## Memorandum

Date: December 7, 2010

To: Paul Hom, El Dorado County Department of Transportation<br>From: Dowling Associates, Inc.<br>Reference \#: P08044.009<br>Subject: 2030 No Build Intersection and Ramp Analysis

As a part of the Silva Valley Interchange Traffic Operations Study (Dowling Associates, August 2010), No-Build conditions (i.e., without Silva Valley Interchange) were analyzed under 2010 and 2020 future conditions only. To better gauge the long-term cumulative plus project traffic impacts and to support the environmental document for the proposed project, a 2030 No-Build traffic operations analysis for intersections; basic freeway segments and freeway-ramp merge/diverge was performed. This memorandum presents the results for the 2030 No-Build analysis.

## 1. 2030 NO-BUILD ANALYSIS

## Project Description

The Silva Valley Parkway to US-50 interchange project consists of a new interchange along a new alignment for Silva Valley Parkway to the east of the current Silva Valley Parkway/White Rock Road alignment. It includes constructing the over-crossing and ramps, and the signalization of the eastbound and westbound on-/off-ramps. The No-Build scenario for this analysis assumes the above mentioned improvements will not be constructed.

## 2030 No-Build Volumes

To forecast intersections turning movement volumes assuming no Silva Valley Interchange, an additional model run using the El Dorado County DOT travel model was performed. The following steps describe in general the methodology adopted to forecast future No-Build turning movement volumes.

1. The out-year forecast of the El Dorado County DOT travel model is 2025. In order to generate 2030 No-Build turning movement volumes, the AM/PM peak hour "raw" 2025 "with Silva Valley Interchange" volumes were compared to the like "raw" 2025 "without Silva Valley Interchange" model volumes.
2. The relative difference in "raw" ramp volumes at the El Dorado Hills Blvd and Bass Lake Road interchanges were computed to provide the trip diversion splits from the Silva Valley Interchange to the adjacent interchanges at Bass Lake and El Dorado Hills.
3. These were used as control points to help balance the study area network and estimate turning movement volumes at the study intersections as described in the subsequent steps.
4. Comparison of intersection turning movement volumes between the No-Build and Build scenario in 2020 was used to estimate delta (percentage difference) for study intersections.
5. This delta was applied to the 2030 build volumes to provide a starting point for developing 2030 No-Build volumes.
6. Assuming a closed system, turning movement volumes were adjusted manually with ramp volumes as control points. These adjustments were performed on a movement by movement basis to account for different distribution patterns between 2020 and 2030 as well as between the No-Build and Build scenarios. Engineering judgment was applied to reconcile differences between two analysis scenarios and achieve reasonable balancing between study intersections.

Figure 1 presents the 2030 No Project Volumes at all study intersections. Figure 2.provides freeway and ramp volumes for US-50.

## 2030 No-Build Operational Analysis

## Intersection Analysis

Based on El Dorado County requirements, the methodology utilized to evaluate the level of service for the signalized intersections is the Highway Capacity Manual, Special Report No. 209, Transportation Research Board, Third Edition, updated 2000. The average delay criteria were used to determine the LOS at signalized intersections.

El Dorado County's desired level of service (LOS) is LOS 'D', although the General Plan allows LOS E with the "community areas" like El Dorado Hills. The County's LOS threshold is based on the average of each all movements within the intersection. The Caltrans LOS standard assumed for this study is LOS D

Table 1 presents the intersection level of service summary for the 2030 No-Build scenario. As presented in the table, all study intersections except White Rock Road \& Jorger Cutoff Road are forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS E or worse.

Table 12030 No-Build - Intersection Level of Service Summary

| \# | Synch | Intersection | Control | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | V/c | Delay (secs) | LOS | v/c | Delay (secs) | LOS |
| 1 | 111 | Silva Valley Pkwy \& US-50 EB | Future* | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2 | 112 | Silva Valley Pkwy \& US-50 WB | Future* | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 113 | Silva Valley Pkwy \& Serrano Pkway | Signal | 1.13 | 88.4 | F | 0.89 | 50.7 | D |
| 4 | 114 | Silva Valley Pkwy \& Country Club | Future | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | 115 | White Rock Rd \& Jorger Cutoff | 2-Way Stop | 0.53 | 0.1 | A | 0.76 | 0.2 | D |
| 6 | 116 | Valley View \& White Rock Road | Signal | 1.04 | 73.7 | E | 1.43 | 189 | F |
| 7 | 117 | Latrobe Road \& White Rock Road | Signal | 1.35 | 127.1 | F | 1.47 | 156.7 | F |
| 8 | 118 | El Dorado Hills/Latrobe \& US-50 EB | Signal | 1.17 | 68.1 | E | 1.68 | 124.8 | F |
| 9 | 119 | El Dorado Hills \& US-50 WB | Signal | 1.3 | 130.2 | F | 1.52 | 191.4 | F |
| 10 | 120 | Bass Lake Rd \& US-50 EB | Signal | 1.24 | 103.9 | F | 1.3 | 151.8 | F |
| 11 | 121 | Bass Lake Rd \& US-50 WB | Signal | 1.33 | 93.9 | F | 1.4 | 136.6 | F |
| * Future intersections not assumed under no-build scenario. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highlighted cell indicate unacceptable LOS conditions. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 1: 2030 No-Build - Peak Hour Intersection Turning Movement Volumes
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Figure 2: 2030 No-Build US-50 Volumes


## 2020 Queue Storage Requirements

The required queue storage lengths for 2030 no-project conditions are presented in Table $\mathbf{2}$
Table 2 Required Left Turn Storage - 2030 No Build

| Left Turn Pocket Queue Storage Requirements |  |  |  | 2030 No Project |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Intersection | Control | Dir | Max AM/PM | Required |
|  |  |  |  | (vph) | Storage (ft) |
| 3 | Silva Valley \& Serrano | Signal | NB | 320 | 275 |
|  |  |  | SB | 175 | 150 |
|  |  |  | EB | 299 | 250 |
|  |  |  | WB | 225 | 200 |
| 4 | Silva Valley \& Cntry Clb | Signal | NB | N/A | N/A |
|  |  |  | SB | NA | NA |
|  |  |  | EB | N/A | N/A |
|  |  |  | WB | 340 | 300 |
| 5 | White Rock \& Jorger C | 2-Way Stop | NB | NA | NA |
|  |  |  | SB | NA | NA |
|  |  |  | EB | NA | NA |
|  |  |  | WB | NA | NA |
| 6 | Valley Vw \& White Rock | Signal | NB | 400 | 350 |
|  |  |  | SB | 112 | 100 |
|  |  |  | EB | 162 | 150 |
|  |  |  | WB | 256 | 225 |
| 7 | Latrobe \& White Rock | Signal | NB | 451 | 400 |
|  |  |  | SB | 508 | 425 |
|  |  |  | EB | 705 | 600 |
|  |  |  | WB | 290 | 250 |
| 8 | El Dorado \& US 50 EB | Signal | NB | NA | NA |
|  |  |  | SB | 1033 | 875 |
|  |  |  | EB | NA | NA |
|  |  |  | WB | NA | NA |
| 9 | El Dorado \& US 50 WB | Signal | NB | 1524 | 1275 |
|  |  |  | SB | 75 | 75 |
|  |  |  | EB | 1400 | 1175 |
|  |  |  | WB | 265 | 225 |
| 10 | Bass Lake \& US 50 EB | 2-Way Stop | NB | N/A | N/A |
|  |  |  | SB | 753 | 650 |
|  |  |  | EB | 757 | 650 |
|  |  |  | WB | N/A | N/A |
| 11 | Bass Lake \& US 50 WB | 2-Way Stop | NB | NA | NA |
|  |  |  | SB | N/A | N/A |
|  |  |  | EB | N/A | N/A |
|  |  |  | WB | 425 | 375 |

Available Storage is equal to the number of lanes in the left turn pocket multiplied by their average length in
feet.
Required storage is given in total numer of lanes and feet required. For multiple lane turn pockets, the length per lane is derived by dividing the total required storage by the number of lanes.

## Basic Freeway Segment LOS Analysis

The HCM/HCS analysis method was used to evaluate US-50 mainline (basic freeway segment) from Bass Lake Road to Empire Ranch Road. Basic freeway segment LOS criterion is based on vehicle density expressed in passenger cars per mile per lane ( $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ ) per hour. Consistent with the Silva Valley Interchange Traffic Operations Study (June, 2009), the US-50 freeway volumes reflect passenger car equivalents based on the Caltrans truck classification data. Ideal hourly lane capacities were based on the HCM 2000 maximum flow rates for basic freeway segments with design speeds of 70 mph . A peak hour factor of .92 was applied as part of the base year analysis.

The AM/PM US-50 mainline direction peak hour volumes presented in Figure 2 were input to Highway Capacity Manual operational spreadsheets to compute LOS. Table 3 presents the 2030 No Project HCM LOS results for basic freeway segments for the AM and PM peak hours respectively. Appendix A provides the detailed HCM LOS worksheets.

Results indicate that during the AM peak hour, US-50 mainline operations on the mixed flow lanes will operate at LOS D or better in the eastbound direction. In the westbound direction, US-50 mixed flow lanes will operate at LOS E for the mainline segment from Bass Lake Road to west of El Dorado Hills.

During the PM peak hour, eastbound US-50 mainline operations from east of Bass Lake Road to west of El Dorado Hills Blvd will operate at unacceptable LOS E or worse. In the westbound direction, mainline operation between Bass Lake Road and El Dorado Hills Blvd will operate at unacceptable LOS E.

Table 3: 2030 US-50 Basic Freeway Segment LOS

| US 50 | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Density ${ }^{1}$ pc/mi/ln | LOS ${ }^{2}$ | Density ${ }^{1}$ pc/mi/ln | $\operatorname{LOS}^{2}$ |
| 2030 No Project Scenario |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| West of El Dorado Hills | 19.75 | C | 36.17 | E |
| El Dorado Hills to Bass Lake | 28.81 | D | 164.49 | F |
| East of Bass Lake | 23.77 | C | 50.50 | F |
| Westbound |  |  |  |  |
| East of Bass Lake | 27.18 | D | 31.59 | D |
| Bass Lake to El Dorado Hills | 37.86 | E | 37.75 | E |
| West of El Dorado Hills | 35.77 | E | 34.56 | D |
| ${ }^{1}$ Density expressed in pc/mi/ln, passenger cars per mile per lane |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Level of service is based on density as described in B asic Freeway Segment, Chapter 23, HCM 2000 |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{3}$ Denotes a weave section. Level of Service is based on density as described in Freeway Weave, Chapter 24, HCM 2000 |  |  |  |  |

## Ramp Merge-Diverge Analysis

The HCM/HCS analysis method consistent with the methodology used in the Silva Valley Interchange PSR (Dowling, 2010) was used to evaluate US-50 ramp operations (merge-diverge) from Bass Lake Road to west of El Dorado Hills Blvd. Ramp merge-diverge LOS criteria are based on vehicle density expressed in passenger cars per mile per lane ( $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ ) per hour. Per HCM, average on- and off-ramp speeds of 30 mph and 35 mph respectively were assumed. A peak hour factor of .92 was applied for this analysis.

For merge diverge areas, HCM LOS criteria for LOS A through LOS E reflects vehicle densities operating at stable flow, with no breakdowns within the merge influence area (defined as $1,500 \mathrm{ft}$ downstream from ramp juncture) or diverge influence area ( $1,500 \mathrm{ft}$ upstream from ramp juncture). LOS F conditions reflect unstable flow - turbulence that causes freeway speeds to drop below 35 mph within the merge-diverge influence area.

Using the methodology described above, a merge-diverge analysis was performed for the No-Build scenario. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4 and Table 5.

In 2030 AM peak hour, all ramp merge-diverge influence areas are projected to operate at level of service "D" or better with the exception of two merge areas in the westbound direction, such as Bass Lake Road to US 50 WB On-ramp and El Dorado Hills Blvd to US 50 WB On-ramp. These two merge sections will operate with unstable flow conditions, i.e. LOS F. All diverge-influence area are forecast to operate at LOS "D" or better

In the PM peak hour, merge sections in both directions are characterized by unstable flow conditions with LOS F conditions. The eastbound and westbound US-50 diverge sections are anticipated to be operating with stable flows (LOS D or better) with the exception of Bass Lake Rd EB off-ramp, which will function at LOS F

Table 4: 2030 No-Build - Merge Analysis

|  |  |  |  | Freeway-Ramp Components and Characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Freeway Data |  |  | On-Ramp Data |  |  |  | Terrain | Volume Composition |  |  | Results of Merge Area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ID | Interchange | Direction (NB or SB) SB) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ramp } \\ & \text { Type } \\ & \text { (On or } \\ & \text { Off) } \end{aligned}$ | Number of <br> Lanes on Freeway (Each Direction), <br> N | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{S}_{\mathrm{FF}} \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { Volume } \\ (\mathrm{vph}) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l\|} \hline \text { Side of } \\ \text { Ramp } \\ \text { (Left or } \\ \text { Right) } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{S}_{\mathrm{FR}} \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Volume, } \\ & \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{R}}(\mathrm{vph}) \end{aligned}$ | Lanes on Ramp, $N$ | Type (Level, Rolling, Mountaino us, Grade, Composite) | Percent Trucks and Buses on Freeway (\%) | Percent <br> Trucks and Buses on Ramp (\%) | Percent Trucks and Buses on Adjacent Ramp (\%) | Max. Downstream Freeway Flow, v ( $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ ) | Max Desirable Flow Entering Influence Area, $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{R} 12}$ (pc/h) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Capacity } \\ \text { Check: } \\ \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{FO}}> \\ \text { Max. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Capacity } \\ \text { Check: } \\ V_{\text {R12 }>}> \\ \text { Max. } \end{gathered}$ | Compute $D_{R}$ (pc/mi/h) | Ms | Compute $S_{R}(m p h)$ | Los |
| AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NonMitigated Conditions | Latrobe to US 50 EB ON | EB | On | 3 | 70 | 2,769 | Right | 35 | 2005 | 1 | Rolling | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 7200 | 4600 | No | No | 26.7 | 0.4 | 58 | C |
|  | EDH to US 50 WB ON | WB | On | 3 | 70 | 3,528 | Right | 35 | 2979 | 1 | Rolling | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 7200 | 4600 | No | Yes | 43.9 | 1.3 | 35 | F |
|  | Bass Lake to US 50 EB ON | EB | On | 3 | 70 | 3,867 | Right | 35 | 708 | 1 | Rolling | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 7200 | 4600 | No | No | 27.5 | 0.4 | 59 | c |
|  | Bass Lake to US 50 WB ON | WB | On | 2 | 70 | 4,335 | Right | 35 | 1208 | 1 | Level | 6\% | 2\% | 6\% | 4800 | 4600 | Yes | Yes | 39.9 | 1.4 | 32 | F |
| PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NonMitigated Conditions | Latrobe to US 50 EB ON | EB | On | 3 | 70 | 4,965 | Right | 35 | 2619 | 1 | Rolling | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 7200 | 4600 | Yes | Yes | 43.7 | 2.3 | 6 | F |
|  | EDH to US 50 WB ON | WB | On | 3 | 70 | 3,797 | Right | 35 | 2541 | 1 | Rolling | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 7200 | 4600 | No | Yes | 41.8 | 1.0 | 42 | F |
|  | Bass Lake to US 50 EB ON | EB | On | 3 | 70 | 6,436 | Right | 35 | 774 | 1 | Rolling | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 7200 | 4600 | Yes | Yes | 40.9 | 0.9 | 46 | F |
|  | Bass Lake to US 50 WB ON | WB | On | 2 | 70 | 4,892 | Right | 35 | 571 | 1 | level | 6\% | 2\% | 6\% | 4800 | 4600 | Yes | Yes | 39.6 | 1.3 | 34 | F |
| Mitigated Conditions treats HOV, truck and auxiliary lanes as mixed flow lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 5: 2030 No-Build - Diverge Analysis

|  |  |  |  | Freeway-Ramp Components and Characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Freeway Data |  |  | On-Ramp Data |  |  |  | Terrain | Volume Composition |  |  |  | Results of Merge Area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ID | Interchange | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Direction } \\ \text { (NB or } \\ \text { SB) } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Ramp } \\ \text { Type (On } \\ \text { or Off) } \end{gathered}$ | Number of Lanes on Freeway (Each Direction), N | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{FF}} \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{gathered}$ | Volume | Side of Ramp (Left or Right) | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{S}_{\mathrm{FR}} \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Volume, } \\ & \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{R}} \text { (vph) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Lanes } \\ \text { on } \\ \text { Ramp, N } \end{gathered}$ | Type (Level, Rolling, Mountaino us, Grade, Composite) | Percent Trucks and Buses on Freeway (\%) | Percen Trucks and Buses on Ramp (\%) | Percen Trucks and Buses on Adjacent Ramp (\%) |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Max } \\ \text { Desirable } \\ \text { Flow } \\ \text { Entering } \\ \text { Influence } \\ \text { Area, } \mathrm{v}_{12} \\ \text { (pc/h) } \end{gathered}$ | Capacity <br> Check: <br> $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{F}}>$ <br> Max | Capacity Check: $\mathrm{V}_{12}>$ Max. | Capacity Check: $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{FO}}>$ Max. |  | $\mathrm{D}_{\text {s }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Compute } \\ & \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{R}}(\mathrm{mph}) \end{aligned}$ | Los |
| AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-MitigatedConditions | US 50 EB OFF to Latrobe/EDH | EB | Off | 4 | 70 | 4,987 | Right | ${ }^{35}$ | 2506 | 2 | Rolling | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 9600 | 4400 | No | No | No | 5.9 | 0.7 | 51.1 | A |
|  | US 50 WB OFF to EDH-Latrobe | wB | Off | 4 | 70 | 5,404 | Right | 35 | 2120 | 1 | Rolling | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 9600 | 4400 | No | No | No | 24.0 | 0.6 | 52.2 | c |
|  | US 50 EB Off to Bass Lake | EB | Off | 3 | 70 | 4,544 | Right | 35 | 765 | 1 | Rolling | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 7200 | 4400 | No | No | No | 28.1 | 0.5 | 55.9 | D |
|  | US 50 WB Off to Bass Lake | WB | Off | 3 | 70 | 5,089 | Right | 35 | 852 | 1 | level | 6\% | 2\% | 6\% | 7200 | 4400 | No | No | No | 20.4 | 0.5 | 55.8 | c |
| PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-MitigatedConditions | US 50 EB OFF to Latrobe/EDH | EB | Off | 4 | 70 | 8,267 | Right | 35 | 3731 | 2 | Rolling | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 9600 | 4400 | No | Yes | No | 22.4 | 0.8 | 47.8 | c |
|  | US 50 WB OFF to EDH-Latrobe | wB | Off | 4 | 70 | 5,398 | Right | 35 | 1809 | 1 | Rolling | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 9600 | 4400 | No | No | No | 22.4 | 0.6 | 53.0 | c |
|  | US 50 EB Off to Bass Lake | EB | Off | 3 | 70 | 7,283 | Right | 35 | 957 | 1 | Rolling | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 7200 | 4400 | Yes | Yes | No | 39.2 | 0.5 | 55.4 | F |
|  | US 50 WB Off to Bass Lake | WB | Off | 3 | 70 | 5,712 | Right | 35 | 926 | 1 | level | 6\% | 2\% | 6\% | 7200 | 4400 | No | No | No | 23.0 | 0.5 | 55.7 | c |
| Mitigated Conditions treats HOV, truck and auxiliary lanes as mixed flow lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

