPWY(NS)/HOMESTEAD RD(EW) [HOV:AM 6-9 PM 3-7 CRD]

Cycle (sec):	190	Critical Vol./Cap.(X):	0.885
Loss Time (sec):	12	Average Delay (sec/veh):	84.5
Optimal Cycle:	202	Level Of Service:	F

Approach:	North Bound			South Bound			East Bound			West Bound		
Movement:	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R
Control:	Protected			Protected			Protected			Protected		
Rights:		Ovl			Ovl			Ovl			Ovl	
Min. Green:	22	107	107	17	102	102	23	43	43	23	43	43
Y+R:	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Lanes:	2 0	3 0	1	2 0	3 0	1	2 0	2 0	1	2 0	2 0	1
Volume Module: >> Count Date: 19 Sep 2013 << 8 : 00 - 9 : 00												
Base Vol:	304	3691	217	79	1522	439	306	343	121	483	680	283
Growth Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Initial Bse:	304	3691	217	79	1522	439	306	343	121	483	680	283
User Adj:	1.00	0.87	1.00	1.00	0.87	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PHF Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PHF Volume:	304	3211	217	79	1324	439	306	343	121	483	680	283
Reduct Vol:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reduced Vol:	304	3211	217	79	1324	439	306	343	121	483	680	283
PCE Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
MLF Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FinalVolume:	304	3211	217	79	1324	439	306	343	121	483	680	283
Saturation Flow Module:												
Sat/Lane:	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Adjustment:	0.83	1.00	0.92	0.83	1.00	0.92	0.83	1.00	0.92	0.83	1.00	0.92
Lanes:	2.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.00
Final Sat.:	3150	5700	1750	3150	5700	1750	3150	3800	1750	3150	3800	1750
Capacity Analysis Module:												
Vol/Sat:	0.10	0.56	0.12	0.03	0.23	0.25	0.10	0.09	0.07	0.15	0.18	0.16
Crit Moves:		****		****				****		****		
Green/Cycle:	0.11	0.53	0.64	0.08	0.50	0.62	0.11	0.21	0.32	0.11	0.21	0.30
Volume/Cap:	0.89	1.06	0.19	0.30	0.46	0.41	0.85	0.42	0.21	1.35	0.84	0.54
Delay/Veh:	111.8	97.2	21.9	87.5	24.6	10.6	105.5	69.1	50.1	263.0	84.1	60.7
User DelAdj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
AdjDel/Veh:	111.8	97.2	21.9	87.5	24.6	10.6	105.5	69.1	50.1	263.0	84.1	60.7
LOS by Move:	F	F	C	F	C	B	F	E	D	F	F	E
HCM2kAvgQ:	11	74	8	3	13	8	12	9	6	29	22	16

Note: Queue reported is the number of cars per lane.

MITIG8 - Existing (PM) Tue Jan 19, 2016 12:53:18 Page 1-1

Level Of Service Computation Report
2000 HCM Operations Method (Base Volume Alternative)

Intersection #5625 LAWRENCE EXPWY/HOMESTEAD RD

Cycle (sec):	190	Critical Vol./Cap.(X):	0.627
Loss Time (sec):	12	Average Delay (sec/veh):	71.1
Optimal Cycle:	202	Level Of Service:	E

Approach:	North Bound			South Bound			East Bound			West Bound		
Movement:	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R
Control:	Protected			Protected			Protected			Protected		
Rights:		Ovl			Ovl			Ovl			Ovl	
Min. Green:	17	95	95	27	105	105	27	38	38	30	41	41
Y+R:	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Lanes:	2 0	3 0	1	2 0	3 0	1	2 0	2 0	1	2 0	2 0	1
Volume Module: >> Count Date: 2 Oct 2014 << 5:00-6:00PM												
Base Vol:	134	1684	404	209	2977	307	360	677	300	353	470	138
Growth Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Initial Bse:	134	1684	404	209	2977	307	360	677	300	353	470	138
User Adj:	1.00	0.79	1.00	1.00	0.79	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PHF Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PHF Volume:	134	1330	404	209	2352	307	360	677	300	353	470	138
Reduct Vol:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reduced Vol:	134	1330	404	209	2352	307	360	677	300	353	470	138
PCE Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
MLF Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FinalVolume:	134	1330	404	209	2352	307	360	677	300	353	470	138
Saturation Flow Module:												
Sat/Lane:	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Adjustment:	0.83	1.00	0.92	0.83	1.00	0.92	0.83	1.00	0.92	0.83	1.00	0.92
Lanes:	2.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.00
Final Sat.:	3150	5700	1750	3150	5700	1750	3150	3800	1750	3150	3800	1750
Capacity Analysis Module:												
Vol/Sat:	0.04	0.23	0.23	0.07	0.41	0.18	0.11	0.18	0.17	0.11	0.12	0.08
Crit Moves:		****		****				****		****		
Green Time:	16.0	89.4	117.6	25.4	98.8	124.2	25.4	35.7	51.7	28.2	38.6	64.0
Volume/Cap:	0.51	0.50	0.37	0.50	0.79	0.27	0.86	0.95	0.63	0.75	0.61	0.23
Uniform Del:	88.5	37.0	19.1	81.2	39.6	14.7	85.6	81.0	64.6	82.5	73.2	48.3
IncremntDel:	1.6	0.1	0.2	0.9	1.5	0.1	15.6	21.6	2.7	6.9	1.4	0.2
InitQueuDel:	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Delay Adj:	1.06	1.59	2.08	1.10	1.72	2.26	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Delay/Veh:	95.5	59.0	39.9	90.5	69.8	33.3	101.2	103	67.3	89.3	74.6	48.5
User DelAdj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
AdjDel/Veh:	95.5	59.0	39.9	90.5	69.8	33.3	101.2	103	67.3	89.3	74.6	48.5
LOS by Move:	F	E+	D	F	E	C-	F	F	E	F	E	D
HCM2kAvgQ:	5	24	22	7	45	16	13	21	17	14	13	6

Note: Queue reported is the number of cars per lane.

MITIG8 - Existing (AM) Tue Jan 19, 2016 13:00:10 Page 1-1

URS Model 2040 Expressway Planning Study
Lawrence Expressway - Existing Conditions
AM Peak Hour

Level Of Service Computation Report
2000 HCM Operations Method (Base Volume Alternative)

Intersection #5624 LAWRENCE EXPWY(NS)/LOCHINVAR AVE(EW) [HOV:AM 6-9 PM 3-7 CRD]

Cycle (sec):	190	Critical Vol./Cap.(X):	0.551
Loss Time (sec):	12	Average Delay (sec/veh):	51.9
Optimal Cycle:	232	Level Of Service:	D

Approach:	North Bound			South Bound			East Bound			West Bound		
Movement:	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R
Control:	Protected			Protected			Split Phase			Split Phase		
Rights:		Ovl			Ovl			Include			Include	
Min. Green:	10	146	146	14	150	150	30	30	30	30	30	30
Y+R:	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Lanes:	1 0	3 0	1	1 0	3 0	1	1 0	0 1	0	0 0	1! 0	0
Volume Module: >> Count Date: 19 Sep 2013 << 8 : 00 - 9 : 00												
Base Vol:	39	3918	139	54	2071	24	57	53	38	84	21	132
Growth Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Initial Bse:	39	3918	139	54	2071	24	57	53	38	84	21	132
User Adj:	1.00	0.87	1.00	1.00	0.87	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PHF Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PHF Volume:	39	3409	139	54	1802	24	57	53	38	84	21	132
Reduct Vol:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reduced Vol:	39	3409	139	54	1802	24	57	53	38	84	21	132
PCE Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
MLF Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FinalVolume:	39	3409	139	54	1802	24	57	53	38	84	21	132
Saturation Flow Module:												
Sat/Lane:	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Adjustment:	0.92	1.00	0.92	0.92	1.00	0.92	0.92	1.00	0.92	0.92	1.00	0.92
Lanes:	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	0.56	0.44	0.36	0.08	0.56
Final Sat.:	1750	5700	1750	1750	5700	1750	1750	1068	766	625	156	982
Capacity Analysis Module:												
Vol/Sat:	0.02	0.60	0.08	0.03	0.32	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.05	0.13	0.13	0.13
Crit Moves:	****				****			****			****	
Green/Cycle:	0.04	0.63	0.76	0.06	0.65	0.78	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13
Volume/Cap:	0.52	0.95	0.10	0.51	0.49	0.02	0.25	0.38	0.38	1.04	1.04	1.04
Delay/Veh:	114.8	64.5	14.0	109.9	9.6	0.0	91.5	93.6	93.6	171.5	171	171.5
User DelAdj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
AdjDel/Veh:	114.8	64.5	14.0	109.9	9.6	0.0	91.5	93.6	93.6	171.5	171	171.5
LOS by Move:	F	E	B	F	A	A	F	F	F	F	F	F
HCM2kAvgQ:	3	73	5	4	10	0	4	6	6	23	23	23

Note: Queue reported is the number of cars per lane.

MITIG8 - Existing (PM) Tue Jan 19, 2016 13:00:43 Page 1-1

URS Model 2040 Expressway Planning Study
Lawrence Expressway - Existing Conditions
PM Peak Hour

Level Of Service Computation Report
2000 HCM Operations Method (Base Volume Alternative)

Intersection #5624 LAWRENCE EXPWY(NS)/LOCHINVAR AVE(EW) [HOV:AM 6-9 PM 3-7 CRD]

Cycle (sec):	190	Critical Vol./Cap.(X):	0.577
Loss Time (sec):	12	Average Delay (sec/veh):	38.9
Optimal Cycle:	232	Level Of Service:	D

Approach:	North Bound			South Bound			East Bound			West Bound		
Movement:	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R
Control:	Protected			Protected			Split Phase			Split Phase		
Rights:		Ovl			Ovl			Include			Include	
Min. Green:	11	136	136	24	149	149	30	30	30	30	30	30
Y+R:	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Lanes:	1 0	3	0 1	1 0	3	0 1	1 0	0	1 0	0 0	1!	0 0
Volume Module: >> Count Date: 10 Sep 2013 << 5:15-6:15 PM												
Base Vol:	14	2187	133	198	4272	16	36	54	15	39	31	111
Growth Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Initial Bse:	14	2187	133	198	4272	16	36	54	15	39	31	111
User Adj:	1.00	0.77	1.00	1.00	0.82	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PHF Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PHF Volume:	14	1684	133	198	3503	16	36	54	15	39	31	111
Reduct Vol:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reduced Vol:	14	1684	133	198	3503	16	36	54	15	39	31	111
PCE Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
MLF Adj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FinalVolume:	14	1684	133	198	3503	16	36	54	15	39	31	111
Saturation Flow Module:												
Sat/Lane:	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Adjustment:	0.92	1.00	0.92	0.92	1.00	0.92	0.92	1.00	0.92	0.92	1.00	0.92
Lanes:	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	0.77	0.23	0.22	0.16	0.62
Final Sat.:	1750	5700	1750	1750	5700	1750	1750	1460	405	382	304	1088
Capacity Analysis Module:												
Vol/Sat:	0.01	0.30	0.08	0.11	0.61	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.10	0.10	0.10
Crit Moves:		****		****				****			****	
Green/Cycle:	0.05	0.59	0.72	0.10	0.64	0.77	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13
Volume/Cap:	0.17	0.50	0.11	1.09	0.96	0.01	0.16	0.29	0.29	0.79	0.79	0.79
Delay/Veh:	107.1	38.7	17.4	198.1	25.2	0.0	90.1	92.0	92.0	114.5	115	114.5
User DelAdj:	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
AdjDel/Veh:	107.1	38.7	17.4	198.1	25.2	0.0	90.1	92.0	92.0	114.5	115	114.5
LOS by Move:	F	D	B	F	C	A	F	F	F	F	F	F
HCM2kAvgQ:	1	28	5	17	62	0	2	4	4	15	15	15

Note: Queue reported is the number of cars per lane.

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
FOR PRINTING 2-SIDED DOCUMENTS