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## Executive Summary

This report documents the 2017 monitoring results of Contra Costa County's multi-modal traffic service objectives (MTSOs). The MTSOs are applied to the roads of significance as designated by each Regional Transportation Planning Committee (RTPC) within the County. The MTSO monitoring efforts evaluate whether the transportation system achieves the MTSO standards adopted in the RTPC's 2014 Action Plan. The majority of MTSOs were monitored using the combination of (INRIX Analytics or Caltrans PeMS) commercial speed data, the manual turning movement counts, and in-field observations.

The 2017 MTSO monitoring results are summarized below:

- Intersection Level of Service: A total of 231 intersections were monitored in 2017. 6\% (15) locations operated at LOS lower than MTSO standards during the AM or PM peak period
- Roadway Segment Level of Service: A total of 20 roadway segments in the East County were analyzed. Ten segments (in the AM peak) and eleven segments (in the PM peak) didn't achieve the MTSO standards
- Average Speed: All 16 monitored roadway segment in the Central County met the MTSO standards
- Delay Index: A total of 34 roadway segment were monitored using delay index. $1 \%$ (5) segments didn't achieve the MTSO standards
- Duration of Congestion: One roadway segment was analyzed; it met the MTSO standard
- HOV Lane Utilization: A total of four roadway segments were monitored; all met the MTSO standards, except for the I-80 WB segment in the West County during the AM peak period
- Vehicle Ridership: A total of three roadway segments were monitored; none met the MTSO standards
- Vehicle Occupancy: A total of two roadway segments were monitored; neither met their MTSO standard
- Transit Ridership: BART loading factors were monitored in Lamorinda; all monitored loading factors met the MTSO standard
- Maximum Side Street Wait Time: three out of the total of 13 roadway segments exceeded MTSO standards

Several additional measures were monitored and reported this MTSO report at CCTA's request. Since no specific MTSO standards are defined in the Action Plans for these MTSOs, they are reported as informational only MTSOs:

- vehicle volumes,
- pedestrian or bicycle volumes,
- frequency of collision,
- bus ridership,
- pedestrian delay at the signalized intersection, and
- pavement condition.

As part of Contra Costa County's transportation planning and growth management responsibilities, Contra Costa County Transportation Authority (CCTA) regularly monitors the performance of the transportation system in Contra Costa. Two of the main components of this transportation performance monitoring effort are the Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP), and the monitoring of the Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs) as part of updates of the Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance.

The CCTA Action Plan designates and defines the County's transportation performance measures (for performance monitoring purposes) and the service objective for each of the designated intersections and roadway segments.

On a quadrennial basis (i.e., once every four years) through the CCTA's Multi-Modal Monitoring program, CCTA evaluates the performance of the County's transportation system and identifies those monitored locations which operated below the predetermined MTSO standards (which were last updated in 2014) and highlights long-term transportation utilization, growth and congestion trends.

CCTA has monitored the achievement of the level-of-service standards established in the County's Congestion Management Program since the first CMP in 1991; and CCTA has regularly maintained and updated this MTSO monitoring report since 2009.

This 2017 MTSO monitoring report is divided into four chapters:

- Chapter 1 - Introduction: provides an introduction and describes the background for the 2017 MTSO monitoring efforts
- Chapter 2 - Methodology: documents the performance evaluation (analytical) methodologies and describes the underlying data sources
- Chapter 3 - Results: presents the MTSO results—the study's findings, divided into three parts including intersection analysis, roadway segment analysis and other MTSO reporting elements (e.g., pedestrian, bicycle and transit)
- Chapter 4 - Summary of Findings: summarizes the monitoring results and highlights the locations that failed to meet the designated 2014 MTSO standards


### 1.1 Changes to Transportation System

Since the last MTSO monitoring in 2013, there were some significant changes made to the County's transportation system, including:

- State Route 4 / State Route 160 Connector Ramps
- State Route 4 East Widening: Loveridge Road to Somersville Road
- Interstate 680 Express Lane Conversion(s)
- Interstate 80 / San Pablo Dam Road Interchange Improvements


### 1.2 Additional MTSO Measures

The following MTSO measurements are new in this MTSO monitoring, which are subject to the MTSOs identified in each Action Plan.

- Duration of congestion
- Average trail user delay
- Frequency of collision
- Pavement condition

This chapter describes the methodology and underlying assumptions used to quantify the performance on the MTSO intersections, roadway segments and transportation elements. This chapter of the MTSO report is divided into three sections by the type of monitored locations (roadway intersections, roadway segments and other transportation elements or facilities).

### 2.1 Intersection Analysis

This section summarizes the two-step methodology of calculating the MTSO measures for the designated MTSO reported roadway intersections. The first step in the reporting process is to collect intersection turning movement count data, in accordance with CCTA's Technical Procedures. For reporting side street wait times, the number of signal cycles required for "back of queue" vehicles to clear the intersection was recorded during the AM and PM peak hours for 60 minutes (7:00 AM to 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM to 6:00 PM) at each intersection.

The second step in the evaluation process is to evaluate the performance of the roadway intersection and report the mandated MTSO measures - and compare the current performance of the roadway intersections to the performance thresholds in the CCTA Action Plan.

### 2.1.1 Data Collection

The project team selected the data collection days to ensure that all count data were collected on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays during AM and PM peak hours in April 2017. The days in the following categories were removed or excluded from the data collection period:

- Public Holidays and School Vacations (including Spring Breaks);
- Special Events (no special events were observed to impact traffic conditions during the 2017 monitoring period); and
- Road Closures and Construction Activities.


### 2.1.2 Intersection Level of Service, V/C and Average Stopped Delay

The intersection Level of Service (LOS) measures were estimated using the Transportation Research Board's Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2000 and HCM 2010 methodologies. The

MTSO analyses were performed using the Synchro intersection analysis software. The evaluation input data prepared by the project team included the turning movement volume (i.e., count) data, intersection geometry and roadway network data, and intersection signaltiming plans. The team consulted with CCTA staff to resolve conflicts when inconsistencies were identified between current timing plans and the Contra Costa member agency provided signal timing information. The Synchro intersection analysis software generated the vehicular delays (in seconds) and LOS for the AM and PM peak hours of operation.

The HCM's LOS thresholds were established as a function of the intersection's vehicular delay values, as shown in Table 1. A LOS value of " $A$ " describes a state of very low traffic volumes and no significant traffic delays. This means that most of vehicles arrive during the signal's green time. On the other hand, a LOS of "F" represents an intersection with high levels of congestion, over saturated traffic conditions, and long queues upstream of the intersection. For MTSO reporting, the average stopped delays were expressed in units of signal cycles - the number of signal cycles needed to clear the intersection. The MTSO reported delays (in units of signal cycles) was estimated by dividing the average stopped delay (in seconds) by the signal's cycle length (in seconds per cycle).

The previously described MTSO evaluation was performed for:

- 82 locations in the Tri Valley sub area (LOS);
- 56 locations in the West County (LOS);
- 41 locations in the East County (LOS);
- 50 locations in the Central County (LOS, V/C and Average Stopped Delay).

Table 1: HCM 2010 \& 2000 Level of Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections

| Level of Service | Average Control <br> Delay <br> (seconds/vehicle) | General Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| A | $0-10$ | Free Flow |
| B | $>10-20$ | Stable Flow (slight delays) |
| C | $>20-35$ | Stable flow (acceptable delays) |
| D | $>35-55$ | Approaching unstable flow (tolerable delay, occasionally wait <br> through more than one signal cycle before proceeding) |
| E | $>55-80$ | Unstable flow (intolerable delay) |
| F | $>80$ | Forced flow (congested and queues fail to clear) |

### 2.1.3 Maximum Side Street Wait Time

The Lamorinda Action Plan contains a MTSO for "Side Street Wait Time". The maximum side street wait time is reported directly from field observations at each of the designated roadway intersections. The locations where side street wait time analyses were performed are:

- Pleasant Hill Road - Maintain a maximum wait time for drivers on side streets wishing to access Pleasant Hill Road or Taylor Boulevard of one signal cycle or less; and
- Camino Pablo/ San Pablo Dam Road- The maximum wait time for drivers on side streets wishing to access San Pablo Dam Road or Camino Pablo should be no greater than one signal cycle.


### 2.2 Roadway Segment Analysis

This section summarizes the methods for data collection and data analyses for freeway and arterial roadway segment MTSO reporting. The vast majority of the roadway segment evaluations were performed using commercially available vehicular speed data (i.e., INRIX Analytics speed data). Roadway travel time data were collected via floating car runs (sometimes called probe vehicles or tach runs) for roadway segments where the commercial speed data were unavailable or deemed insufficient because of sample size limitations.

### 2.2.1 Speed, LOS, Delay Index

The average vehicular speeds, Level of Service (LOS), and delay index estimation use similar inputs and data processing and evaluation techniques. Peak hour average vehicular speeds is the most influential variable (input) in the roadway segment LOS estimation process. Further, the LOS estimation and reporting processes are consistent with previous reporting periods.

### 2.2.1.1 Data Collection

The roadway segment travel time data were collected (i.e., downloaded) from the INRIX Analytics website, or were obtained via floating car runs for segments where the INRIX data were not available.

## A) INRIX Data

The downloaded segment-based INRIX data were filtered to remove:

- Holidays during the monitoring period;
- Times outside the morning and afternoon peak periods (times outside the 6:00-10:00 A.M. and 3:00-7:00 P.M. windows);
- Days other than Tuesdays - Thursdays;
- Data points impacted by construction and special events, as applicable; and
- Data points with low INRIX quality scores (INRIX data quality scores of 10 and 20) ${ }^{1}$. Similar to CMP Monitoring, roadways undergoing short-term construction and/or with ongoing incidents were reviewed for anomalies in the reported vehicular speeds. To be conservative, the data collected on the MTSO segments which might have been impacted on those identified construction/incident days were excluded. This filtration process insures that the speeds data used in the MTSO monitoring is reflective of the traffic conditions experienced on an average workday by commuters. Additionally, data collected on days with significant weather events were removed. While there were some public holidays during the spring of 2017, none occurred on Tuesdays, Wednesdays or Thursdays. Local schools were also in session during the data collection period.


## B) Floating Car Data

The speed data for the Pleasant Hill Road MTSO segment between Geary Road and Taylor Boulevard was supplemented with floating car runs, due to the insufficient sample size from INRIX data. In accordance with Technical Procedures ${ }^{2}$, the floating data were collected on Tuesday, September 26, 2017.

### 2.2.1.2 Data Processing

The (MTSO) performance measure computation is a four-step process that entails: 1) spatial conflation; 2) spatial coverage check; 3) temporal aggregation; and 4) computation of required performance measure. The following sections provide additional detail. Note that the floating car data were collected on the designated MTSO segment during the peak periods. Therefore, the steps one through three do not apply to the floating car data.

[^0]
## 1) Spatial Conflation

Raw INRIX data provides travel time data along each Traffic Message Channels (TMC) in one-minute intervals. A TMC is a relatively short section of a roadway, generally in the range of a half-mile or so. The first step of analysis includes mapping the INRIX TMCs (and the raw speed data to the County's MTSO segments. The INRIX-TMC $\rightarrow$ CCTA-Segment mapping file completed for the County's CMP efforts was used as a starting point for MTSO Monitoring spatial conflation efforts. A thorough review of TMC links over each MTSO segment was performed. Figure 1 shows a schematic example of mapping or combining four TMC links to one MTSO reporting segment. Note that the end of the last TMC link does not align with the end of the MTSO Segment. In these instances, only the overlapping portion of the TMC is used in subsequent steps in the evaluation process.

Figure 1: End points of MTSO and TMC do not align

## 2) Coverage Check

Prior to the temporal aggregation, a reality check was performed to assure that small sample estimation errors did not negatively impact the reliability of the reported MTSOs. The project team performed a check to ensure that time-periods with excess TMCs removals were not included in the further analysis. To do this, the team removed all one-minute time periods where the total mapped TMC data available was less than $99 \%$. Using the $99 \%$ threshold, only a small minority of the time periods were flagged as having inadequate sample size. In these cases, the threshold was lowered to $70 \%$ to ensure adequate sample size. The number of oneminute data points for MTSO segment varies as a result of removing data points during this filtering process. The team selected a minimum sample size threshold for sample sizes of 100 observations (i.e., data points). Locally collected floating car surveys were performed where the MTSO segment failed the minimum sample size criteria. In the 2017 MTSO monitoring, this occurred at only one location - Pleasant Hill Road between Geary Road and Taylor Boulevard.

## 3) Temporal Aggregation

In this step, the one-minute intervals for each MTSO segment were aggregated to peak periods. The peak hour speeds were estimated in 15-minute moving average time-periods, e.g., from 6:00 to 7:00 A.M., then from 6:15 to 7:15 A.M., etc. Next, the lowest peak hour speed (during the peak period) was used as an input to the LOS and delay estimation process, which is described in the next section.

## 4) Compute Required Performance Measure (Speed, LOS, and Delay Index)

The procedure of calculating LOS and delay index is in conformance with CCTA's Technical Procedures.

- For floating car runs, the speeds were averaged to estimate the peak hour speed.
- The LOS assignment process is consistent with previous MTSO reporting efforts and consistent with legislative requirements from the California Government Code - as shown in Table 2 for freeway segments, and Table 3 for arterial street segments.

Table 2: Freeway Level of Service Standards (HCM 1985)

| Level of Service | Traffic Speed <br> (miles/hour) |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $\geq 60$ |
| B | $\geq 57$ |
| C | $\geq 54$ |
| D | $\geq 46$ |
| E | $\geq 30$ |
| F | $<30$ |

Table 3: Arterial Level of Service Standards (HCM 1985)

| Level of Service | Traffic Speed <br> (miles/hour) |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $\geq 55$ |
| B | $\geq 50$ |
| C | $\geq 45$ |
| D | $\geq 40$ |
| E | $<40$ |

- The Delay Index is an expression of the amount of time required to travel between two points during the peak hour as compared to a baseline. The numerator of the delay index formula, the free flow travel time is defined as "the time it takes to traverse a roadway segment at the posted speed limit". The denominator of the delay index formula measured or actual peak hour travel time experienced by motorists, which was the peak hour speed identified in the third step as mentioned above.


### 2.2.2 Duration of Congestion, HOV Lane Utilization

The Tri-valley Action Plan includes MTSOs for duration of congestion for the mixed-flow or general-purpose lanes on I- 680 south of SR-84. The duration of congestion captures or measures the number of congested hours per average workday.

MTSO standards for HOV lane utilization (in vehicles per hour) were established in the East County and West County.

### 2.2.2.1 Data Collection

Vehicular speed data were downloaded from the Caltrans PeMS website for the vehicle detector station (VDS) locations along the freeway's MTSO segments during non-holiday Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays for the months of February, March, and April of 2017.

### 2.2.2.2 Data Processing

Duration of congestion is defined as the number of congested hours during a normal or average non-holiday workday. The MTSO standard of no more than five (5.0) hours was established for I-680 south of SR-84 in the Tri-valley. First, the five-minute speeds were aggregated to each half-hour periods for each PeMS detector location. Second, a congested half-hour period was flagged if it performed at a speed below 35 miles per hour. Finally, the number of congested half-hour periods were summed and reported as total (daily) hours of congestion.

HOV lane usage is measured by the number of vehicles using the HOV lane at the highest HOV volume along the MTSO reporting section. The East County established MTSO standard for freeways with HOV lane utilization exceeding 600 vehicles per lane in the peak direction during the peak hour. The maximum volume was identified by aggregating five-minute traffic volumes (obtained from the Caltrans PeMS website) to peak hour volume.

### 2.2.3 Average Vehicle Ridership

The Tri-valley Action Plan contains a MTSO for I-580 and I-680 that specifies the ratio of total person commute trips to vehicles used for commuting on I-580 and I-680 increased by 10\% from 1.1 to 1.2.

### 2.2.3.1 Data Collection

Average vehicle ridership was estimated using data from the Bay Area Manage Lane Report published by Caltrans in 2013 and 2015.

### 2.2.4 Average Vehicle Occupancy

The MTSO standard for average vehicle occupancy is included in the Lamorinda Action Plan. It is a measure of the average number of passengers (including the driver) per vehicle on Pleasant Hill Road and Camino Pablo/ San Pablo Dam Road. The MTSO standards include:

- Increase the average vehicle occupancy on Pleasant Hill Road/Taylor Boulevard to at least 1.3 during the peak commute hours by 2018; and
- Increase the average vehicle occupancy on Camino Pablo/San Pablo Dam Road to at least 1.3 during the peak commute hours by 2018.


### 2.2.4.1 Data Collection

Vehicle occupancy data were collected from a stationary position along Pleasant Hill Road and Camino Pablo/ San Pablo Dam Road. Video data captured traffic flow during AM and PM peak periods on May $23^{\text {rd }}$ and May $25^{\text {th }}$, 2017. In accordance with the Technical Procedures, the data were collected on mid-week workdays (i.e., Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays) on non-holiday days while local area schools were in session.

### 2.2.4.2 Data Processing

The field data were reported in 15-minute intervals during AM and PM peak periods. The occupancy counts were then aggregated to estimate the average per peak period vehicle occupancy.

### 2.3 Transit Ridership

The usage of public transit was monitored in the East County and the Lamorinda. There is no specified goal in the East County Action Plan.

- Lamorinda
- Maintain an hourly average transit load factor (ratio of passengers to seats) of 1.5 or less when approaching Lafayette Station westbound and Orinda Station eastbound during each and every hour of service.
- East County
- A measure of the average number of riders boarding a fixed-route bus during an hour of scheduled bus service when persons may board with a fare or pass.
- A measure of the average number of weekday riders on all BART trains between the Bay Point and North Concord Stations.


### 2.3.1 Data Collection

The transit ridership data were obtained directly from Tri Delta Transit, LAVTA and BART.

### 2.3.2 Description and Method of Calculation

For East County, the average ridership per service hour was derived from the ridership for Tri Delta Transit fixed-route buses in a sample month (May 2017); BART passenger counts between the Bay Point and North Concord Stations (April 2017) were averaged to obtain the average number of weekday riders. For Lamorinda, BART ridership approaching the Lafayette Station westbound and Orinda Station eastbound was tallied and then averaged per service hour.

### 2.4 Additional Performance Measures

The Tri-valley and Lamorinda Action Plans now contains MTSOs not reported in the previous monitoring cycles.

- Pedestrian and Bicycle Volumes: The Tri-valley Action Plans includes a MTSO for pedestrian and bicycle volumes using Iron Horse Trail (directly measured from field observations).
- Crash frequency: The Tri-valley and Lamorinda Action Plan includes MTSOs for vehicle crash frequency and/or pedestrian or bicycle injury crash frequency. The collision data were obtained from the Caltrans Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) for the calendar year 2013-2016.
- Average Trail User Delay at Major Road Crossings: The Tri-valley Action Plans includes a MTSO for pedestrian delay at the signaled intersection. The delays (in units of seconds) were determined by the cycle length and the green times for vehicles when pedestrians are prohibited to enter crosswalk with an assumption of uniform pedestrian arrival rate.
- Pavement Condition: The Tri-valley Action Plans includes a MTSO for Iron Horse Trail that measures the relative comfort of the trail for its users using the pavement condition. This MTSO was reported using Pavement Condition Index.
- Frequency of Lane Closure: The Lamorinda Action Plan includes a MTSO for the frequency of lane closure.
- Inventory of pedestrian and bicycle facilities: The Lamorinda Action Plan includes a MTSO for the inventory of pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

This chapter summarizes the results from the 2017 MTSO monitoring at the designated MTSO roadway intersections and segments.

### 3.1 Intersection Analysis

This section on roadway intersection analysis is divided into two sub-sections:

1) Intersection Level of Service (LOS) and Volume-to-Capacity ratio (V/C), and
2) Average Stopped Delay and Maximum Side Street Wait Time.

The intersection analysis MTSO monitoring results are summarized in Table 4 for Tri-valley County, Table 5 for the East County, Table 6 for the West County and in Table 7 for the Central County sub-region.

### 3.1.1 Intersection LOS and V/C

The LOS and/or V/C ratios were analyzed for 231 MTSO locations: 82 locations in the Tri Valley sub area, 56 locations in the West County, 41 locations in the East County, and 50 locations in the Central County. Of these 231 locations, 13 locations currently exceed the standard threshold either in the AM and/or PM peak periods.

The following MTSO locations are reported for each sub-region:
Tri Valley: two (2) locations operate at a lower LOS:

- T9: San Ramon Valley Boulevard/Alcosta Boulevard; (HCM 2010 AM Peak); and
- T60: Stanley Boulevard/Murrieta Boulevard. (HCM 2000 AM and PM Peak)

West County: five (5) locations operate at a lower LOS:

- W1: San Pablo Avenue/John Muir Parkway; (HCM 2010 AM and PM Peak, HCM 2000 PM Peak)
- W5: San Pablo Avenue/Rumrill Boulevard; (HCM 2010 and 2000 PM Peak)
- W30: San Pablo Avenue/Richmond Parkway; (HCM 2010 and 2000 PM Peak)
- W49: Richmond Parkway/Westbound I-80 Ramps/Blume Drive; (HCM 2010 AM and PM Peak) and
- W55: Richmond Parkway/Pittsburgh Avenue. (HCM 2010 and 2000 PM Peak)

East County: four (4) locations operate at a lower LOS:

- E12: Main Street/Delta Road; (HCM 2010 and 2000 AM and PM Peak) Stop Control
- E23: Bailey Road/Leland Road; (HCM 2010 AM Peak)
- E24: Railroad Avenue/Leland Road; (HCM 2010 AM Peak) and
- E31: Lone Tree Way/West Tregallas Road. (HCM 2010 PM Peak)

Central County: all locations operate at an acceptable level for LOS and/or V/C standards.

- The V/C standard threshold of 1.5 for Central County intersections on Pacheco Blvd, Pleasant Hill Rd, Taylor Blvd, Treat Blvd, and Ygnacio Valley Blvd reflect the level of congestion on a given roadway.
- All intersections analyzed with V/C are at an acceptable level.

Table 4: 2017 MTSO Intersection Draft LOS Results - Tri Valley Sub Area
[ MTSO = LOS E $]$

| Intersection |  |  | HCM Method | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility | Cross Street |  | Delay (sec) | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ |
| T1 | Danville <br> Boulevard | Livorna Road | 2010 | 27.3 | C |  | 33.6 | C |  |
| T2 | Danville <br> Boulevard | Stone Valley <br> Road | 2010 | 43.0 | D |  | 36.3 | D |  |
| T3 | Hartz <br> Avenue | Diablo Road | 2010 | 25.3 | C |  | 24.6 | C |  |
| T4 | Hartz <br> Avenue- <br> San <br> Ramon <br> Valley <br> Boulevard | Railroad Avenue (South) | 2000 | 26.6 | C |  | 29.8 | C |  |
| T5 | San <br> Ramon <br> Valley <br> Boulevard | Sycamore Valley Road | 2000 | 33.7 | C |  | 41.1 | D |  |
| T6 | San <br> Ramon <br> Valley <br> Boulevard | Crow Canyon Road | 2010 | 35.2 | D |  | 46.9 | D |  |
| T7 | San <br> Ramon <br> Valley <br> Boulevard | Norris Canyon Road | 2020 | 51.1 | D |  | 36.2 | D |  |
| T8 | San <br> Ramon <br> Valley <br> Boulevard | Bollinger <br> Canyon Road | 2010 | 50.9 | D |  | 52.1 | D |  |
| T9 | San <br> Ramon <br> Valley <br> Boulevard | Alcosta <br> Boulevard | 2010 | 83.4 | F |  | 58.8 | E |  |
| T10 | Sycamore <br> Valley <br> Road | Northbound I-680 Ramp | 2000 | 16.7 | B | B | 21.5 | C | B |
| T11 | Sycamore <br> Valley <br> Road | Southbound I-680 Ramps | 2000 | 10.3 | B | B | 8.5 | A | B |


| Intersection |  |  | HCM Method | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility | Cross Street |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | Delay (sec) | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ |
| T12 | Sycamore <br> Valley <br> Road | Brookside Drive | 2010 | 15.9 | B | B | 11.5 | B | B |
| T13 | Sycamore <br> Valley <br> Road | Camino Tassajara | 2010 | 11.2 | B | C | 17.1 | B | B |
| T14 | Camino <br> Tassajara | Sherburne Hills Road | 2010 | 15.2 | B | B | 14.1 | B | C |
| T15 | Camino Tassajara | Crow Canyon <br> Road- <br> Blackhawk <br> Road | 2000 | 41.4 | D | D | 43.4 | D | D |
| T16 | Crow Canyon Road | Bollinger <br> Canyon Road | 2010 | 29.5 | C | C | 28.9 | C | D |
| T17 | Crow Canyon Road | Northbound I-680 Ramp | 2000 | 19.0 | B | B | 19.0 | B | C |
| T18 | Crow Canyon Road | Southbound I-680 Ramp | 2010 | 33.2 | C | B | 29.6 | C | C |
| T19 | Crow Canyon Road | Crow Canyon Place | 2010 | 26.4 | C | C | 46.2 | D | D |
| T20 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Crow } \\ & \text { Canyon } \\ & \text { Road } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Camino Ramon | 2010 | 57.6 | E | C | 53.0 | D | D |
| T21 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Crow } \\ & \text { Canyon } \end{aligned}$ Road | Alcosta <br> Boulevard | 2010 | 14.2 | B | B | 15.6 | B | C |
| T22 | Crow <br> Canyon <br> Road | Dougherty <br> Road | 2010 | 16.7 | B | B | 22.9 | C | C |
| T23 | Bollinger <br> Canyon <br> Road | Northbound I-680 Ramp | 2000 | 34.5 | C | B | 22.4 | C | C |
| T24 | Bollinger <br> Canyon <br> Road | Southbound I-680 Ramp | 2000 | 44.4 | D | C | 67.8 | E | D |
| T25 | Bollinger Canyon | Sunset DriveChevron | 2000 | 51.1 | D | D | 31.8 | C | D |


| Intersection |  |  | HCM Method | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility | Cross Street |  | Delay (sec) | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Road | Circle |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T26 | Bollinger Canyon Road | Camino Ramon | 2000 | 33.1 | C | F | 41.5 | D | F |
| T27 | Bollinger Canyon Road | Alcosta <br> Boulevard | 2010 | 50.4 | D | D | 56.0 | E | F |
| T28 | Alcosta Boulevard | Northbound I-680 Ramps | 2010 | 79.0 | E | C | 65.7 | E | D |
| T29 | San <br> Ramon <br> Valley <br> Boulevard | Southbound I-680 Ramps | 2000 | 29.3 | C |  | 45.1 | D |  |
| T30 | Alcosta Boulevard | Village Parkway | 2010 | 13.1 | B | B | 16.9 | B | B |
| T31 | Dougherty <br> Road | Westbound I-580 Ramps | 2010 | 16.3 | B |  | 17.0 | B |  |
| T32 | Dougherty <br> Road | Dublin <br> Boulevard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T33 | Dougherty <br> Road | Amador Valley Road | 2000 | 47.9 | D |  | 28.9 | C |  |
| T34 | Tassajara Road | Fallon Road | 2010 | 26.7 | C | C | 23.1 | C | D |
| T35 | Tassajara Road | Dublin Boulevard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T36 | Tassajara Road | Gleason Road | 2010 | 30.3 | C |  | 18.9 | B |  |
| T37 | Tassajara Road | Westbound I-580 Ramps |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T38 | Dublin <br> Boulevard | Amador Plaza | 2010 | 23.2 | C |  | 41.1 | D |  |
| T39 | Dublin Boulevard | Regional Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T40 | Dublin Boulevard | Hacienda Drive |  |  |  |  | 24.5 | C |  |
| T41 | Dublin Boulevard | Fallon Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T42 | Dublin Boulevard | San Ramon <br> Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T43 | Dublin | Viiage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  | HCM Method | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility | Cross Street |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Boulevard | Parkway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T44 | San <br> Ramon <br> Road | Amador <br> Valley Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T45 | Fallon Road | Gleason Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T46 | Fallon Road | Eastbound I-580 Ramps |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T47 | El Charro Road | Westbound I-580 Ramps |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T48 | Stanley Boulevard | Isabel Avenue | 2010 | 36.3 | D |  | 14.9 | B |  |
| T49 | Isabel <br> Avenue | Airway Boulevard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T50 | Isabel Avenue | Jack London Boulevard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T51 | Isabel Avenue | Vallecitos <br> Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T52 | Isabel <br> Avenue | Vineyard Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T53 | First Street | Eastbound I-580 Ramps | 2010 | 10.1 | B |  | 18.9 | B |  |
| T54 | First Street | Westbound I-580 Ramps | 2010 | 7.4 | A |  | 8.2 | A |  |
| T55 | North <br> Canyons <br> Parkway | Collier <br> Canyon Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T56 | North <br> Canyons <br> Parkway / <br> Portola <br> Avenue | Isabel Ave <br> Extension |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T57 | Holmes Street | Murrieta Blvd/4th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T58 | Holmes Street | Concannon Boulevard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T59 | Airway Boulevard | Eastbound I-580 Ramp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T60 | Stanley | Murrieta | 2000 | 125.5 | F |  | 140.4 | F |  |


| Intersection |  |  | HCM <br> Method | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility | Cross Street |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Delay } \\ & \text { (sec) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Boulevard | Boulevard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T61 | Hopyard Road | Owens Drive | 2000 | 37.2 | D |  | 68.5 | E |  |
| T62 | Hopyard <br> Road | Stoneridge Drive | 2010 | 37.4 | D |  | 39.9 | D |  |
| T63 | Hopyard Road | Eastbound I-580 Ramps | 2010 | 44.2 | D |  | 19.5 | B |  |
| T64 | Hopyard <br> Road | West Las Positas Boulevard | 2010 | 32.3 | C |  | 35.3 | D |  |
| T65 | Hopyard Road | Valley Avenue | 2000 | 23.8 | C |  | 33.5 | C |  |
| T66 | Santa Rita <br> Road | West Las <br> Positas <br> Boulevard | 2000 | 32.8 | C |  | 25.3 | C |  |
| T67 | Santa Rita Road | Valley Avenue | 2010 | 49.9 | D |  | 45.2 | D |  |
| T68 | Santa Rita Road | Eastbound I-580 Ramps | 2000 | 37.9 | D |  | 40.9 | D |  |
| T69 | Santa Rita <br> Road | Stoneridge Drive | 2010 | 60.6 | E |  | 75.8 | E |  |
| T70 | Stanley <br> Boulevard | Valley Avenue/Bern <br> al Avenue | 2000 | 48.4 | D |  | 36.7 | D |  |
| T71 | Stanley Boulevard | Main Street | 2000 | 20.7 | C |  | 18.9 | B |  |
| T72 | Stoneridge Drive | West Las <br> Positas <br> Boulevard | 2010 | 22.7 | C |  | 38.2 | D |  |
| T73 | Stoneridge Drive | Northbound I-680 Ramps | 2010 | 16.2 | B |  | 8.3 | A |  |
| T74 | Stoneridge Drive | Southbound I-680 Ramps | 2010 | 11.2 | B |  | 14.1 | B |  |
| T75 | Sunol <br> Boulevard | Bernal Avenue | 2010 | 43.9 | D |  | 34.4 | C |  |
| T76 | Sunol <br> Boulevard | Northbound I-680 Ramps | 2010 | 22.5 | C |  | 46.1 | E |  |
| T77 | Sunol Boulevard | Southbound I-680 Ramps | 2010 | 20.1 | C |  | 21.8 | C |  |
| T78 | West Las | Hacienda | 2000 | 22.8 | C |  | 21.1 | C |  |


| Intersection |  |  | HCM Method | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility | Cross Street |  | Delay (sec) | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | Delay (sec) | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Positas Boulevard | Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T79 | Bernal Avenue | Northbound I-680 Ramps | 2000 | 21.1 | C |  | 29.8 | C |  |
| T80 | Bernal Avenue | Southbound <br> I-680 Ramps | 2010 | 15.7 | B |  | 20.9 | C |  |
| T81 | Hacienda Drive | Eastbound I-580 Ramps | 2000 | 25.2 | C |  | 14.1 | B |  |
| T82 | Hacienda Drive | Westbound I-580 Ramps | 2010 | 10.3 | B |  | 8.8 | A |  |

Table 5: 2017 MTSO Intersection Draft LOS Results - West County Sub Area

| Intersection |  |  | MTSO | HCM Method | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility | Cross Street |  |  | Delay (sec) | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | Delay (sec) | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ |
| W1 | San Pablo Avenue | John Muir Parkway | E | 2010 | 185.8 | F | D | 239.0 | F | E |
| W2 | San Pablo Avenue | Pinole Valley Road | E | 2010 | 4.9 | A | B | 13.8 | B | B |
| W3 | San Pablo Avenue | Appian Way | E | 2010 | 21.6 | C | C | 39.6 | D | D |
| W4 | San Pablo Avenue | Hilltop Drive | E | 2010 | 42.5 | D | C | 57.7 | E | E |
| W5 | San Pablo <br> Avenue | Rumrill Boulevard | E | 2010 | 37.8 | D | C | 98.3 | F | D |
| W6 | San Pablo <br> Avenue | El Portal Drive | E | 2010 | 33.2 | C | C | 33.5 | C | C |
| W7 | San Pablo Avenue | Road 20 | E | 2000 | 42.2 | D | D | 47.4 | D | D |
| W8 | San Pablo <br> Avenue | San Pablo Dam Road | E | 2000 | 32.5 | C | C | 37.2 | D | D |
| W9 | San Pablo <br> Avenue | McBryde Avenue | E | 2000 | 24.0 | C | C | 27.4 | C | C |
| W10 | San Pablo Avenue | Westbound I-80 Ramps | E | 2000 | 38.4 | D | B | 22.9 | C | D |
| W11 | San Pablo Avenue | Eastbound I-80 Ramps / Roosevelt Avenue | E | 2000 | 16.8 | B | C | 30.7 | C | D |
| W12 | San Pablo Avenue | Barrett Avenue | E | 2010 | 33.8 | C | C | 34.2 | C | C |
| W13 | San Pablo Avenue | Cutting Boulevard | E | 2010 | 29.3 | C | C | 27.5 | C | C |
| W14 | San Pablo Avenue | Central Avenue | E | 2000 | 41.4 | D | C | 47.2 | D | C |
| W15 | San Pablo Dam Road | Westbound I-80 Ramps | E | 2000 | 24.2 | C | C | 35.9 | D | C |
| W16 | San Pablo Dam Road | Eastbound I-80 Ramps /Amador Street | E | 2000 | 51.4 | D | C | 49.7 | D | E |
| W17 | San Pablo Dam Road | El Portal Drive | E | 2000 | 45.2 | D | D | 32.0 | C | D |


| Intersection |  |  | MTSO | HCM Method | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility | Cross Street |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Delay } \\ & \text { (sec) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Delay } \\ & \text { (sec) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ |
| W18 | San Pablo Dam Road | Appian Way | E | 2010 | 62.4 | E | C | 50.4 | D | D |
| W19 | San Pablo Dam Road | Castro Ranch Road | E | 2010 | 25.2 | C | C | 27.5 | C | C |
| W20 | San Pablo Dam Road | Bear Creek <br> Road | E | 2000 | 44.1 | D |  | 63.6 | E |  |
| W26 | Cutting Boulevard | Carlson Boulevard | D | 2010 | 26.2 | C |  | 24.1 | C |  |
| W27 | San Pablo <br> Avenue <br> /Parker <br> Avenue | Willow Avenue | E | 2000 | 9.7 | A |  | 9.4 | A |  |
| W28 | San Pablo Avenue | Sycamore Avenue | E | 2000 | 10.8 | B | C | 13.3 | B | C |
| W29 | San Pablo Avenue | Tennant Avenue | E | 2000 | 13.7 | B | B | 74.3 | E | A |
| W30 | San Pablo <br> Avenue | Richmond Parkway | E | 2010 | 63.6 | E | C | 98.7 | F | C |
| W31 | San Pablo Avenue | Robert H Miller Drive | E | 2000 | 23.3 | C | B | 26.1 | C | B |
| W32 | San Pablo Avenue | Church Lane | E | 2010 | 32.4 | C | B | 35.9 | D | C |
| W33 | San Pablo <br> Avenue | Potrero <br> Avenue | E | 2010 | 27.8 | C | C | 27.5 | C | B |
| W34 | San Pablo <br> Avenue | Schmidt Lane | E | 2000 | 11.2 | B | B | 13.8 | B | B |
| W35 | San Pablo <br> Avenue | Carlson <br> Boulevard | E | 2010 | 57.4 | E | C | 45.9 | D | C |
| W36 | 23rd Street | Rheem Avenue | D | 2010 | 10.7 | B | C | 12.6 | B | C |
| W37 | 23rd Street | Barrett Avenue | D | 2010 | 15.7 | B | B | 19.2 | B | B |
| W38 | 23rd Street | Macdonald Avenue | D | 2010 | 9.7 | A | A | 12.4 | B | A |
| W39 | 23rd Street | Cutting Boulevard | D | 2010 | 34.4 | C | B | 31.9 | C | C |
| W40 | Appian Way | Tara Hills Drive-Canyon Drive | D | 2000 | 47.5 | D | C | 40.9 | D | C |
| W41 | Appian Way | Westbound I-80 Ramps | D | 2000 | 23.4 | C | D | 22.9 | C | D |


| Intersection |  |  | MTSO | HCM Method | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility | Cross Street |  |  | Delay (sec) | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | Delay (sec) | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ |
| W42 | Appian Way | Eastbound I-80 Ramps | D | 2000 | 8.6 | A | A | 11.3 | B | B |
| W43 | Appian Way | Fitzgerald Drive-Sarah Drive | D | 2000 | 23.8 | C | C | 34.3 | C | D |
| W44 | Carlson Boulevard | Bayview Avenue | D | 2000 | 38.2 | D | D | 25.3 | C | C |
| W45 | Carlson Boulevard | Central Avenue | D | 2010 | 21.6 | C | B | 20.5 | C | B |
| W46 | Central <br> Avenue | Pierce Street | D | 2010 | 10.5 | B | B | 12.6 | B | B |
| W47 | Central Avenue | Westbound I-80 Ramps | D | 2000 | 11.4 | B | B | 14.2 | B | C |
| W48 | Central Avenue | Eastbound I-80 Ramps | D | 2000 | 16.1 | B | B | 25.7 | C | C |
| W49 | Richmond Parkway | Westbound I-80 Ramps /Blume Drive | D | 2010 | 95.1 | F | B | 64.4 | E | B |
| W50 | Castro Street | Eastbound I-580 Ramps | D | 2000 | 14.9 | B |  | 21.2 | C |  |
| W51 | Castro Street | Westbound I-580 Ramps | D | 2000 | 25.5 | C |  | 35.9 | D |  |
| W52 | Castro Street | Hensley Street | D | 2010 | 27.4 | C |  | 48.9 | D |  |
| W53 | Castro Street | Mills Street | D | 2000 | 4.2 | A |  | 6.5 | A |  |
| W54 | Richmond Parkway | Gertrude Avenue | D | 2000 | 16.0 | B | C | 31.2 | C | D |
| W55 | Richmond Parkway | Pittsburgh Avenue | D | 2010 | 35.9 | D | F | 59.4 | E | F |
| W56 | Richmond Parkway | Parr Boulevard | D | 2010 | 42.4 | D | F | 40.6 | D | C |
| W57 | Richmond Parkway | Hensley Street | D | 2010 | 20.1 | C | C | 19.1 | B | C |
| W58 | Richmond Parkway | Barrett Avenue | D | 2010 | 17.1 | B | B | 18.5 | B | C |
| W59 | Richmond Parkway | McDonald | D | 2010 | 13.5 | B | C | 18.5 | B | C |
| W60 | Richmond Parkway | Eastbound I-580 Ramps | D | 2000 | 30.3 | C | C | 34.6 | C | B |
| W61 | Richmond | Westbound | D | 2000 | 21.0 | C | B | 29.7 | C | B |


| Intersection |  |  | MTSO | HCM <br> Method | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility | Cross Street |  |  | Delay <br> (sec) | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | Delay (sec) | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2013 \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Parkway | I-580 Ramps |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 6: 2017 MTSO Intersection Draft LOS Results - East County Sub Area

| Intersection |  |  | MTSO | HCM <br> Method | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility | Cross Street |  |  | Delay (sec) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| E1 | Railroad Avenue | Westbound SR-4 Ramps /California Avenue | E | 2010 | 27.4 | C |  | 16.1 | B |  |
| E2 | Railroad <br> Avenue | Eastbound SR-4 Ramps | E | 2000 | 29.7 | C |  | 39.8 | D |  |
| E3 | Railroad Avenue | Buchanan <br> Road | E | 2000 | 48.5 | D |  | 23.1 | C |  |
| E4 | Main Street | Neroly Road | E | 2000 | 23.3 | C | C | 26.8 | C | C |
| E5 | Main Street | Big Break Road | E | 2010 | 19.7 | B | C | 48.5 | D | D |
| E6 | Main Street | Oakley Road /Empire Road | E | 2010 | 13.7 | B | C | 18.3 | B | B |
| E7 | Main Street | Cypress Road | E | 2010 | 28.5 | C | C | 43.1 | D | C |
| E8 | Brentwood Boulevard | Balfour Road | E | 2010 | 47.8 | D | D | 51.3 | D | D |
| E10 | 18th Street- <br> Main Street | Southbound SR-160 Ramps | D | 2010 | 31.5 | C | B | 29.5 | C | B |
| E11 | Main Street | Northbound SR-160 Ramps | D | 2010 | 13.4 | B | B | 13.0 | B | B |
| E12 | Main Street | Delta Road | D | 2010 | 63.6 | F |  | 51.3 | F |  |
| E13 | Brentwood Boulevard | Lone Tree Way | D | 2010 | 27.8 | C | C | 33.6 | C | C |
| E14 | Brentwood Boulevard | Sand Creek <br> Road | D | 2010 | 25.0 | C | C | 28.5 | C | C |
| E15 | Brentwood Boulevard | Central BlvdSycamore Road | D | 2010 | 18.3 | B | B | 17.2 | B | B |
| E16 | Brentwood <br> Boulevard | Oak Street | D | 2000 | 25.7 | C | C | 25.4 | C | C |
| E17 | Walnut Boulevard | Oak Street | D | 2000 | 20.5 | C | B | 22.6 | C | B |
| E18 | Walnut Boulevard | Balfour Road | D | 2010 | 33.7 | C | D | 34.4 | C | C |


| Intersection |  |  | MTSO | HCM <br> Method | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility | Cross Street |  |  | Delay (sec) | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ (\mathrm{sec}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| E19 | Walnut Boulevard | Marsh Creek <br> Road | D | 2010 | 25.2 | C | C | 36.2 | D | D |
| E20 | Bailey Road | Willow Pass <br> Road | E | 2010 | 29.9 | C | C | 32.7 | C | C |
| E21 | Bailey Road | Westbound SR-4 Ramps | E | 2010 | 27.1 | C | C | 17.6 | B | B |
| E22 | Bailey Road | Eastbound SR-4 Ramps | E | 2000 | 21.3 | C | C | 28.7 | C | C |
| E23 | Bailey Road | Leland Road | E | 2010 | 92.1 | F | D | 53.0 | D | C |
| E24 | Railroad <br> Avenue | Leland Road | D | 2010 | 79.0 | E | E | 47.0 | D | F |
| E25 | Somersville Road | Westbound SR-4 Ramps | D | 2000 | 32.4 | C | C | 24.7 | C | C |
| E26 | Somersville Road | Eastbound SR-4 Ramps | D | 2000 | 20.1 | C | B | 33.9 | C | B |
| E27 | Somersville <br> Road | Delta Fair <br> Boulevard | D | 2000 | 34.3 | C | C | 40.5 | D | D |
| E28 | Somersville <br> Road | Buchanan <br> Road | D | 2010 | 28.9 | C | D | 27.4 | C | D |
| E29 | Lone Tree Way-A Street | Westbound SR-4 Ramps | D | 2000 | 29.1 | C | C | 21.4 | C | C |
| E30 | Lone Tree Way | Eastbound SR-4 Ramps | D | 2010 | 24.7 | C | C | 28.2 | C | C |
| E31 | Lone Tree Way | West Tregallas Road | D | 2010 | 54.1 | D | B | 137.2 | F | C |
| E32 | Lone Tree Way | James Donlon Boulevard | D | 2010 | 27.9 | C | D | 28.0 | C | D |
| E33 | Lone Tree Way | Deer Valley <br> Road | D | 2010 | 28.6 | C | D | 28.6 | C | D |
| E34 | Lone Tree Way | Hillcrest Avenue | D | 2010 | 27.5 | C | C | 29.8 | C | C |
| E35 | Lone Tree Way | Empire <br> Avenue | D | 2010 | 33.1 | C | D | 34.3 | C | D |
| E36 | Lone Tree Way | Fairview Avenue | D | 2000 | 45.0 | D | D | 49.8 | D | D |
| E37 | Lone Tree Way | O'Hara <br> Avenue | D | 2010 | 43.1 | D | D | 42.6 | D | D |


| Intersection |  |  | MTSO | HCM Method | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility | Cross Street |  |  | Delay (sec) | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | Delay (sec) | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ |
| E38 | Hillcrest Avenue | Westbound SR-4 Ramps | D | 2010 | 4.2 | A | C | 4.5 | A | C |
| E39 | Hillcrest Avenue | Eastbound SR-4 Ramps | D | 2000 | 23.6 | C | C | 37.2 | D | C |
| E40 | Hillcrest Avenue | Deer Valley <br> Road | D | 2000 | 31.1 | C | C | 32.1 | C | C |
| E41 | Leland Road | Loveridge <br> Road | D | 2010 | 32.5 | C | D | 30.9 | C | C |
| E42 | Buchanan <br> Road | Loveridge <br> Road | D | 2010 | 23.2 | C | C | 17.9 | B | C |

Table 7: 2017 MTSO Intersection Draft LOS Results - Central County Sub Area

| Intersection |  |  | MTSO | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility | Cross Street |  | 2017Observed(HCM 2000) |  | 2013 Observed v/c, Delay | 2017 Observed (HCM 2000) |  | 2013 <br> Observed <br> Delay <br> Delay |
|  |  |  |  | V/C, Delay (sec) | LOS |  | V/C, <br> Delay <br> (sec) | LOS |  |
| C3 | Pacheco <br> Boulevard | John Muir Road | 1.5 | 0.38 | C | 0.34 | 0.63 | D | 0.50 |
| C11 | North Main Street | Geary Road | E | 41.2 | D |  | 61.3 | E |  |
| C16 | Treat <br> Boulevard | Clayton Road | 1.5 | 0.77 | D | 0.87 | 0.77 | D | 0.90 |
| C17 | Treat Boulevard | Cowell Road | 1.5 | 0.87 | E | 1.08 | 0.79 | D | 0.97 |
| C18 | Treat Boulevard | Oak Grove Road | 1.5 | 0.87 | E | 0.93 | 0.78 | D | 0.98 |
| C19 | Treat Boulevard | Bancroft Road | E/ 1.5 | 38.6 / 0.87 | D | 1.13 | $\begin{gathered} 39.1 / \\ 0.72 \end{gathered}$ | D | 1.17 |
| C20 | Treat Boulevard | Oak Road | 1.5 | 0.65 | D | 1.03 | 0.61 | C | 0.80 |
| C22 | Ygnacio Valley Road | Clayton Road | 1.5 | 0.79 | C | 0.91 | 0.69 | D | 0.78 |
| C23 | Ygnacio Valley Road | Alberta Way | 1.5 | 0.82 | D | 0.98 | 0.85 | D | 0.88 |
| C24 | Ygnacio Valley Road | Ayers Road | 1.5 | 0.93 | D | 1.01 | 0.93 | E | 0.90 |
| C25 | Ygnacio Valley Road | Cowell Road | 1.5 | 0.95 | E |  | 1.02 | E |  |
| C27 | Ygnacio Valley Road | Bancroft Road | E/ 1.5 | 44.1 / 0.86 | D | 1.08 | $\begin{gathered} 47.8 / \\ 0.85 \end{gathered}$ | D | 1.18 |
| C28 | Ygnacio Valley Road | Walnut Boulevard | 1.5 | 0.94 | C | 1.04 | 0.86 | C | 0.98 |
| C31 | Ygnacio Valley Road | Civic Drive | E/ 1.5 | 46.9 / 0.77 | D | 0.96 | $\begin{gathered} 46.5 / \\ 0.80 \end{gathered}$ | D | 1.22 |
| C32 | Pacheco <br> Boulevard | Shell Avenue | 1.5 | 0.68 | B | 0.65 | 0.52 | B | 0.43 |
| C33 | Pacheco Boulevard | Howe Road | 1.5 | 0.52 | B | 0.47 | 0.51 | B | 0.53 |


| Intersection |  |  | MTSO | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility | Cross Street |  | 2017 <br> Observed <br> (HCM 2000) |  | 2013 <br> Observed v/c, Delay <br> Delay | 2017 Observed (HCM 2000) |  | 2013 <br> Observed v/c, Delay |
|  |  |  |  | V/C, <br> Delay <br> (sec) | LOS |  | V/C, <br> Delay <br> (sec) | LOS |  |
| C34 | Pacheco <br> Boulevard | Morello Avenue | 1.5 | 0.91 | C | 0.75 | 0.91 | E | 0.80 |
| C35 | Pacheco <br> Boulevard | Arthur Road | 1.5 | 0.58 | C | 0.59 | 0.60 | C | 0.65 |
| C36 | Pacheco Boulevard | Blum Road / WB SR-4 Ramps | 1.5 | 0.50 | D | 0.65 | 0.81 | E | 0.85 |
| C37 | Pacheco <br> Boulevard | Center Avenue | 1.5 | 0.59 | D | 0.56 | 0.76 | D | 0.82 |
| C38 | Taylor Boulevard | Ruth Drive | 1.5 | 0.81 | D | 0.62 | 0.58 | C | 0.47 |
| C39 | Taylor Boulevard | Norse Drive | 1.5 | 0.82 | D | 0.91 | 0.75 | D | 0.54 |
| C40 | Taylor Boulevard | Morello Ave | 1.5 | 0.76 | D | 0.67 | 0.66 | D | 0.55 |
| C41 | Taylor Boulevard | Apollo Way | 1.5 | 0.51 | B | 0.41 | 0.46 | B | 0.68 |
| C43 | Taylor Boulevard | Grayson Road | 1.5 | 0.85 | E | 0.85 | 0.65 | C | 0.71 |
| C44 | Pleasant Hill Road | Paso Nogal Road | 1.5 | 0.65 | C | 0.77 | 0.54 | C | 0.63 |
| C45 | Pleasant Hill Road | Devon Avenue | 1.5 | 0.52 | B | 0.73 | 0.52 | B | 0.62 |
| C46 | Pleasant Hill Road | Westover Drive | 1.5 | 0.40 | B | 0.48 | 0.33 | B | 0.33 |
| C47 | Pleasant Hill Road | Grayson Road | 1.5 | 0.71 | D | 1.05 | 0.66 | D | 0.91 |
| C49 | Treat Boulevard | Jones Road | 1.5 | 0.67 | C | 0.78 | 0.63 | D | 0.99 |
| C50 | Treat Boulevard | Cherry Lane | 1.5 | 0.78 | C | 1.02 | 0.85 | D | 0.75 |
| C51 | Treat Boulevard | Carriage Drive | 1.5 | 0.79 | C | 1.10 | 0.53 | B | 0.64 |
| C52 | Treat Boulevard | Winton Drive | 1.5 | 0.51 | A | 0.91 | 0.48 | B | 0.77 |


| Intersection |  |  | MTSO | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility | Cross Street |  | 2017 Observed (HCM 2000) |  | 2013 Observed v/c, Delay | 2017Observed(HCM 2000) |  | 2013 <br> Observed v/c, Delay |
|  |  |  |  | V/C, <br> Delay <br> (sec) | LOS |  | V/C, <br> Delay <br> (sec) | LOS |  |
| C53 | Treat Boulevard | Oak Grove Plaza | 1.5 | 0.49 | B | 0.60 | 0.57 | C | 0.64 |
| C54 | Treat <br> Boulevard | San Simeon Drive | 1.5 | 0.60 | C | 0.83 | 0.62 | C | 0.56 |
| C55 | Treat <br> Boulevard | Navarone Way | 1.5 | 0.84 | B | 0.96 | 0.74 | B | 0.72 |
| C56 | Treat Boulevard | Turtle Creek Road | 1.5 | 0.51 | B | 0.59 | 0.62 | B | 0.54 |
| C57 | Treat <br> Boulevard | Bel Air Drive | 1.5 | 0.60 | B | 0.70 | 0.64 | B | 0.67 |
| C59 | Ygnacio Valley Road | North California Boulevard | 1.5 | 0.83 | D | 0.83 | 0.83 | D | 0.87 |
| C60 | Ygnacio Valley Road | North Main Street | 1.5 | 0.70 | D | 0.72 | 0.73 | D | 0.95 |
| C61 | Ygnacio Valley Road | North Broadway | 1.5 | 0.68 | D | 0.79 | 0.70 | D | 1.01 |
| C62 | Ygnacio Valley Road | Homestead Avenue | 1.5 | 0.84 | C | 0.93 | 0.97 | D | 1.09 |
| C63 | Ygnacio Valley Road | Tampico Drive | 1.5 | 0.68 | B | 0.82 | 0.74 | C | 0.92 |
| C64 | Ygnacio Valley Road | La Casa Via | 1.5 | 0.72 | C | 0.79 | 0.74 | D | 0.99 |
| C65 | Ygnacio <br> Valley Road | San Carlos Drive | 1.5 | 0.95 | E | 0.99 | 0.98 | F | 0.90 |
| C66 | Ygnacio Valley Road | Wiget Lane | 1.5 | 0.72 | D | 0.84 | 0.72 | C | 1.04 |
| C67 | Ygnacio Valley Road | Via Monte | 1.5 | 0.51 | C | 0.61 | 0.64 | B | 0.72 |
| C68 | Ygnacio Valley Road | Crystyl Ranch Road | 1.5 | 0.85 | B | 0.92 | 0.96 | C | 0.85 |
| C69 | Ygnacio Valley Road | Michigan Boulevard | 1.5 | 0.47 | B | 0.57 | 0.75 | B | 0.72 |
| C70 | Ygnacio Valley Road | Park Highlands Boulevard | 1.5 | 0.42 | B | 0.66 | 0.51 | C | 0.53 |

### 3.1.2 Average Stopped Delay

The Action Plan for the Central County includes a MTSO for the average stopped delay of vehicles, measuring how many cycles it takes to pass through an intersection.

Table 8 shows the results of the average stopped delay. All intersections analyzed in the Central County meet or pass the average stopped delay threshold.

Table 8: Average Stopped Delay - Central County Sub Area

| Sub Area | Facility | Cross/Street Segment | MTSO <br> (cycle) | 2017 Observed |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | PM |  |
|  | Bailey Road | Concord Boulevard | 3 | 0.54 | 0.40 |
|  | Bailey Road | Clayton Road | 3 | 0.24 | 0.21 |
|  | Treat Boulevard | Clayton Road | 3 | 0.33 | 0.34 |
|  | Treat Boulevard | Cowell Road | 5 | 0.39 | 0.30 |
|  | Treat Boulevard | Oak Grove Road | 5 | 0.45 | 0.32 |
|  | Ygnacio Valley Road | Clayton Road | 3 | 0.39 | 0.31 |
|  | Ygnacio Valley Road | Alberta Way | 4 | 0.39 | 0.29 |
|  | Ygnacio Valley Road | Cowell Road | 4 | 0.33 | 0.42 |

### 3.1.3 Maximum Side Street Wait Time

The Action Plan for the Lamorinda area includes a MTSO of the maximum wait time for vehicles on a side street crossing a major street. The maximum number of cycles a vehicle should wait on a side street in Lamorinda is one cycle.

Table 9 shows the results of the side street wait time analysis for 13 intersections. All intersections have acceptable wait times in the PM peak hour. On the other hand, three intersections have an observed side street wait time longer than the MTSO standards in the AM peak hour.

Table 9: Side Street Wait Time - Lamorinda Sub Area
[ MTSO = one or less]

| Sub Area | Facility | Cross/Street Segment | $2017$ <br> Observed |  | $2013$ <br> Observed |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AM | PM | AM | PM |
| Lamorinda | Pleasant Hill Road | Rancho View Drive | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Pleasant Hill Road | Green Valley Drive | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
|  | Pleasant Hill Road | Reliez Valley Road | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Pleasant Hill Road | Spring Hill Road | 1 | 1 |  |  |
|  | Pleasant Hill Road | Deer Hill Road | 1 | 1 |  |  |
|  | Camino Pablo | Wildcat Canyon Road | 1 | 1 |  |  |
|  | Camino Pablo | Monte Vista Road | 1 | 1 |  |  |
|  | Camino Pablo | Los Amigos Court | 1 | 1 |  |  |
|  | Camino Pablo | Manzanita Road | 2 | 1 |  |  |
|  | Camino Pablo | North Lane | 1 | 1 |  |  |
|  | Camino Pablo | Miner Road | 1 | 1 |  |  |
|  | Camino Pablo | Orinda Way | 1 | 1 |  |  |
|  | Camino Pablo | Camino Sobrante | 2 | 1 |  |  |

### 3.2 Roadway Segment Analysis

Overall, the following location did not meet the MTSO standards:

1) Central County: One (1) location operated at a delay index that did not meet MTSO standards
2) East County: Ten (10) AM Peak and eleven (11) PM Peak locations operate at a LOS not meeting MTSO standards
3) Lamorinda: Two (2) AM Peak and three (3) PM Peak locations operate at a LOS not meeting MTSO standards
4) West County: One (1) location operate at a LOS not meeting MTSO standards
5) Tri-valley: I-80 Westbound (AM peak hour) failed to meet the MTSO standards for the Duration of Congestion and HOV-Lane Utilization
6) Tri-valley: All (PM peak period) locations failed to meet the MTSO standards for average vehicle ridership
7) Lamorinda: All locations failed to meet the MTSO standards for vehicle occupancy

This remainder of section on Roadway Segment Analysis is divided into four parts:
3.2.1) LOS, Speed and Delay Index
3.2.2) Duration of Congestion, HOV Lane Utilization
3.2.3) Average Vehicle Ridership
3.2.4) Average Vehicle Occupancy

### 3.2.1 LOS, Speed, and Delay Index

The delay index, average speed, and LOS are determined by the peak hour speed computed in the same manner as previously described, using INRIX Analytics speed (and/or travel-time) data.

The results for the Central County, East County, Lamorinda County, Tri-valley County and West County are summarized in Table 10 through Table 15.

Table 10-1: Roadway Segment Analysis- Central County (Peak Hour Speed)

| [ $\mathrm{MTSO}=15 \mathrm{mph}]$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route | Limits | Dir | Length (mile) | AM |  | PM |  |
|  |  |  |  | $2017$ <br> Observed | $2013$ <br> Observed | $2017$ <br> Observed | $2013$ <br> Observed |
| Alhambra Avenue | Arch Street to Taylor Boulevard | NB | 4.77 | 28.1 | 28 | 29.4 | 28.9 |
| Alhambra Avenue | Arch Street to Taylor Boulevard | SB | 4.77 | 26.7 | 27 | 27.7 | 29.5 |
| Clayton <br> Road | Treat Boulevard to Kirker Pass Road | EB | 2.12 | 24.7 | 33 | 24.0 | 27.2 |
| Clayton <br> Road | Treat Boulevard to Kirker Pass Road | WB | 2.12 | 21.8 | 28 | 24.3 | 27.6 |
| Contra <br> Costa <br> Boulevard | Center Avenue to Astrid Drive | NB | 3.52 | 20.1 | 23 | 16.6 | 20.0 |
| Contra <br> Costa <br> Boulevard | Center Avenue to Astrid Drive | SB | 3.17 | 19.1 | 20 | 16.9 | 18.0 |
| Pacheco Boulevard | Warren Street to Center Avenue | NB | 4.3 | 25.6 | 32 | 25.5 | 21.0 |
| Pacheco Boulevard | Warren Street to Center Avenue | SB | 4.3 | 26.5 | 25 | 21.2 | 25.0 |
| Pleasant Hill Road | Geary Road to <br> Taylor Boulevard | NB | 0.8 | 32.1* | 30 | 35.1* | 26.0 |
| Pleasant Hill Road | Geary Road to Taylor Boulevard | SB | 0.76 | 41.4* | 30 | 35.0* | 27.3 |
| Taylor Boulevard | Withers Avenue to Contra Costa Boulevard | NB | 3.26 | 30.0 | 33 | 29.3 | 25.6 |
| Taylor Boulevard | Withers Avenue to Contra Costa Boulevard | SB | 3.26 | 31.1 | 28 | 30.5 | 27.3 |

* Floating car runs conducted on 9/26/2017

Table 10-2: Roadway Segment Analysis- Central County (Delay Index)

| Route | Limits | Dir | Length <br> (mile) | MTSO | AM |  | PM |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2013 <br> Observed |  | 2013 <br> Observed |  |  |  |
| SR-242 | I-680 to <br> State Route 4 | NB | 3.07 | 3 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 3.6 | 1.3 |
| SR-242 | I-680 to <br> State Route 4 | SB | 3.07 | 3 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 1.3 |
| SR-4 | Between Central County <br> sub-area boundaries | EB | 11.93 | 5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 1.4 |
| SR-4 | Between Central County <br> sub-area boundaries | WB | 11.87 | 5 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.0 |
| I-680 | Between central sub-area <br> boundaries | NB | 14.23 | 4 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 2.0 | 1.5 |
| I-680 | Between central sub-area <br> boundaries | SB | 14.2 | 4 | 1.9 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 1.2 |

Table 11-1: Roadway Segment Analysis- East County (LOS)
[ MTSO = LOS D ]

| Route | Limits | Dir | Length <br> (mile) | AM <br> 2017 <br> Observed | PM <br> 2017 <br> Observed |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deer Valley <br> Road | Prewett Ranch Road to <br> Sand Creek Road | NB | 0.6 | E | E |
| Deer Valley <br> Road | Prewett Ranch Road to <br> Sand Creek Road | SB | 0.6 | D | E |
| Walnut <br> Boulevard | Camino Diablo to <br> Vasco Road | NB | 0.89 | E | E |
| Walnut <br> Boulevard | Camino Diablo to <br> Vasco Road | SB | 0.89 | E | E |
| Cypress <br> Road | Sellers Avenue to <br> Bethel Island Road | EB | 1.96 | E | E |
| Cypress <br> Road | Sellers Avenue to <br> Bethel Island Road | WB | 1.96 | E | E |


| Route | Limits | Dir | Length (mile) | $\begin{gathered} \text { AM } \\ 2017 \end{gathered}$ <br> Observed | $\begin{gathered} \text { PM } \\ 2017 \end{gathered}$ <br> Observed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deer Valley <br> Road | Antioch limit / <br> Marsh Creek | NB | 4.87 | D | D |
| Deer Valley <br> Road | Antioch limit / <br> Marsh Creek | SB | 4.87 | D | D |
| Sellers Avenue | Laurel Road Extension to Cypress Road | NB | 0.5 | E | E |
| Sellers <br> Avenue | Laurel Road Extension to Cypress Road | SB | 0.5 | D | E |
| Balfour <br> Road | Deer Valley to Brentwood | NB | 4.78 | E | E |
| Balfour <br> Road | Deer Valley to Brentwood | SB | 4.78 | E | E |
| Vasco Road | Marsh Creek Road to Alameda County Line | NB | 12.13 | B | E |
| Vasco Road | Marsh Creek Road to Alameda County Line | SB | 12.13 | E | B |
| Byron Highway | Brentwood Boulevard to Alameda County Line | NB | 8.04 | D | D |
| Byron Highway | Brentwood Boulevard to Alameda County Line | SB | 8.04 | C | C |
| Marsh Creek Road | Deer Valley Road to SR-4 | EB | 5.03 | D | C |
| Marsh Creek Road | Deer Valley Road to SR-4 | WB | 5.03 | C | C |
| Camino <br> Diablo <br> Road | Marsh Creek Road to Vasco Road | EB | 3.58 | E | D |
| Camino Diablo Road | Marsh Creek Road to Vasco Road | WB | 3.58 | D | D |

Table 11-2: Roadway Segment Analysis- East County (Delay Index)

$$
\text { [ MTSO = } 2.5 \text { ] }
$$

| Route | Limits | Dir | Length <br> (mile) | AM <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ <br> Observed | PM <br> 2017 <br> Observed |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR-160 | Between State Route 4 and <br> the Sacramento County line | NB | 2.6 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| SR-160 | Between State Route 4 and <br> the Sacramento County line | SB | 2.6 | 1.2 | 1.1 |
| SR-4 | Between East County <br> sub-area boundaries | EB | 17.99 | 1.0 | 1.1 |
| SR-4 | Between East County <br> sub-area boundaries | WB | 17.99 | 2.5 | 1.0 |
| SR-4 | Between East County <br> sub-area boundaries | EB | 17.99 | 1.1 | 1.4 |
| SR-4 | Between East County <br> sub-area boundaries | WB | 17.99 | 1.4 | 1.3 |

Table 12: Roadway Segment Analysis- Lamorinda County (Peak Periods Delay Index) [ $\mathrm{MTSO}=2$ ]

| Route | Limits | Dir | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Length } \\ & \text { (mile) } \end{aligned}$ | AM |  | PM |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { Observed } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { Observed } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { Observed } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ \text { Observed } \end{gathered}$ |
| Camino Pablo / San Pablo Dam Road | Moraga Way to Inspiration Trail | EB | 3.8 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 1.2 |
| Camino Pablo / San Pablo Dam Road | Moraga Way to Inspiration Trail | WB | 3.8 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.2 |
| Pleasant Hill <br> Road | SR-24 to <br> Taylor Boulevard | NB | 1.8 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 1.4 |
| Pleasant Hill Road | SR-24 to <br> Taylor Boulevard | SB | 1.8 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| Moraga Way | Moraga Road to Bryant Way | EB | 4.7 | 1.3 |  | 1.3 |  |
| Moraga Way | Moraga Road to Bryant Way | WB | 4.7 | 1.6 |  | 1.4 |  |
| Moraga Way | Moraga Way to Mount Diablo Boulevard | NB | 4.7 | 1.6 |  | 1.6 |  |
| Moraga Way | Moraga Way to Mount Diablo Boulevard | SB | 4.7 | 1.4 |  | 1.4 |  |
| Mt Diablo Boulevard | Happy Valley to Brown Avenue | EB | 1.3 | 2.1 |  | 2.3 |  |
| Mt Diablo Boulevard | Happy Valley to Brown Avenue | WB | 1.3 | 2.1 |  | 2.3 |  |
| SR-24 | Alameda County Line to I-680 | EB | 8.5 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 1.4 |


| Route | Limits | Dir | Length <br> (mile) | AM |  | PM |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2017 <br> Observed | 2013 <br> Observed | 2017 <br> Observed | 2013 <br> Observed |  |  |
| SR-24 | Alameda County <br> Line to I-680 | WB | 8.6 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 1.5 |

Table 13: Roadway Segment Analysis- Lamorinda County (Off-Peak Periods Delay Index)
$[\mathrm{MTSO}=1.5$ ]

| Start Time | EB |  | WB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ <br> Observed | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ <br> Observed | 2017 <br> Observed | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ <br> Observed |
| 12:00 AM | 1.0 | 0.93 | 1.1 | 1.01 |
| 1:00 AM | 1.0 | 0.94 | 1.0 | 1.03 |
| 2:00 AM | 1.0 | 0.95 | 1.0 | 1.04 |
| 3:00 AM | 1.0 | 0.95 | 1.0 | 1.04 |
| 4:00 AM | 1.0 | 0.96 | 1.0 | 1.01 |
| 5:00 AM | 1.0 | 0.95 | 1.0 | 1.03 |
| 6:00 AM | 1.0 | 0.95 | 1.0 | 1.12 |
| 9:00 AM | 1.1 | 0.97 | 1.5 | 1.26 |
| 10:00 AM | 1.0 | 0.97 | 1.1 | 1.05 |
| 11:00 AM | 1.0 | 0.97 | 1.0 | 1.04 |
| 12:00 PM | 1.0 | 0.97 | 1.0 | 1.04 |
| 1:00 PM | 1.0 | 0.97 | 1.0 | 1.05 |
| 2:00 PM | 1.0 | 0.99 | 1.0 | 1.05 |
| 7:00 PM | 1.1 | 1.00 | 1.0 | 1.04 |
| 8:00 PM | 1.0 | 0.95 | 1.0 | 1.02 |
| 9:00 PM | 1.0 | 0.93 | 1.0 | 1.01 |
| 10:00 PM | 1.0 | 0.92 | 1.0 | 1.00 |
| 11:00 PM | 1.0 | 0.92 | 1.0 | 1.01 |

Table 14-1: Roadway Segment Analysis- Tri-valley County (Peak Hour Speed)
[ $\mathrm{MTSO}=30.0 \mathrm{mph}]$

| Route | Limits | Dir | Length (miles) | AM |  | PM |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $2017$ <br> Observed | $2013$ <br> Observed | $2017$ <br> Observed | $2013$ <br> Observed |
| I-580 | Between Tri-valley sub-area boundaries | EB | 25.61 | 65.5 | 62.6 | 31.8 | 46.8 |
| I-580 | Between Tri-valley sub-area boundaries | WB | 25.51 | 47.5 | 36.2 | 63.1 | 59.2 |
| I-680 | Between Tri-valley sub-area boundaries (southern end point: Washington Boulevard) | NB | 27.4 | 52.8 | 58 | 36.6 | 37.5 |
| I-680 | Between Tri-valley sub-area boundaries (southern end point: is Washington Boulevard) | SB | 27.39 | 48.5 | 51.2 | 61.2 | 42 |

Table 14-2: Roadway Segment Analysis- Tri-valley County (Delay Index)

| Route | Limits | Dir | Length (miles) | MTSO | AM |  | PM |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $2017$ <br> Observed | $2013$ <br> Observed | $2017$ <br> Observed | $2013$ <br> Observed |
| I-580 | Between Tri-valley sub-area boundaries | EB | 25.61 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.28 |
| I-580 | Between Tri-valley sub-area boundaries | WB | 25.51 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 1.01 |
| I-680 | Between Tri-valley sub-area boundaries (southern end point: Washington Boulevard) | NB | 27.4 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.8 | 1.59 |
| I-680 | Between Tri-valley sub-area boundaries (southern end point: Washington Boulevard) | SB | 27.39 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.42 |
| SR-84 | Between I-580 and I-680 | NB | 10.18 | 3.0 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.49 |
| SR-84 | Between I-580 and I-680 | SB | 10.18 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 1.44 |

Table 15: Roadway Segment Analysis- West County (Delay Index)

| Route | Limits | Dir | Length (miles) | MTSO | AM |  | PM |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $2017$ <br> Observed | $2013$ <br> Observed | $2017$ <br> Observed | $2013$ <br> Observed |
| SR-4 | I-80 to Cummings Skyway | EB | 4.72 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| SR-4 | I-80 to Cummings Skyway | WB | 4.64 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| I-580 | Between West sub-area boundaries (western end point: middle of bridge) | EB | 7.67 | 2 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.3 |
| I-580 | Between West sub-area boundaries (western end point: middle of bridge) | WB | 7.68 | 2 | 2.8 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.1 |
| I-80 | Between west sub-area boundaries | EB | 13.75 | 3 | 1.1 | 1 | 2.8 | 2.9 |
| I-80 | Between west sub-area boundaries | WB | 13.81 | 3 | 2.4 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 |

### 3.2.2 Duration of Congestion and HOV Lane Utilization

The duration of congestion and HOV lane utilization are determined from Caltrans PeMS peak hour speed and volume data. One location in the West County that did not meet the MTSO standard.

The results of 2017 MTSO monitoring are shown in Table 16 through Table 18.

Table 16: HOV Utilization - East County

| Route | MTSO | Dir | Peak Hour | 2017 <br> Observed <br> (Max Volume) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR-4 | 600 <br> vehicles per lane | WB | AM (7:00-8:00) | 1,755 |
|  | $E B$ | PM (5:45-6:54) | 1,810 |  |

Table 17: Duration of congestion - Tri-valley County

| Route | Limits | Dir | MTSO <br> (hour) | 2017 <br> Observed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-680 | SR-84 to County Line | SB | 5.0 | 4.5 |

Table 18: HOV Lane Utilization - West County

$$
[\mathrm{MTSO}=10 \% \text { ] }
$$

| Route | Dir | Peak Hour | $2013$ <br> Observed | $2017$ <br> Observed | $2017$ <br> Observed | $2013$ <br> Observed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Max Volume | Max Volume | \% Change | \% Change |
| 1-80 | EB | 6:00-7:00 AM | 945 | 1,399 | 48\% | $43 \%^{ \pm}$ |
|  |  | 5:00-6:00 PM | 1,169 | 1,349 | 15\% |  |
|  | WB | 7:30-8:30 AM | 1,401 | 1,430 | 2\% |  |
|  |  | 3:00-4:00 PM | 1,130 | 1,511 | 34\% |  |

$\pm$ Change in directional HOV lane usage was unavailable, in 2013 MTSO report

### 3.2.3 Average Vehicle Ridership

The Tri-Valley MTSO for average vehicle ridership reflects the number of people in a vehicle during the AM and PM peaks. This data were provided by Caltrans and is shown in Table 19. All three segments in the Tri-Valley area are below the threshold of 1.2 average vehicle ridership. Caltrans has not reported the data for the I-680 northbound segment.

Table 19: Average Vehicle Ridership - Tri-valley County [ MTSO =1.2 ]

| Roadway | Limits |  | 2017 <br> Observed* |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM | PM |  |
| I-680 Southbound | Rudgear Road to Alcosta Boulevard | 1.2 | 1.0 |  |
| I-680 Northbound | Alcosta Boulevard to Livorna Road | None | 1.0 |  |
| I-580 Eastbound | Hacienda Drive to N Livermore Avenue | 1.2 | 1.1 |  |

* Mixed Flow occupancy rate, excluding buses
*Source: Caltrans Managed Lane Report 2015


### 3.2.4 Vehicle Occupancy

The field data collected in the Lamorinda (Average vehicle occupancy) area are shown in Table 20. None of the locations analyzed met Lamorinda's average vehicle occupancy standard.

Table 20: Average Vehicle Occupancy - Lamorinda Sub Area
[ 2018 MTSO = 1.3]

| Roadway Segment | Dir | Peak Hour | 2017 <br> Observed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pleasant Hill Road | NB | AM | 1.2 |
|  |  | PM | 1.2 |
|  | SB | AM | 1.1 |
|  |  | PM | 1.2 |
| Camino Pablo/ San <br> Pablo Dam Road | NB | AM | 1.1 |
|  |  | PM | 1.1 |
|  | SB | AM | 1.2 |


|  |  | PM | 1.2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

### 3.3 Transit Ridership

This transit ridership section is divided into two parts: 1) BART Ridership; 2) Bus Ridership. Overall, there is no specific standards defined in the Action Plans.

### 3.3.1 BART Ridership

The East County Action Plan contains a MTSO that is measure of the average number of weekday riders on all BART trains between Bay Point and North Concord Stations.

Table 21 shows the monitoring results.

Table 21: BART Ridership - East County (weekday)

| Origin <br> Station | Destination <br> Station | Total Weekday <br> Ridership* | Average Weekday Ridership <br> (both directions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bay Point | $* *$ | 6,329 | 12,739 |
| $* *$ | Bay Point | 6,410 |  |

* Source: BART Ridership Report, April 2017
** Other stations in the BART system

The Lamorinda County Action Plan contains a MTSO that establishes an hourly average loading factor (ratio of passengers to seats) of 1.5 or less approaching Lafayette Station westbound and Orinda Station eastbound during each and every hour of service.

Table 22 shows the monitoring results.

Table 22: BART Loading Factor - Lamorinda County (weekday) $[\mathrm{MTSO}=1.5]$

| Start <br> Time | $2017$ <br> Observed |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | WestboundLafayette | EastboundOrinda |
| 04:00 | 0.14 | 0.003 |
| 05:00 | 0.58 | 0.028 |
| 06:00 | 0.77 | 0.128 |
| 07:00 | 1.16 | 0.243 |
| 08:00 | 1.51 | 0.253 |
| 09:00 | 1.67 | 0.174 |
| 10:00 | 0.74 | 0.130 |
| 11:00 | 0.70 | 0.155 |
| 12:00 | 0.40 | 0.209 |
| 13:00 | 0.25 | 0.427 |
| 14:00 | 0.21 | 0.536 |
| 15:00 | 0.22 | 0.765 |
| 16:00 | 0.18 | 1.589 |
| 17:00 | 0.27 | 2.626 |
| 18:00 | 0.40 | 2.868 |
| 19:00 | 0.31 | 1.333 |
| 20:00 | 0.14 | 0.852 |
| 21:00 | 0.12 | 0.579 |
| 22:00 | 0.12 | 0.496 |

* Source: BART ridership in April 2017

The monthly ridership counts at the BART Pleasanton station in the Tri-valley sub-region were reported in consultation with CCTA.

Table 23 shows the MTSO monitoring results.

Table 23: BART Ridership - Tri-Valley County (weekday)

| Station | To | From | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dublin / Pleasanton | 8,110 | 8,210 | 8,160 |

* Source: BART ridership in April 2017


### 3.3.2 Bus Ridership

The East County Action Plan contains a MTSO that is a measure of the average number of riders boarding a fixed-route bus during an hour of scheduled bus service when persons may board with a fare or pass.

Table 24 shows the monitoring results.

Table 24: Tri-delta Bus Ridership - East County

| Route Number | Ridership per revenue service hour |
| :---: | :---: |
| 200 | 8.4 |
| 201 | 16.6 |
| 300 | 43.4 |
| 379 | 15.8 |
| 380 | 52.3 |
| 383 | 8.8 |
| 385 | 9.1 |
| 386 | 0.4 |
| 387 | 23.5 |
| 388 | 31.9 |
| 389 | 4.7 |
| 390 | 9.0 |
| 391 | 30.2 |

The monthly ridership counts for LAVTA transit services in the Tri-valley were reported in consultation with CCTA.

Table 25 presents the results.

Table 25: LAVTA Bus Ridership - Tri-valley County

| Route Number | Description | 2013 <br> Annual Ridership | 2017 <br> Annual <br> Ridership | Route Number | Description | 2013 <br> Annual <br> Ridership | 2017 <br> Annual Ridership |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | East Dublin | 37,287 | 16,856 | 503* | West Dublin | 4,519 | NA |
| 2 | Dublin Ranch | 7,870 | 8,252 | 501 | Positano Hill | 32,047 | NA |
| 3 | West Dublin | 10,017 | NA | 502 | Emerald Glen | 12,368 | NA |
| 3 | Stoneridge | NA | 31,972 | 503 | Shannon Park | 7,021 | NA |
| 8 | Hopyard / <br> Vintage Hills | 60,536 | 53,722 | 601 | Ruby Hill | 9,880 | 6,525 |
| 9 | Hacienda | 34,639 | 2,004 | 602 | Parkside/Valley Trails/Del Prado | 15,822 | 14,375 |
| 10 | Intermunicipal | 560,478 | 428,870 | 603 | Muirwood Park | 10,245 | 8,216 |
| 11 | Northeast Livermore | 7,611 | 6,060 | 604 | Muirwood/Hacienda/ Fairlands | 22,962 | 21,406 |
| 12 | Intermunicipal | 158,463 | 14,566 | 605 | Amaral Park/Fairlands | 9,650 | 13,650 |
| 14 | Central Livermore | 46,204 | NA | 606 | Vintage Hills | 8,481 | 10,592 |
| 14 | Intermunicipal | NA | 94,087 | 607 | Oak Hill/Laguna Oaks | 7,727 | 3,945 |
| 15 | Springtown | 141,627 | 112,513 | 608 | Amaral Park | 15,666 | 18,775 |
| 18 | Granada | 5,782 |  | 609 | Del Prado Park | 2,572 | 3,198 |
| 20 | Intermunicipal | 16,849 | 10,306 | 610 | Fairlands | 11,509 | 11,586 |
| 30 | Intermunicipal | 358,447 | 461,036 | 611 | Vintage Hills | 12,469 | 10,831 |
| 53 | Stoneridge | 33,924 | 34,716 | 580 | Intermunicipal Shuttle | NA | 8,480 |
| 54 | Hacienda | 23,678 | 14,444 | 403 | Granada | NA | 582 |
| 70 | Walnut Creek /Pleasant Hill | 48,847 | 38,407 | 504 | Dublin Ranch | NA | 19,413 |
| 401* | Big Trees Park | 4,484 | NA | 505 | Positano Hill | NA | 4,017 |
| 402* | Hagemann Park | 1,234 | NA | 501* | East Dublin | 23,621 | NA |
| 502* | East Dublin | 13,360 | NA |  |  |  |  |

### 3.4 Additional performance measures

This section is divided into two parts: 1) Iron Horse Trail; 2) Pleasant Hill Road and Camino Pablo Dam Rd. Overall, there is no specific standards defined in the Action Plans.

### 3.4.1 Iron Horse Trail (Tri-valley)

The Tri-valley County Action Plan contains a MTSO that is a measure of measure of the use of the facility and potential overcrowding or conflict.

Table 26 presents the result of Pedestrian and Bicycle Volumes.

Table 26: Pedestrian and Bicycle Volumes- Tri-valley County

|  | AM |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bike |  |  |  | Pedestrian |  |
| Crossing Street | NB | EB | SB | WB | NB/SB | EB/WB |
| San Ramon Valley Boulevard | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Camino Ramon | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 91 | 6 |
| Crow County Road | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 146 | 7 |
| Bollinger Canyon Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 134 | 11 |
| Alcosta Boulevard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 56 | 9 |
|  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Bike |  |  |  | Pedestrian |  |
| Crossing Street | NB | EB | SB | WB | NB/SB | EB/WB |
| San Ramon Valley Boulevard | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 |
| Camino Ramon | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 71 | 9 |
| Crow County Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 144 | 8 |
| Bollinger Canyon Road | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 19 |
| Alcosta Boulevard | 4 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 72 | 17 |

The Tri-valley County Action Plan contains a MTSO that is a measure of the difficulty crossing roadways along the trail.

Table 27 presents the result of automobile vehicle volume.

Table 27: Automobile Vehicles at Crossing- Tri-valley County

| Crossing Street | AM |  |  |  | PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NB | EB | SB | WB | NB | EB | SB | WB |
| San Ramon Valley Boulevard | 1,190 | 0 | 865 | 0 | 2,830 | 0 | 1,447 | 0 |
| Camino Ramon / Sycamore Valley Road | 1,314 | 2,041 | 80 | 3,036 | 1,225 | 3,452 | 207 | 1,655 |
| Crow County Road | 0 | 2,062 | 0 | 3,212 | 0 | 3,939 | 0 | 2,969 |
| Bollinger Canyon Road | 34 | 1,697 | 0 | 4,507 | 326 | 4,600 | 0 | 2,107 |
| Alcosta Boulevard | 60 | 697 | 0 | 1,549 | 222 | 1,365 | 0 | 1,111 |

The Tri-valley County Action Plan contains a MTSO that is a measure of the delay to trail users caused by at-grade crossings of the trail. The intersections were chosen in consultation with CCTA.

Table 28 presents the result of the pedestrian delay at the signalized intersection.

Table 28: Average Trail User Delay- Tri-valley County

| Crossing Street | AM <br> (seconds) | PM <br> (seconds) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| San Ramon Valley Boulevard | 20.8 | 25.7 |
| Camino Ramon/Sycamore Valley Road | 45.5 | 41.5 |
| Crow County Road | 55.1 | 50.1 |
| Bollinger Canyon Road | 55.1 | 50.1 |
| Alcosta Boulevard | 41.1 | 41.1 |

The Tri-valley County Action Plan contains a MTSO that is a measure of the relative safety of the trail for its pedestrian and bicycling users.

Table 29 presents the result of frequency of pedestrian or bicyclist injury.

Table 29: Frequency of Pedestrian or Bicyclist Injury- Tri-valley County

| Year | Number of <br> Pedestrian / Bicyclist <br> Injuries |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2013 | 5 |
| 2014 | 3 |
| 2015 | 0 |
| 2016 | 1 |

The Tri-valley County Action Plan contains a MTSO that is a measure of relative comfort of the trail for its users.

Table 30 presents the result of pavement condition.

Table 30: Pavement Condition Index (PCI) - Tri-valley County

| Street <br> ID | Section <br> ID | Begin <br> Location | End <br> Location | Lanes | FC | Length <br> (FT) | Width <br> (FT) | Area <br> (SF) | ST | PCI Date | PCI |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IHT | TR010 | Dublin Central <br> Parkway | Dougherty <br> Road | 1 | C | 2,429 | 10 | 24,290 | AC | $2015-12-04$ | 73 |
| IHT | TR020 | Dougherty <br> Road | Amador Valley <br> Boulevard | 1 | C | 2,904 | 12 | 34,848 | AC | $2015-12-04$ | 78 |
| IHT | TR030 | Amador Valley <br> Boulevard | ALCO /COCO <br> Border | 1 | C | 4,771 | 13 | 62,023 | AC | $2015-12-04$ | 78 |
| IHT | TR180 | ALCO / COCO <br> Border | Alcosta <br> Boulevard | 1 | C | 1,760 | 12 | 21,120 | AC | $2015-12-04$ | 76 |


| Street <br> ID | Section <br> ID | Begin <br> Location | End <br> Location | Lanes | FC | Length <br> (FT) | Width <br> (FT) | Area <br> (SF) | ST | PCI Date | PCI |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IHT | TR190 | Alcosta <br> Boulevard | Pine Valley <br> Road | 1 | C | 4,435 | 10 | 44,350 | AC | $2015-12-04$ | 63 |
| IHT | TR200 | Pine Valley <br> Road | Montevideo <br> Road | 1 | C | 5,298 | 10 | 52,980 | AC | $2015-12-04$ | 61 |
| IHT | TR210 | Montevideo <br> Road | Bollinger <br> Canyon Road | 1 | C | 4,276 | 10 | 42,760 | AC | $2015-12-04$ | 62 |
| IHT | TR230 | Norris Canyon <br> Road | Crow Canyon <br> Road | 1 | C | 2,174 | 12 | 26,088 | AC | $2015-12-02$ | 62 |
| IHT | TR240 | Crow Canyon <br> Road | Fostoria | 1 | C | 957 | 10 | 9,570 | AC | $2015-12-02$ | 61 |

### 3.4.2 Pleasant Hill Road and Camino Pablo Dam Rd (Lamorinda)

The Lamorinda Action Plan contains MTSOs that monitor pedestrian or bicycle injury crash frequency, and vehicle crash frequency.

The results are presents in Table 31 and 32.
Table 31: Vehicle Crash Frequency- Lamorinda County

| Location | Year | Number of <br> Vehicle Crashes <br> (frequency per year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pleasant Hill Road | 2013 | 1 |
|  | 2014 | 1 |
|  | 2015 | 0 |
|  | 2016 | 0 |
|  | 2013 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 0 |
|  | 2015 | 0 |

Table 32: Pedestrian or bicycle injury crash frequency- Lamorinda County

| Location | Year | Number of <br> Pedestrian/Bicyclist <br> Injuries* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pleasant Hill Road | 2013 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 0 |
|  | 2015 | 1 |
|  | 2016 | 0 |
|  | 2013 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 0 |
|  | 2016 | 0 |

* retrieved from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS), which contains the records reported by California Highway Patrol (CHP) staff only


### 3.4.3 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

Results from "Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility" MTSO performance evaluation - forthcoming.

### 3.4.4 Frequency of Lane Closures

The lane closures data was not provided by the local agencies nor was it available from any other known data source. As such, the frequency of lane closures MTSO could not be calculated and reported.

A summary of results of the 2017 MTSO analysis for the five sub-areas within the Contra Costa County is shown in Table 33. The table lists the number of locations that do not meet the designated MTSO standards.

Table 33: Summary of Monitoring Results

| Sub Area | MTSO Measure | Locations | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Not Achieving MTSOs |  | Not Achieving MTSOs |  |
|  |  |  | No | \% | No | \% |
| East | Delay Index | 4 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | Intersection LOS | 41 | 3 | 7.3\% | 2 | 4.9\% |
|  | Roadway Segment LOS | 20 | 10 | 50.0\% | 11 | 55.0\% |
|  | HOV Lane Usage | 2 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Central | Delay Index | 6 | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 16.7\% |
|  | Average Speed | 12 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | Average Stopped Delay | 8 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | Intersection LOS V/C | 50 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Lamorinda | Delay Index | 12 | 3 | 25.0\% | 3 | 25.0\% |
|  | Side Street Wait Time | 13 | 3 | 23.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | Average Vehicle Occupancy | 2 | 2 | 100.0\% | 2 | 100.0\% |
| Tri-valley | Delay Index | 6 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | Intersection LOS | 82 | 2 | 2.4\% | 1 | 1.2\% |
|  | Average Speed | 4 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | Duration of Congestion | 1 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | Average Vehicle Ridership | 3 | 0 | 0.0\% | 3 | 100.0\% |
| West | Delay Index | 6 | 1 | 16.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | Intersection LOS | 56 | 2 | 3.6\% | 5 | 8.9\% |
|  | HOV Lane Usage | 2 | 1 | 50.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Total - Countywide |  | 330 | 27 | 8.2\% | 28 | 8.5\% |

Appendices

Appendix A - Intersection Turning Movement Counts

Appendix B - INRIX Data Collection and Analysis Technical Details

Appendix C - Intersection LOS Analysis Supplementary Information

Appendix D - Freeway Segment LOS Analysis Supplementary Information


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ INRIX includes a data quality score that accompanies every INRIX data point. A score of 30 indicates data are exclusively generated from real-time sources; a mix of historical and real-time sources are used (indicated by a score of 20); and data are exclusively generated from historical data (indicated by a score of 10).
    ${ }^{2}$ Technical Procedures, CCTA, January 162013

