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## Washoe County Development Application

Your entire application is a public record. If you have a concern about releasing personal information, please contact Planning and Building staff at 775.328.6100.

| Project Information |  | Staff Assigned Case No.: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: Bishop Manogue Catholic High School Expansion |  |  |  |
| Project Bishop Manogue Catholic High School is planning to expand their facility to add additional Description: classrooms, cafeteria, theater, and common areas to increase the student population from 800 students to 1200 students. |  |  |  |
| Project Address: 110 Bishop Manogue Drive |  |  |  |
| Project Area (acres or square feet): 48.11 acres |  |  |  |
| Project Location (with point of reference to major cross streets AND area locator): <br> Project site is located west of South Virginia Street with access from either Bishop Manogue Drive or McCabe Drive. |  |  |  |
| Assessor's Parcel No.(s): | Parcel Acreage: | Assessor's Parcel No.(s): | Parcel Acreage: |
| 162-010-28 | 48.11 |  |  |
| Indicate any previous Washoe County approvals associated with this application: Case No.(s). SPW8-41-97 |  |  |  |
| Applicant Information (attach additional sheets if necessary) |  |  |  |
| Property Owner: |  | Professional Consultant: |  |
| Name: Bishop Manogue Catholic High School |  | Name: Wood Rodgers, Inc |  |
| Address: 110 Bishop Manogue Drive |  | Address: 1361 Corporate Boulevard |  |
| Reno, NV | Zip: 89511 | Reno, NV | p: 89502 |
| Phone: 775-336-6000 | Fax: | Phone: 775-250-8213 | Fax: |
| Email: matthew.schambari@bishopmanogue.org |  | Email: shuggins@woodrodgers.com |  |
| Cell: | Other: | Cell: | Other: |
| Contact Person: Matthew Schambari |  | Contact Person: Stacie Huggins |  |
| Applicant/Developer: |  | Other Persons to be Contacted: |  |
| Name: SAME AS ABOVE |  | Name: H\&K Architects |  |
| Address: |  | Address: 5485 Reno Corporate Drive, Suite 100 |  |
| Zip: |  | Reno, NV | Zip: 89511 |
| Phone: | Fax: | Phone: 775-870-4877 | Fax: |
| Email: |  | Email: jeff@hkarchitects.com |  |
| Cell: | Other: | Cell: | Other: |
| Contact Person: |  | Contact Person: Jeff Klippenstein |  |
| For Office Use Only |  |  |  |
| Date Received: | Initial: | Planning Area: |  |
| County Commission District |  | Master Plan Designation(s): |  |
| CAB(s): |  | Regulatory Zoning(s): |  |

## Special Use Permit Application <br> Supplemental Information

(All required information may be separately attached)

1. What is the project being requested?

Bishop Manogue Catholic High School (BMCHS) is planning to expand their existing facility by 160,200 sqft in order to increase student population from 800 to 1,200 students. The expansion will include new classrooms, a larger cafeteria, a theater, and a gymnasium.
2. Provide a site plan with all existing and proposed structures (e.g. new structures, roadway improvements, utilities, sanitation, water supply, drainage, parking, signs, etc.)

Noted. Refer to civil plan set included with application packet.
3. What is the intended phasing schedule for the construction and completion of the project?

Full build out of the proposed expansion is planned over 4 phases that could take up to 10 years. Phase 1 cafeteria/parking lot to begin within 2 years of SUP approval and be complete by 2026; Phase 2 - weight room and practice gym, Phase 3 - STEM building, and Phase 4 - performing arts theater. All phases are anticipated to be complete by 2036 .
4. What physical characteristics of your location and/or premises are especially suited to deal with the impacts and the intensity of your proposed use?

The project site is already mostly developed with an existing high school. The proposed expansion includes buildings in undeveloped areas primarily adjacent to the existing building.
5. What are the anticipated beneficial aspects or affects your project will have on adjacent properties and the community?

Bishop Manogue already serves as a community partner to a number of different entities in need of facilities like theirs. The proposed expansion will make them an even greater community resource for events, the arts and STEM initiatives.
6. What are the anticipated negative impacts or affect your project will have on adjacent properties? How will you mitigate these impacts?

There are no anticipated negative impacts on adjacent properties since all of the new development is proposed adjacent to the existing building(s).
7. Provide specific information on landscaping, parking, type of signs and lighting, and all other code requirements pertinent to the type of use being purposed. Show and indicate these requirements on submitted drawings with the application.

Refer to civil and landscape plans included with this application packet.
8. Are there any restrictive covenants, recorded conditions, or deed restrictions (CC\&Rs) that apply to the area subject to the special use permit request? (If so, please attach a copy.)
$\qquad$
9. Utilities:

| a. Sewer Service | South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility |
| :--- | :--- |
| b. Electrical Service | NV Energy |
| c. Telephone Service | AT\&T |
| d. LPG or Natural Gas Service | NV Energy |
| e. Solid Waste Disposal Service | Waste Management |
| f. Cable Television Service | Charter |
| g. Water Service | TMWA |

For most uses, Washoe County Code, Chapter 110, Article 422, Water and Sewer Resource Requirements, requires the dedication of water rights to Washoe County. Please indicate the type and quantity of water rights you have available should dedication be required.

| h. Permit \# |  | acre-feet per year |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| i. Certificate \# |  | acre-feet per year |  |
| j. Surface Claim \# |  | acre-feet per year |  |
| k. Other \# |  | acre-feet per year |  |

Title of those rights (as filed with the State Engineer in the Division of Water Resources of the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources).
$\square$
10. Community Services (provided and nearest facility):

| a. Fire Station | TMFD Station 33 (.9 miles) |
| :--- | :--- |
| b. Health Care Facility | Renown Medical Group (.53 miles) |
| c. Elementary School | Elizabeth Lenz Elementary School (.79 miles) |
| d. Middle School | Picollo Middle School (.64 miles) |
| e. High School | Manogue High School |
| f. Parks | South Hills Park (.24 miles) |
| g. Library | South Valleys Library (1.36 miles) |
| h. Citifare Bus Stop | S. Virginia/McCabe (.24 miles) |

## Special Use Permit Application for Grading <br> Supplemental Information

(All required information may be separately attached)

1. What is the purpose of the grading?

Grading is required to accommodate the proposed building expansions and associated site improvements such as accessible sidewalks and parking areas.
2. How many cubic yards of material are you proposing to excavate on site?

Approximately 20,000 cy of material will be excavated for the project.
3. How many square feet of surface of the property are you disturbing?

The proposed project will disturb approximately 280,000 square feet of the property.
4. How many cubic yards of material are you exporting or importing? If none, how are you managing to balance the work on-site?

The project is anticipated to export approximately 18,000 cy of material.
5. Is it possible to develop your property without surpassing the grading thresholds requiring a Special Use Permit? (Explain fully your answer.)

No. The proposed building expansion is greater than 4 acres. Additionally, the majority of the proposed development is comprised of the building footprint expansion that no only needs to be flat but also match the existing building finish floor elevation. The building expansion results in an earthwork volume greater than $5,000 \mathrm{cy}$, also requiring an SUP.
6. Has any portion of the grading shown on the plan been done previously? (If yes, explain the circumstances, the year the work was done, and who completed the work.)

The property was previously graded in the early 2000's when the existing school facilities were built. All proposed grading associated with this SUP is new in support of the school expansion.
7. Have you shown all areas on your site plan that are proposed to be disturbed by grading? (If no, explain your answer.)

Yes. Building and hardscape limits are shown on the civil plans and limits of landscape improvements are shown on the landscape plans.
8. Can the disturbed area be seen from off-site? If yes, from which directions and which properties or roadways?

Disturbed areas will be screened from view by existing commercial/civic uses east of the site and mature landscaping along the property boundary. It is not anticipated that the disturbed areas behind the school will be visible due to existing topography, ballfield fencing, and existing landscaping/trees.
9. Could neighboring properties also be served by the proposed access/grading requested (i.e. if you are creating a driveway, would it be used for access to additional neighboring properties)?

No. The proposed improvements include expanding the existing building and adding a parking lot, neither of which will accessible to neighboring properties.
10. What is the slope (horizontal/vertical) of the cut and fill areas proposed to be? What methods will be used to prevent erosion until the revegetation is established?

The preliminary design includes slopes that are $3(\mathrm{H}): 1(\mathrm{~V})$ or less. Fiber rolls and slope tracking will be provided with each phase of development to prevent erosion until landscape improvements are installed for each phase.
11. Are you planning any berms?

| Yes | No $X$ | If yes, how tall is the berm at its highest? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

12. If your property slopes and you are leveling a pad for a building, are retaining walls going to be required? If so, how high will the walls be and what is their construction (i.e. rockery, concrete, timber, manufactured block)?

Retaining walls, varying in height from small landscape walls to 8 foot retaining walls will be provided as shown on the civil plans. The construction materials will vary from keystone block and rockery to case-in-place concrete or masonry.
13. What are you proposing for visual mitigation of the work?

Existing and proposed landscape treatments, including trees and shrubs, will provide visual mitigation.
14. Will the grading proposed require removal of any trees? If so, what species, how many and of what size?

Yes, approximately 14 trees (greater than $6^{\prime \prime}$ caliper) will be removed within the improvement area. Trees will be replaced with a tree of similar caliper at a $1: 1$ ratio to offset the caliper loss. Refer to grading plan and landscape plan for additional details.
15. What type of revegetation seed mix are you planning to use and how many pounds per acre do you intend to broadcast? Will you use mulch and, if so, what type?

Only areas to be developed will be disturbed, therefore revegetation is not anticipated. All disturbance will be covered in either hardscape, building, or landscape. Mulch within landscape areas will include rock blends, DG, and other materials complimentary to the exiting landscaping and the proposed improvements.
16. How are you providing temporary irrigation to the disturbed area?

If needed, temporary irrigation will either be provided by water truck or through the use of the existing private irrigation system extending throughout the site.
17. Have you reviewed the revegetation plan with the Washoe Storey Conservation District? If yes, have you incorporated their suggestions?
N/A
18. Are there any restrictive covenants, recorded conditions, or deed restrictions (CC\&Rs) that may prohibit the requested grading?

| Yes | No $X$ | If yes, please attach a copy. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

Section 2

## Executive Summary

Applicant: Bishop Manogue Catholic High School
APN: 162-010-28
Request: A request to allow Bishop Manogue Catholic High School to expand its building footprint in the Medium Density Suburban zoning district per Table 110.302.52 of the Washoe County Development Code.
Location The 48-acre project site is located west of South Virgina Street via Bishop Manogue Drive and McCabe Drive in south Reno.

## Project Request

This application package contains the required Washoe County application and supporting information for the following request:

- A Special Use Permit (SUP) to allow an existing Private School Facility to expand its building footprint within the current school campus located in south Reno.


## Background

In 1997, the Washoe County Planning Commission approved a special use permit (SPW8-41-97) to develop the Bishop Manogue Catholic High School (BMCHS) campus on a 48-acre parcel. The campus would consist of 186,350 square foot building to include classrooms, an auditorium, gymnasium, library, cafeteria, chapel, as well as athletic fields. After several years of fundraising, in 2004, the $140,000 \pm$ square foot new high school campus and associated facilities officially opened their doors. This new school was designed to accommodate approximately 800 students but given the size of the parcel, the school had the ability to expand the facilities when the time was right.

Over the last 10 years, with increased residential development throughout the Truckee Meadows, BMCHS has seen an increase is applications for new students. However, due to the current size of the facility, the school cannot physically accommodate more students resulting in a need to expand by utilizing the remaining undeveloped portions of the campus property and adding new wings to the existing building.

Physically, from the southwest portion of the project site, the site slopes downward to the northeast at approximately 2-percent. The existing school is situated at approximately the center of the parcel and is surrounded by athletic fields to the south, west and north. The majority of the area impacted by the school addition is occupied by landscaping and/or rough graded zones capped with aggregate (refer to Preliminary Geotechnical Letter in Section 4 of this submittal package).

The project site has a master plan designation of Suburban Residential (SR) and a zoning designation of Medium Density Suburban (MDS). The zoning designation of MDS conforms with the master plan designation and a high school (Private School Facility) is a permitted use in the MDS zoning category. The project site is adjacent to existing single family residential, existing commercial and existing church. The current land use and zoning designations are conforming with the surrounding land uses and in conformance with the goals and policies of the Master Plan (refer to Vicinity Map, Existing Master Plan and Existing Zoning exhibits in Section 3 of this submittal package).

| ADJACENT PROPERTY DESCRIPTION |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Land Use Designation | Zoning | Use |
| North | Suburban Mixed Use (SMU) | Mixed Use Suburban (MS) | Retail Commercial |
| South | Open Space (OS) | Open Space (OS) | Whites Creek Drainage |
| East | Suburban Mixed Use (SMU) <br> Commercial (C) | Mixed Use Suburban (MS) <br> Neighborhood Commercial (NC) | Post Office <br> Auto Dealership <br> Catholic Church |
| West | Suburban Residential (SR) | Medium Density Suburban <br> (MDS) | Single Family Residential |

## Project Details

The project consists of approximately $162,000 \pm$ square feet of new building added on to the existing building, creating a campus with approximately 300,597 square feet of building area. The expansion will include additional classrooms to increase the student enrollment from 800 students to approximately 1,200 students, additional space for cafeteria, theater, and gymnasium. As part of the expansion, two new parking areas will be constructed/improved providing a total of 695 parking spaces ( 138 (new) spaces) to serve the campus.

On-site circulation will provide access around the entire project site utilizing the existing access points at the north (McCabe Drive) and south (Bishop Manogue Drive) ends of the site which are accessible via South Virginia Street (US 395). Parking will be provided throughout the site and include safe pedestrian access from parking lots to the high school buildings.

Off-site, pedestrians will be able to use existing sidewalks to access the Project site on foot and bicycle. Specifically, the Project site frontage has sidewalks and pedestrian access curb ramps. In addition, the signalized intersection at Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive includes pedestrian crosswalks with push buttons and curb ramps on all legs. The unsignalized intersection at Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive also has a pedestrian crosswalk with signage and curb ramps along the west leg of the intersection. The roundabouts of Bishop Manogue HS Access have curb ramps on all legs and a pedestrian crosswalk on the Bishop Manogue HS Access \& McCabe Drive south leg.

In terms of phasing, the project is anticipated to be constructed in multiple phases over approximately 10 years. While phases and specific additions are subject to change, below is an estimated phasing schedule for build out of the project:

Phase 1 - Cafeteria and South Parking Lot - The expansion of the cafeteria building, new storage outbuilding, and south parking lot will begin within two years of the approval of the SUP, with a target completion date of July 2026.

Phase 2 - Weight Room and Practice Gym - The expansion of the weight room and practice gym, should begin after the completion of Phase 1 with a target completion date of July 2030.

Phase 3 - Science and Engineering Building - The Science and Engineering building expansion should begin after the completion of Phase 2 with a target completion date of July 2033

# Bishop Manogue <br> High School Expansion <br> Special Use Permit <br> Project Description 

Phase 4- Performing Arts Theater - The Theater is anticipated to be the last phase of the program with an anticipated completion of July 2036.

## Building Architecture and Floor Plan

The new additions for BMCHS will add a total of $+/-162,000$ square feet to the existing building. This includes approximately 14,000 square feet of mechanical space. This expansion will allow the school to increase enrollment from 800 students to approximately 1,200 students.

The additions will relate to the exterior design language of the existing building by using similar materials such as concrete masonry units (CMU). Metal panel cladding will be used as a secondary material to complement the existing metal roofs and aid in elevation articulation. Roofs will be primarily flat with parapet walls. An abundance of natural light will be provided to interior spaces through large windows, skylights, and clerestories. Interior hallways will be generously wide to accommodate the busy class changes. Stairwells will also be extra wide and have exterior views to aid in wayfinding. Exterior heights of the additions will not surpass the existing chapel's steeple to maintain the chapel's centrality to the overall composition of the building.

It is anticipated for the total construction to be split into four phases: a Cafeteria wing, STEM/Classroom wing, Athletics wing, and a Theater/Art wing.

The cafeteria wing will extend the existing cafeteria, add a new kitchen, and add 8 classrooms between two stories. The expanded cafeteria will feature double height space with a mezzanine and clerestory windows. The cafeteria wing will be the first phase of construction as the existing cafeteria is not meeting the needs of current enrollment.

The STEM/Classroom wing will consist of a large double height STEM lab space with mezzanine and a two-story wing with 14 classrooms. The design of the STEM/Classroom wing exterior will take a more industrial approach to relate to its function and provide visual separation from the rest of the building. The cafeteria wing and STEM wing will be connected to each other as well as the existing building via corridors on both levels. This will allow for easy circulation between buildings and creates two large outdoor courtyards.

The new athletics addition will include a half-court practice gym, expanded weight room, and athletic offices. The weight room expansion will nearly triple the existing weight room space and include dedicated space for cardio and stretching.

The Theater/Art wing will include a partial fly, $\sim 400$ seat theater, a digital art classroom, and offices for campus ministry. An approximately 9,000 square foot outbuilding will be constructed adjacent to the tennis courts to provide much needed storage for facilities. Lastly, an approximately 500 square foot secure-entry lobby will be added to the main entrance to enhance the campus' security.

## Traffic and Site Circulation

Wood Rodgers prepared a Traffic Impact Study to identify potential impacts from the project and develop recommendations if necessary. According to the study, the Project site currently generates approximately 1,693 daily trips (ADT), with 515 AM Peak Hour Trips and 312 afternoon peak trips. New trips generated by the proposed Project were estimated using rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition (ITE). With the Project, site traffic is estimated to increase generation by 911 daily trips, 277 AM Peak Hour Trips (164 Inbound, 114 Outbound), and 168 Afternoon Peak Hour Trips ( 66 Inbound, 102 Outbound) under typical weekday traffic demand conditions.

# Bishop Manogue <br> High School Expansion <br> Special Use Permit <br> Project Description 

In terms of on-site circulation, the Project trips will circulate through one of four existing Project driveways. According to the study, all four intersections and driveways are projected to operate at acceptable level of service (LOS) or better under existing pls project future peak hour conditions. As a result, the Project was found to have negligible impact on all four study intersections under all future study conditions (refer to Traffic Impact Study in Section 4 of this submittal package).

## Parking

As noted previously, the proposed Project adds approximately 160,200 square feet of new building area and increased enrollment up to 1,200 students. As a result of the expansion, the number of employees is also expected to increase, up to a total of 160 (with maximum enrollment). The existing Project site has 557 parking spaces which includes 25 accessible spaces.

In accordance with Washoe County Development Code, off-street parking spaces shall be provided for all new development. The parking space requirements for "Civic Use Types," which includes the "Education" category is provided in Table 110.410.10.2. Specifically, the parking space requirements for an "Elementary/Secondary School" are as follows:

- 1 space per employee during peak employee shift
- 0.25 spaces per student of driving age

Assuming 160 employees and projected 900 students of driving age (assuming $75 \%$ of the 1,200 students are of driving age), 385 parking spaces would be required for the Project per Washoe County Development Code. As designed, the proposed Project includes 695 total parking spaces, including a minimum of 14 ADA accessible spaces (per Table 110.410.15.1), which is anticipated to be adequate to meet the Project parking demand.

## Landscaping

New landscaping will be provided as part of the Project. Washoe County Development Code requires that a minimum of 20\% of the improvement area is required to be landscaped. As designed, the project includes 104,683 sqft (37\%) of new landscape area which includes a mix of ornamental plantings and ornamental hardscape. The project will also include a minimum of 189 new trees that will be strategically planted throughout the project area (refer to Color Site Plan in Section 3 or Landscape Plan in map pocket).

## Lighting

The project site includes existing light poles throughout the parking areas and around the athletic fields. As part of this expansion project, new light poles, typical of a high school, will be provided in the new parking areas. New light poles will not exceed a maximum height of 30 -feet in parking areas and 12 -feet if within 100 feet of residential neighborhoods. Any new light poles will be consistent in style with existing on-site poles and will promote "dark sky's" by including covers that prevent spillover and reflect away from adjoining properties.

Note that where lights may be located adjacent to the existing ballfields, the fields are several feet above the parking lot and therefore will provide some natural screening from neighborhood properties due to topography.

## Utilities

Utilities that will serve the project site are summarized as follows:

- Water - The project site is currently served by TMWA. There is a 10 -inch water main loop on site that surrounds the existing building. It is anticipated that the existing water main is sufficient to serve the proposed building expansions and their associated new services. Based on initial information, the existing water main may be located outside the drive aisle at the southwest corner of the building. In anticipation of this possibility, the proposed plan shows relocation of the water main into the drive aisle. Reference the utility plan for locations of the proposed services and relocated water main.
- Sewer - The site is currently being served by Washoe County at the South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility. The project is anticipated to generate 18,900 gallons per day (gpd) more flow as a result of the proposed building expansions. Sewer will connect to existing facilities serving the site. Reference the sewer study for detailed calculations and new sewer service locations.


## Neighborhood Meeting

As required the applicant hosted a Neighborhood Meeting to discuss the project prior to this application. Post cards were mailed to over 245 property owners within 750 feet of the project site. The virtual meeting was held on Wednesday, January 10, 2024 from 6:00-7:00 pm in the Bishop Manogue High School cafeteria. An overview of the project including preliminary site plans and project details were presented. Four people attended the meeting and asked questions related to traffic during construction, project phasing, and next steps. The preapplication meeting materials including a recording of the neighborhood meeting presentation was uploaded to the Washoe County HUB website.

## Development Statistics

Total Parcel Area:
$48 \pm$ acres
Proposed Project Area:
$6.5 \pm$ acres (283,140 sqft.)

## Existing Building Area:

Proposed Building Area:
$153,000 \pm$ sqft.

Proposed Parking/Paved Area:
Proposed Landscape Area:
$161,500 \pm$ sqft.
$78,100 \pm$ sqft.
$104,683 \pm$ sqft.

Landscape Area Required:
$56,628 \pm$ sqft (20\%)
Landscape Area Provided:
$104,683 \pm$ sqft. (37\%)
Trees Required:
189 trees
Trees Provided:
189 trees

Parking Required: 385 stalls
Parking Provided: 695 stalls
Accessible Parking Required: 14 stalls
Accessible Parking Provided: 14 stalls

## Special Use Permit Findings

Section 110.810.30 Findings. Prior to approving an application for a special use permit, the Planning Commission, Board of Adjustment or a hearing examiner shall find that all of the following are true:
(a) Consistency. The proposed use is consistent with the action programs, policies, standards and maps of the Master Plan and the applicable area plan;

Response: According to the Envision Washoe 2040 Master Plan adopted in November 2023, the subject properties are in the Southwest Truckee Meadows planning area which identifies the parcels as having a master plan designation of Suburban Residential (SR). There are no specific Principles or Policies in the planning area that are applicable to the proposed school expansion. The granting of this special use permit is consistent with the policies and maps of the Master Plan and Southwest Truckee Meadows area.
(b) Improvements. Adequate utilities, roadway improvements, sanitation, water supply, drainage, and other necessary facilities have been provided, the proposed improvements are properly related to existing and proposed roadways, and an adequate public facilities determination has been made in accordance with Division Seven;

Response: As detailed on the attached engineering plans and reports, all infrastructure and services needed to serve the project are in place or can be extended to serve the building expansion areas.
(c) Site Suitability. The site is physically suitable for the type of development and for the intensity of development;

Response: As previously noted, from the southwest portion of the project site, the site slopes downward to the northeast at approximately 2 -percent. The existing school is situated at approximately the center of the parcel and is surrounded by athletic fields to the south, west and north. The majority of the area impacted by the proposed school expansion is currently either landscaped and/or rough graded with aggregate making these area well suited for the intensity of the use.
(d) Issuance Not Detrimental. Issuance of the permit will not be significantly detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare; injurious to the property or improvements of adjacent properties; or detrimental to the character of the surrounding area; and

Response: Given that the site already developed with a high school campus and athletic fields, issuance of this special use permit to allow the school to expand within its current footprint will not be significantly detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare of the surrounding area. Consideration has been given to the neighboring properties through the overall site design and additional landscaping to help mitigate grading impacts and screen the development from public view.
(e) Effect on a Military Installation. Issuance of the permit will not have a detrimental effect on the location, purpose or mission of the military installation.

Response: N/A.

Section 3
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| Existing Square Footage: |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Level 1: 120,202 sf <br> Level 2: 19, 200 s <br> Football Out Buildings: 4,680 sf Baseball Out Building: 9,000 sf Total: 153, 082 sf | ,680 sf <br> , 000 sf |
| Added Square Footage: |  |
|  |  |
|  | Sutroal + +5,0.00 st |
| Cafeteria Wing |  |
|  | SibToal + H5200 sf $^{\text {d }}$ |
| Weghtromanaleis ofires |  |
| Treaedmmisisy friesat Wing | Sat Wing $=+2$ 22000s |
| Faditesoutuiding | $=+4.6,008$ |
| Mechanical+ Mech. Penthouse <br> Secure Entry |  |
|  | $=4$ ¢ 40085 |




1 Floor Plan




4) South Elevation
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3 West Elevation


1) East Elevation
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## Introduction

This study shall serve as the preliminary sanitary sewer report for expansion of the existing Bishop Manogue Catholic High School. The purpose of this report is to address the sewerage issues that result from further development of the project site in accordance with the Washoe County development standards and sound design and engineering practices. This report describes existing conditions, quantifies the estimated sanitary sewer flows to be generated from the proposed expansion project, describes the proposed on-site private sewer network, and analyzes the impacts of this development on downstream facilities.

## Project Area and Description

The proposed School Expansion project is located on a developed 48.1-acre site (APN: 162-010-28). It is located within Section 17 of T18N, R20E, MDB\&M, Washoe County, Nevada. The property is surrounded by developed land to the west (residential), north (commercial), east (commercial), and by Whites Creek to the south. Access to the site is provided by two public roads to the east, McCabe Drive and Bishop Manogue Drive that dead-end in roundabouts at the project entrances. A Vicinity Map is included in the Appendix of this report for reference.

The property was previously developed with a 780 -student high school in the early 2000's along with associated outdoor athletic facilities, parking, landscaping, and utilities.

The proposed school expansion will add about 162,000 sf of new building area allowing student capacity to increase to 1,200 . The building expansion is anticipated to be a multi-phase project that adds a new wing or expands an existing wing of the building with each phase. The proposed expansions include the following four wings: Cafeteria, STEM, Athletics, and Theater/Art. A Facilities Building is also proposed, which is anticipated to be constructed with the Cafeteria phase. The project will include added parking, landscaping, and utilities to support the proposed phases of further development. (Reference the Preliminary Sanitary Sewer Layout in the appendix for a layout of the proposed improvements.)

## Existing Condition

McCabe Drive and Bishop Manogue Drive were constructed with 8 -inch public sewer mains extending from the 10 -inch public interceptor in Virginia Street, to the east, to the subject property. In the case of the 8 -inch public sewer main in McCabe Drive, the sewer main was extended through the subject property toward the residential subdivision to the west. (Existing public sewer main information was found on the record drawings Bishop Manogue Phase 1 - Infrastructure Construction Plans prepared by Jeff Codega, dated 1999.) The sewer main originating in McCabe Drive serves the football field

concession stand and bathrooms while the sewer main originating in Bishop Manogue Drive serves the main part of the campus including the school and baseball field concession stand and bathrooms. (Reference the Existing Sewer Map in the appendix for public main locations.)

Proposed improvements will not impact the sewer main extending from McCabe Drive. Therefore, the remainder of this report will focus on the sewer main extending from Bishop Manogue Drive and the service laterals connecting to this line.

Construction of Bishop Manogue Catholic High School in the early 2000's included extension of sewer laterals to the building with several connection points all around the building. The sewer laterals were installed using both 4 -inch and 6 -inch pipes with cleanouts. An existing grease interceptor is located in the back of the building on the east side to serve the existing cafeteria. (Existing private sewer lateral information was found on the New Bishop Manogue High School Plans prepared by Jeff Codega, dated 2001.) (Reference the Preliminary Sanitary Sewer Layout in the appendix showing existing laterals around the building.)

## Proposed Sewer System

Expansion of the School will include rerouting some existing sewer laterals and running new laterals to the proposed building additions. A Preliminary Sanitary Sewer Layout is included in the Appendix showing the proposed relocations and additions. Included in the lateral relocations is the northern-most line currently located under the future Theater/Arts Wing and the southern-most line extending to the concession stand at the baseball fields, which conflicts with the future STEM Wing.

Proposed sewer extensions include a lateral to the future Athletics Wing expansion, one to the future STEM Wing, one to the future Facilities Building, and an extension to the future Cafeteria expansion. It is anticipated that the future Theater/Arts Wing will be able to utilize the existing sewer lateral that is located within it's building footprint.

All lines have been preliminarily sized based on the existing laterals and uses. Final sewer design including verifying existing service capacity will be provided with final design of the project.

At the time of final design, the existing grease interceptor will be checked for adequate size and location. If it is not adequate to serve the new cafeteria, a new grease interceptor will be proposed.

There will not be any non-domestic waste introduced into the sanitary sewer system with development of this project.


## Project Sewer Contribution

The project peak daily flow rate was calculated using a preliminary average sewage contribution rate of 15 gallons per day per student with a 3.0 peaking factor. The existing flow from the site using this calculation is ( 780 students * $15 \mathrm{gpd} /$ student * 3 ) $=35,100 \mathrm{gpd}$ peak flow. The future flow from the site is estimated to be ( 1200 students * $15 \mathrm{gpd} /$ student $* 3$ ) $=54,000$ gpd peak flow. (The estimated flow rate contribution for a school was taken from the North Carolina Administrative Code 15A NCAC 02T.0114 Wastewater Design Flow Rates, which estimates 15 gallons per day per student for schools with a cafeteria, gym, and showers.) (Construction-level design flow rates will be calculated based on proposed fixture counts at the time of final design.)

The proposed private sanitary sewer system located within the project has been preliminarily laid out to meet the requirements outlined in the Washoe County Community Services Department Design Standards. Specifically, the multiple laterals extending to the building are at least 4 inches in diameter and are separated from water pipes. At the time of final design for each stage of construction, the private sewer network will be evaluated for depth of cover, capacity, and velocity based on design flow rates and a final design report will be prepared.

## Downstream Sewer Capacity Evaluation

The existing 8-inch public sewer main in Bishop Manogue Drive, which provides service to the proposed project expansion areas, has been preliminarily evaluated for flow capacity. The 8 -inch public sewer main collects flow from the subject site, Saint Rose of Lima Church, and the Porsche dealership before transferring flow to a 10 -inch public interceptor at the intersection with South Virginia Street.

In the future condition, the existing 8-inch main in Bishop Manogue Drive is anticipated to collect flow from all of the properties listed above plus the school expansion as well as one remaining undeveloped commercial property at the southwest corner of Bishop Manogue Drive and South Virginia Street.

Preliminary evaluation of the existing 8-inch public main is shown on the Existing Sewer Map in the appendix. The map includes tables summarizing the existing and future design flows from each property, the existing pipe sizes, slopes, and capacities, and the estimated design peak flow in each section of pipe. FlowMaster was used to calculate pipe capacities for the existing 8 -inch main. FlowMaster calculation sheets are included in the appendix.

In summary, the 8-inch public sewer main in Bishop Manogue Drive has an $80 \%$ flow depth capacity of about one million gallons per day and the peak flow in the future condition is about 100,000 gallons per day. Therefore, the preliminary analysis shows that the existing 8 -inch public sewer main in Bishop Manogue Drive has capacity to convey flow from the proposed expansion project.

## CONCLUSION

The existing and proposed sanitary sewer system discussed in this report was preliminarily evaluated and laid out to sufficiently serve the proposed Bishop Manogue Catholic High School Expansion project at build-out. No adverse effects to the downstream infrastructure are anticipated. All proposed private sanitary sewer facilities shall be owned and maintained by the school.
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Bentley Systems, Incorporated, FlowMaster V8i (SELECTseries 1), Copyright 2009.
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## Project Description

| Friction Method | Manning Formula <br> Discharge |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Solve For |  |  |
| Input Data | 0.012 |  |
| Roughness Coefficient | 0.01000 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Channel Slope | 6.40 | in |
| Normal Depth | 8.00 in |  |
| Diameter |  |  |

## Results

| Discharge | 826991.98 | $\mathrm{gal} / \mathrm{day}$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Flow Area | 0.30 | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ |
| Wetted Perimeter | 1.48 | ft |
| Hydraulic Radius | 2.43 | in |
| Top Width | 0.53 | ft |
| Critical Depth | 0.53 | ft |
| Percent Full | 80.0 | $\%$ |
| Critical Slope | 0.00995 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Velocity | 4.27 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Velocity Head | 0.28 | ft |
| Specific Energy | 0.82 | ft |
| Froude Number | 1.01 |  |
| Maximum Discharge | 1.41 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Discharge Full | 1.31 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Slope Full | 0.00955 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Flow Type |  |  |

## GVF Input Data

| Downstream Depth | 0.00 in |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Length | 0.00 ft |
| Number Of Steps | 0 |

## GVF Output Data

| Upstream Depth | 0.00 | in |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Profile Description |  |  |
| Profile Headloss | 0.00 | ft |
| Average End Depth Over Rise | 0.00 | $\%$ |
| Normal Depth Over Rise | 80.00 | $\%$ |
| Downstream Velocity | Infinity | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Upstream Velocity | Infinity | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Normal Depth | 6.40 | in |
| Critical Depth | 0.53 | ft |
| Channel Slope | 0.01000 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Critical Slope | 0.00995 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |

## Project Description

| Friction Method | Manning Formula <br> Discharge |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Solve For |  |  |
| Input Data | 0.012 |  |
| Roughness Coefficient | 0.01500 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Channel Slope | 6.40 | in |
| Normal Depth | 8.00 in |  |
| Diameter |  |  |

## Results

| Discharge | 1012854.19 | $\mathrm{gal} / \mathrm{day}$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Flow Area | 0.30 | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ |
| Wetted Perimeter | 1.48 | ft |
| Hydraulic Radius | 2.43 | in |
| Top Width | 0.53 | ft |
| Critical Depth | 0.58 | ft |
| Percent Full | 80.0 | $\%$ |
| Critical Slope | 0.01301 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Velocity | 5.23 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Velocity Head | 0.43 | ft |
| Specific Energy | 0.96 | ft |
| Froude Number | 1.23 |  |
| Maximum Discharge | 1.72 | $\mathrm{ft} 3 / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Discharge Full | 1.60 | $\mathrm{ft} 3 / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Slope Full | 0.01433 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Flow Type |  |  |

## GVF Input Data

| Downstream Depth | 0.00 in |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Length | 0.00 ft |
| Number Of Steps | 0 |

## GVF Output Data

| Upstream Depth | 0.00 | in |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Profile Description | 0.00 | ft |
| Profile Headloss | 0.00 | $\%$ |
| Average End Depth Over Rise | 80.00 | $\%$ |
| Normal Depth Over Rise | Infinity | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Downstream Velocity | Infinity | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Upstream Velocity | 6.40 | in |
| Normal Depth | 0.58 | ft |
| Critical Depth | 0.01500 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Channel Slope | 0.01301 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |

Worksheet for Ex. 8" SS Main 1.54\% Slope

## Project Description

| Friction Method | Manning Formula <br> Discharge |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Solve For |  |  |  |
| Input Data | 0.012 |  |  |
| Roughness Coefficient | 0.01540 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |  |
| Channel Slope | 6.40 | in |  |
| Normal Depth | 8.00 | in |  |

## Results

| Discharge | 1026270.06 | $\mathrm{gal} / \mathrm{day}$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Flow Area | 0.30 | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ |
| Wetted Perimeter | 1.48 | ft |
| Hydraulic Radius | 2.43 | in |
| Top Width | 0.53 | ft |
| Critical Depth | 0.59 | ft |
| Percent Full | 80.0 | $\%$ |
| Critical Slope | 0.01328 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Velocity | 5.30 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Velocity Head | 0.44 | ft |
| Specific Energy | 0.97 | ft |
| Froude Number | 1.25 |  |
| Maximum Discharge | 1.75 | $\mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Discharge Full | 1.62 | $\mathrm{ft} 3 / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Slope Full | 0.01471 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Flow Type |  |  |

## GVF Input Data

| Downstream Depth | 0.00 in |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Length | 0.00 ft |
| Number Of Steps | 0 |

## GVF Output Data

| Upstream Depth | 0.00 | in |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Profile Description | 0.00 | ft |
| Profile Headloss | 0.00 | $\%$ |
| Average End Depth Over Rise | 80.00 | $\%$ |
| Normal Depth Over Rise | Infinity | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Downstream Velocity | Infinity | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Upstream Velocity | 6.40 | in |
| Normal Depth | 0.59 | ft |
| Critical Depth | 0.01540 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Channel Slope | 0.01328 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |

## Project Description

| Friction Method | Manning Formula <br> Discharge |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Solve For |  |  |
| Input Data | 0.012 |  |
| Roughness Coefficient | 0.02600 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Channel Slope | 6.40 | in |
| Normal Depth | 8.00 in |  |
| Diameter |  |  |

## Results

| Discharge | 1333484.50 | gal/day |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Flow Area | 0.30 | $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ |
| Wetted Perimeter | 1.48 | ft |
| Hydraulic Radius | 2.43 | in |
| Top Width | 0.53 | ft |
| Critical Depth | 0.63 | ft |
| Percent Full | 80.0 | $\%$ |
| Critical Slope | 0.02149 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Velocity | 6.89 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Velocity Head | 0.74 | ft |
| Specific Energy | 1.27 | ft |
| Froude Number | 1.62 |  |
| Maximum Discharge | 2.27 | $\mathrm{ft} 3 / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Discharge Full | 2.11 | ft 3 s |
| Slope Full | 0.02484 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Flow Type |  |  |

## GVF Input Data

| Downstream Depth | 0.00 in |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Length | 0.00 ft |
| Number Of Steps | 0 |

## GVF Output Data

| Upstream Depth | 0.00 | in |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Profile Description | 0.00 | ft |
| Profile Headloss | 0.00 | $\%$ |
| Average End Depth Over Rise | 80.00 | $\%$ |
| Normal Depth Over Rise | Infinity | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Downstream Velocity | Infinity | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Upstream Velocity | 6.40 | in |
| Normal Depth | 0.63 | ft |
| Critical Depth | 0.02600 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Channel Slope | 0.02149 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
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## Introduction

This report represents the Preliminary Technical Drainage Study for expansion of the existing Bishop Manogue Catholic High School. The purpose of this report is to preliminarily address drainage issues that result from development of the proposed project in accordance with Washoe County's development standards, the Truckee Meadows Regional Design Manual (TMRDM), and sound design and engineering practices. This report includes the overall hydrologic analysis for existing and proposed conditions and the preliminary design parameters for on-site storm water management facilities.

## General Location and Development Description

## Location of Project

The proposed School expansion project is located on a developed 48.1-acre site (APN: 162-010-28). It is located within Section 17 of T18N, R20E, MDB\&M, Washoe County, Nevada. The property is surrounded by developed land to the west (residential), north (commercial), east (commercial), and by Whites Creek to the south. Access to the site is provided by two public roads to the east, McCabe Drive and Bishop Manogue Drive, that dead-end in roundabouts at the project entrances. The proposed project will expand the existing high school building and parking lot in the center of the campus. The proposed expansion area covers approximate 6.5 acres. (Reference the Vicinity Map in Appendix A of this report for the property location.)

## Property Description \& History

The property consists of an existing 780-student high school that was built in the early 2000's along with associated outdoor athletic facilities, parking, landscaping, and utilities. It was originally part of a much larger site ( $\sim 86$ acres) that included the land between the school and South Virginia Street known as the Bishop Manogue Business Park.

During development, McCabe Drive and Bishop Manogue Drive were built in conjunction with storm drain networks that tied to detention basins on the downstream edge of the property parallel to South Virginia Street. The detention basins were sized for full development of the 86 -acre business park based on a 100 -year storm event. There are several storm drain networks extending from the existing detention basins to the property. One is located along the northern property line, another extends from McCabe Drive into the northern parking lot, and the last network extends from Bishop Manogue Drive into the center of the campus.

Proposed improvements will not negatively impact either of the two northern storm drain networks. Therefore, the remainder of this report will focus on the storm drain system extending into the property from Bishop Manogue Drive. The area draining to this system is referred to as the Southern Basin.

Within the Southern Basin there are two existing private storm drain networks surrounding the existing building. They are referred to as the North Drain Network and the South Drain Network. They are made up of roof drain connections, landscape drain lines, catch basin laterals, and storm drain mains. The North and South private storm drain networks converge at a public manhole east of the campus at the roundabout on Bishop Manogue Drive. From this convergence point a 24 -inch public storm drain pipe conveys flows east within Bishop Manogue Drive. The main increases to a 36 -inch pipe before outletting to the master-planned detention basin adjacent to South Virginia Street.

## Project Description

The proposed school expansion will add about 162,000 sf of new building area allowing student capacity to increase to 1,200 . The building expansion is anticipated to be a multi-phase project that adds a new wing or expands an existing wing of the building with each phase. The proposed expansions include the following four wings: Cafeteria, STEM, Athletics, and Theater/Art. A Facilities Building is also proposed, which is anticipated to be constructed with the Cafeteria expansion phase. The project will include added parking, landscaping, and utilities to support the proposed phases of further development.

New storm drainage infrastructure is proposed to support expansion of the building by relocating and extending the existing private storm drain networks around and to the improvements. Reference Appendix A, Preliminary Storm Drain Layout map for a plan of the project site.

## Previous Studies

Jeff Codega Planning and Design prepared a study titled, "Hydraulic Report for Bishop Manogue Business Park, Road A and Road B" dated September 1998. (Road A and Road B are now known as McCabe Drive and Bishop Manogue Drive.) The report was followed up with a review of the study and additional evaluation by Nimbus Engineers in a report titled, "Flood Control Master Plan for Bishop Manogue" dated April 1999 ('99 Nimbus Study). The two studies reviewed the pre-developed condition for the Bishop Manogue Business Part and calculated flows for full build-out of the 86-acre site in order to size/confirm-sizing of the detention basins along South Virginia Street.

Wood Rodgers, Inc. prepared a drainage report titled, "Drainage Study Bill Pearce Motors" dated April 27, 2007, which was followed up with an addendum letter on September 13, 2007. Another letter was issued on April 20, 2008 as a result of a design change. The study and update letters describe the existing detention basin along South Virginia Street with a capacity of $1.97+/$ - acre-feet. Development of Bill Pearce Motors resulted in a pond volume increase of 0.13 acre-feet, creating a new total storage volume of 2.10 acre-feet.

Soils on the site were preliminarily characterized by Wood Rodgers, Inc. in a geotechnical review letter summarizing the site condition. The letter, which is dated December 13,2023 , summarizes the site soils
as fine-grained low plasticity silts and sands, and high plasticity gravelly clays.

## Master Drainage Study Plan Revision

As mentioned previously, the property was master planned for development. The area proposed for expansion is included in basin EC-1E of the '99 Nimbus Study. Per the study, the developed site has a Curve Number of 92. Based on soil conditions provided in the USDA NRCS Web Soil Survey, (see Appendix A) the proposed expansion area of the site is split between Hydrologic Soil Groups C and D. A curve number of 92 with a Hydrologic Soil Group designation between C and D corresponds to an "Industrial" hydrologic condition with a 72\% impervious area, per Table 702 of the TMRDM.

The proposed building expansion and site improvements will increase the impervious area creating an impervious area that covers $83 \%$ of the EC-1E drainage basin. The increase in runoff will require additional detention as detailed in this report.

## Drainage Basin Description

## On-Site Drainage Description

Topography of the site generally trends downhill from southwest to northeast and the site is split into three main basin areas. As mentioned previously, this study will focus on the Southern Basin that drains to the storm drain network in Bishop Manogue Drive.

9 subbasins form the Southern Basin in the existing condition, whereas there are 10 subbasins in the proposed condition. Their limits are shown on the Existing Hydrologic Basins Exhibit and Proposed Hydrologic Basins Exhibit in Appendix B. Some of the subbasins drain to the North Drain Network, some to the South Drain Network, and one subbasin in the existing condition sheet drains directly to Bishop Manogue Drive where it is collected in the public storm drain system. The following table summarizes which subbasins are directly connected to each of the three networks.

Table 1: Pipe Network - Subbasin Correlation

|  | North Drain Network | South Drain Network | Direct to Public Network |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Existing Subbasins | X-2, X-7, X-8, X-9, X-10 | X-1, X-3, X-4 | X-5 |
| Proposed Subbasins | P-2, P-6, P-7, P-8, P-9, P-10 | P-1, P-3, P-4, P-5 |  |

Both the North and South Drain Networks connect to the Public Network in Bishop Manogue Drive.

## Offsite Drainage Description

Storm water falling on land outside the property and adjacent to the Southern Basin is directed away from the Southern Basin in either cutoff ditches or natural topography flowing away from the property. Little to no run-on enters the property from offsite. The residential lots to the west are separated from the Southern Basin by the Last Chance Ditch, whereas the land to the south, where White Creek runs,

and to the east is downhill of the property. Reference Appendix B for existing drainage boundary limits.

## FLoodplain Information

The project site is located on FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) number 32031C3245G. The majority of the site is located within FEMA Flood Zone X, defined as areas outside the $0.2 \%$ (500-year) annual chance floodplain. The southern tip of the property extends into FEMA Flood Zone A; however, no improvements are proposed within this area. As the proposed development area of the site is designated Zone $X$, there are no base flood elevations for the site. The FEMA FIRM Panel Firmette showing the project site is provided in Appendix A.

## Proposed Drainage Facilities

## General Description

The proposed expansion project limits are located within the Southern Basin, which includes subbasins $\mathrm{P}-1$ through P-10. The remainder of the site will remain unchanged.

The proposed expansion project storm drainage system generally consists of sheet flow from the proposed parking lots, building roofs, driveways, sidewalks, and landscape areas into gutters and drainage swales in which the water is conveyed to either the North or South Drain System and ultimately to the public storm drain line in Bishop Manogue Drive.

Both the existing North and South Drain Networks include pipe relocations and extensions in order to service the proposed improvements. The North Drain Network includes relocation of a 6 -inch drain line around the proposed Theater/Arts Wing, relocation of a 12-inch drain line around the proposed Athletics Expansion, and extension of a catch basin lateral to the proposed entry parking lot in front of the school.

The South Drain Network, similar to the North Drain Network, includes extension of a catch basin lateral to the proposed entry parking lot in front of the school as well as extension of a storm drain line around the new Stem Wing and through the two proposed courtyards.

## Hydrologic Analysis

5 -year and 100-year storm event runoff flow rates for the existing and proposed hydrologic basins were preliminarily analyzed using the Rational Method, per the TMRDM. Rational Method flow rate calculation input includes rainfall intensity, runoff coefficients, and drainage areas. Rainfall input was generated from the NOAA Atlas 14 Point Precipitation Frequency Estimates at the site (Latitude 39.4226, Longitude -119.7647). A copy of the intensity table is included in Appendix B of this report. Runoff coefficients (C-values) were estimated using standard C-values published in the TMRDM based on surface characteristics. A copy of the Runoff Coefficient table is included in Appendix B of this report. Tables summarizing percentages of different surface types per subbasin that were used to calculate
composite C-values are included on the Existing and Proposed Hydrologic Basins maps.

Rational Method spreadsheets were used to preliminarily calculate runoff from each subbasin during the design storm events. Spreadsheets are included in Appendix B for the 5-year and 100-year events for both the existing and proposed conditions. The spreadsheets include calculations for each subbasin Time of Concentration that determined the rainfall intensity.

Results from the calculations are summarized in the following table:
Table 2: Existing versus Proposed Flow Rates

|  | North Drain Network |  | South Drain Network |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5-Year Flow Rate <br> (cfs) | 100-Year Flow Rate <br> (cfs) | 5-Year Flow Rate <br> (cfs) | 100-Year Flow <br> Rate (cfs) |
| Existing | 5.4 | 17.1 | 4.5 | 20.8 |
| Proposed | 7.1 | 19.9 | 7.1 | 25.9 |
| Difference | 1.7 Increase | 2.8 Increase | 2.6 Increase | 5.1 Increase |

The proposed expansion project increases impervious area on the site and results in an increase in runoff within the subbasins. The impact of the proposed flow rates on the existing site have been preliminarily evaluated and mitigated as described below.

## FACILITY DEsign

The proposed expansion project storm drain system is preliminarily designed to intercept the 5 -year and 100 -year storm events in order to carry them within the pipe networks until discharged into the existing public storm drain system.

In order to limit the impact of increased impervious area in a majority of the existing private system as well as all of the downstream public storm drain system, detention systems are proposed in both the North and South Drain Networks near the upstream end of the existing private pipe networks, but downstream of the proposed expansion projects.

The North Drain Network detention basin is an underground system that is proposed on the north side of the future Athletics Expansion within the existing north parking lot. The proposed detention system will capture and meter flow from subbasins P-2 and P-9 before releasing it downstream. The combined flow from these two subbasins in the 100 -year storm is 11.2 cfs , which is more than the required detention flow rate of 2.8 cfs per Table 2; therefore, no additional subbasins need to be routed to the detention basin. The pipes upstream of the North Drain Network detention basin will be evaluated more thoroughly in the final design report. However, for the purpose of this report the flattest section of pipe with the greatest flow was checked for capacity using FlowMaster V8i. The FlowMaster output

report is included in Appendix C. In summary, the flattest pipe with the largest flow in the North Drain Network upstream of the proposed detention basin is a 12-inch line with 6.5 cfs of flow during the 100 -year storm at the downstream end of subbasin P-9. The 12 -inch line will be able to convey the 100-year flow rate with 1.3 feet of head on the upstream end of the pipe, which maintains the hydraulic grade line below ground level.

The South Drain Network detention basin is proposed as a pond at the downstream end of subbasin P-3. Subbasin P-3 has a 100-year flow rate of 6.6 cfs , which is more than the required detention flow rate of 5.1 cfs for the South Drain Network per Table 2; therefore, no additional subbasins need to be routed to the detention basin. Similar to the North Drain Network, the pipes upstream of the South Drain Network detention basin will be evaluated more thoroughly in the final design report. However, for the purpose of this report the flattest section of pipe with the greatest flow was checked for capacity using FlowMaster V8i. The FlowMaster output report is included in Appendix C. In summary, the flattest pipe with the largest flow in the South Drain Network upstream of the proposed detention basin is a 12 -inch line with 6.6 cfs of flow during the 100-year storm at the downstream end of subbasin P-3. The 12 -inch line will be able to convey the 100-year flow rate with 3.3 feet of head on the upstream end of the pipe. This section of pipe is more than 4 feet underground, so the hydraulic grade line will be below ground level in a 100-year storm.

## DETENTION

The two proposed detention basin minimum volumes were preliminarily calculated using the Rational Formula Method from the TMRDM, which states the volume is equal to the time of concentration in minutes, times a conversion factor of 60, times the detained flow rate in cfs. The following table summarizes the results of this calculation for the 100-year storm event.

Table 3: Detention Basin Volumes

| System | Tc (min) | Detained Q (cfs) | Volume (cf) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North Detention | 13.2 | 2.8 | 2,218 |
| South Detention | 9.8 | 5.1 | 2,999 |

Each of the proposed detention basins will include an outlet control structure. The outlet control structure will include a low flow orifice to release the 5-year storm event flow rate, a higher orifice to release the 100-year storm event flow rate, and an emergency overflow. Detailed design of the two detention systems, including outlet control structures, will be provided in final design.

## Maintenance Plan

Sediment transport and erosion will be controlled through landscape measures as well as sizing of outlet and inlet protection and through conformance with the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared for this site. The SWPPP includes Best Management Practices (BMP's), a maintenance

schedule, and a list of the responsible parties for maintenance to insure the storm drain system operates correctly and prevents excessive sediment transport. The SWPPP will be prepared prior to construction and will be maintained on the project site throughout construction duration.

Post-construction management of the private storm drain system will be the responsibility of the property owner.

## Conclusion

The drainage facilities that will be constructed with the Bishop Manogue Catholic High School Expansion project have been preliminarily designed to capture and perpetuate the design storm event flows with the use of storm drain pipes and detention systems to the existing downstream drain pipe networks. The proposed project is in compliance with State of Nevada drainage statutes, the Washoe County development standards, the Truckee Meadows Regional Drainage Manual, and FEMA requirements and development standards. There will not be negative impacts to adjacent or downstream properties as a result of development due to the implementation of the proposed storm water management system.
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NOAA Atlas 14, Volume 1, Version 5
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** source: USGS
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NOAA, National Weather Service, Silver Spring, Maryland
PF tabular | PF_graphical | Maps \& aerials
PF tabular
PDS-based point precipitation frequency estimates with $90 \%$ confidence intervals (in inches/hour) ${ }^{1}$

| Duration | Average recurrence interval (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 50 | 100 | 200 | 500 | 1000 |
| 5-min | 1.08 <br> $(0.936-1.27)$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.34 \\ (1.15-1.60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.81 \\ (1.55-2.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{2 . 2 7} \\ (1.91-2.69) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.01 \\ (2.46-3.60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.71 \\ (2.93-4.48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.52 \\ (3.46-5.53) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.52 \\ (4.03-6.90) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.14 \\ (4.88-9.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.59 \\ (5.60-11.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| 10-min | $\mathbf{0 . 8 2 2}$ <br> $(0.708-0.972)$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1.03 \\ (0.876-1.22) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.38 \\ (1.18-1.64) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.72 \\ (1.45-2.05) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{2 . 2 9} \\ (1.88-2.74) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{2 . 8 2} \\ (2.23-3.41) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3.44 \\ (2.63-4.22) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.21 \\ (3.07-5.25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{5 . 4 3} \\ (3.72-6.97) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.53 \\ (4.27-8.56) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 15-min | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{0 . 6 8 0} \\ (0.584-0.804) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.848 \\ (0.724-1.00) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.14 \\ (0.972-1.36) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.42 \\ (1.20-1.69) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.89 \\ (1.55-2.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.33 \\ (1.84-2.82) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.85 \\ (2.17-3.48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.47 \\ (2.54-4.34) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.49 \\ (3.08-5.76) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.40 \\ (3.52-7.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| 30-min | 0.458 <br> $(0.394-0.540)$ | 0.570 <br> $(0.488-0.676)$ | 0.770 <br> $(0.654-0.914)$ | 0.958 <br> $(0.808-1.14)$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.28 \\ (1.04-1.53) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.57 \\ (1.24-1.90) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.92 \\ (1.46-2.35) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.34 \\ (1.71-2.92) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.02 \\ (2.07-3.88) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.64 \\ (2.37-4.76) \end{gathered}$ |
| 60-min | $\mathbf{0 . 2 8 4}$ <br> $(0.243-0.334)$ | 0.353 <br> $(0.302-0.419)$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 4 7 6} \\ (0.404-0.565) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.592 <br> $(0.500-0.705)$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{0 . 7 8 9} \\ (0.646-0.944) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.971 \\ (0.767-1.17) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.19 \\ (0.905-1.45) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.45 \\ (1.06-1.81) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.87 \\ (1.28-2.40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.25 \\ (1.47-2.95) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2-hr | 0.189 <br> $(0.167-0.219)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.235 \\ (0.208-0.272) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.302 \\ (0.264-0.349) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 6 0}$ <br> $(0.310-0.416)$ | 0.449 <br> $(0.376-0.523)$ | 0.529 <br> $(0.431-0.624)$ | 0.620 <br> $(0.491-0.743)$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 7 3 4} \\ (0.562-0.912) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.940 \\ (0.687-1.21) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 1.14 \\ (0.796-1.49) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3-hr | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 1 4 9} \\ (0.133-0.170) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 8 6}$ $(0.167-0.213)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.235 \\ (0.208-0.267) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 2 7 3} \\ (0.240-0.312) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{0 . 3 2 8} \\ (0.283-0.376) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.375 \\ (0.318-0.435) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 4 3 1} \\ (0.357-0.507) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 5 0 5} \\ (0.409-0.613) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 6 3 6} \\ (0.499-0.815) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.764 \\ (0.579-1.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| 6-hr | 0.103 <br> $(0.092-0.116)$ | 0.129 <br> $(0.115-0.146)$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 1 6 1} \\ (0.143-0.182) \end{gathered}$ | 0.186 <br> $(0.164-0.210)$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{0 . 2 1 8} \\ (0.189-0.248) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 2 4 2} \\ (0.207-0.278) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 2 6 7} \\ (0.225-0.310) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.297 \\ (0.245-0.350) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.345 <br> $(0.277-0.413)$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 9 6}$ <br> $(0.311-0.507)$ |
| 12-hr | $\mathbf{0 . 0 6 6}$ <br> $(0.059-0.074)$ | 0.083 <br> $(0.074-0.093)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.105 \\ (0.093-0.118) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \boldsymbol{0 . 1 2 2} \\ (0.107-0.137) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \boldsymbol{0} .144 \\ (0.125-0.163) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{0 . 1 6 1} \\ (0.138-0.184) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.178 \\ (0.151-0.207) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 9 6}$ <br> $(0.162-0.230)$ | 0.219 <br> $(0.176-0.263)$ | 0.239 <br> $(0.188-0.292)$ |
| 24 | $\mathbf{0 . 0 4 0}$ <br> $(0.037-0.045)$ | 0.051 <br> $(0.046-0.056)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.064 \\ (0.058-0.071) \end{gathered}$ | 0.075 <br> $(0.067-0.083)$ | 0.089 <br> $(0.080-0.099)$ | 0.101 <br> $(0.090-0.113)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.113 \\ (0.100-0.127) \end{gathered}$ | 0.126 <br> $(0.110-0.142)$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 4 3}$ <br> $(0.122-0.163)$ | 0.156 <br> $(0.132-0.181)$ |
| 2-day | $\mathbf{0 . 0 2 3}$ <br> $(0.021-0.026)$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 3 0}$ <br> $(0.026-0.033)$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{0 . 0 3 7} \\ (0.033-0.042) \\ \hline \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 0 4 4} \\ (0.039-0.049) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{0 . 0 5 2} \\ (0.046-0.059) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 5 9}$ <br> $(0.052-0.067)$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 0 6 6} \\ (0.058-0.076) \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{0 . 0 7 4} \\ (0.063-0.085) \\ \hline \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{0 . 0 8 4} \\ (0.071-0.099) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 9 2}$ <br> $(0.076-0.110)$ |
| 3-day | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{0 . 0 1 7} \\ (0.015-0.019) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 0 2 1} \\ (0.019-0.024) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.027 \\ (0.024-0.031) \end{gathered}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 3 2}$ <br> $(0.029-0.036)$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{0 . 0 3 9} \\ (0.034-0.044) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 4 4}$ <br> $(0.039-0.050)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.050 \\ (0.043-0.057) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.056 \\ (0.048-0.064) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 6 4}$ <br> $(0.054-0.075)$ | 0.071 <br> $(0.058-0.084)$ |
| 4-day | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 0 1 4} \\ (0.012-0.015) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 0 1 7} \\ (0.016-0.019) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.022 \\ (0.020-0.025) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 2 6}$ <br> $(0.024-0.029)$ | 0.032 <br> $(0.028-0.036)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.037 \\ (0.032-0.041) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.041 \\ (0.036-0.047) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 0 4 7} \\ (0.040-0.053) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 5 4}$ <br> $(0.045-0.063)$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 6 0}$ <br> $(0.050-0.071)$ |
| 7-day | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 9}$ <br> $(0.008-0.010)$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 0 1 1} \\ (0.010-0.013) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.015 \\ (0.013-0.017) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1 8}$ <br> $(0.016-0.020)$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \mathbf{0 . 0 2 1} \\ (0.019-0.024) \\ \hline \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{0 . 0 2 4} \\ (0.021-0.028) \\ \hline \hline \end{array}$ | 0.028 <br> $(0.024-0.032)$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 3 1}$ <br> $(0.027-0.036)$ <br> 0.024 | $\mathbf{0 . 0 3 6}$ <br> $(0.030-0.042)$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 3 9}$ <br> $(0.033-0.046)$ |
| 10-day | 0.007 <br> $(0.006-0.008)$ | 0.009 <br> $(0.008-0.010)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.011 \\ (0.010-0.013) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 0 1 4} \\ (0.012-0.015) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.017 <br> $(0.015-0.019)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.019 \\ (0.017-0.021) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.021 \\ (0.018-0.024) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 0 2 4} \\ (0.020-0.027) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 2 7}$ <br> $(0.023-0.032)$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 3 0}$ <br> $(0.025-0.035)$ |
| 20-day | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{0 . 0 0 4} \\ (0.003-0.004) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{0 . 0 0 5} \\ (0.004-0.006) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.007 \\ (0.006-0.008) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 8}$ <br> $(0.007-0.009)$ <br> $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 6}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{0 . 0 1 0} \\ (0.009-0.011) \\ \hline \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 0 1 1} \\ (0.010-0.012) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.012 \\ (0.011-0.014) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 0 1 4} \\ (0.012-0.016) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{0 . 0 1 5} \\ (0.013-0.018) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 0 1 7} \\ (0.014-0.020) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 30-day | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 3}$ <br> $(0.003-0.003)$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 4}$ <br> $(0.003-0.004)$ | 0.005 <br> $(0.004-0.006)$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 6}$ <br> $(0.005-0.007)$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 7}$ <br> $(0.006-0.008)$ | 0.008 <br> $(0.007-0.009)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.009 \\ (0.008-0.010) \end{gathered}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1 0}$ <br> $(0.009-0.012)$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 0 1 1} \\ (0.010-0.013) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 0 1 2} \\ (0.010-0.014) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 45-day | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 2}$ <br> $(0.002-0.002)$ <br> 0.002 | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 3}$ <br> $(0.003-0.003)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.004 \\ (0.003-0.004) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 5}$ <br> $(0.004-0.005)$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 5}$ <br> $(0.005-0.006)$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 6}$ <br> $(0.005-0.007)$ <br> 0.005 | $\begin{gathered} 0.007 \\ (0.006-0.008) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 0 0 7} \\ (0.006-0.008) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 8}$ <br> $(0.007-0.009)$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 9}$ <br> $(0.007-0.010)$ |
| 60-day | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 2}$ <br> $(0.002-0.002)$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 2}$ <br> $(0.002-0.003)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.003 \\ (0.003-0.004) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 0 0 4} \\ (0.003-0.004) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 4}$ <br> $(0.004-0.005)$ | 0.005 <br> $(0.004-0.006)$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathbf{0 . 0 0 5} \\ (0.005-0.006) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 0 0 6} \\ (0.005-0.007) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 6}$ <br> $(0.006-0.007)$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 7}$ <br> $(0.006-0.008)$ |

[^1]Back to Top
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## RATIONAL FORMULA METHOD RUNOFF COEFFICIENTS

| Land Use or Surface Characteristics | Aver. \% Impervious Area |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { efficients } \\ & \text { 100-Year } \\ & \left(C_{100}\right) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Business/Commercial: |  |  |  |
| Downtown Areas | 85 | . 82 | . 85 |
| Neighborhood Areas | 70 | . 65 | . 80 |
| Residential: |  |  |  |
| (Average Lot Size) |  |  |  |
| $1 / 8$ Acre or Less (Multi-Unit) | 65 | . 60 | . 78 |
| 1/4 Acre | 38 | . 50 | . 65 |
| 1/8 Acre | 30 | . 45 | . 60 |
| 1/2 Acre | 25 | . 40 | . 55 |
| 1 Acre | 20 | . 35 | . 50 |
| Industrial: | 72 | . 68 | . 82 |
| Open Space: |  |  |  |
| (Lawns, Parks, Golf Courses) | 5 | . 05 | . 30 |
| Undeveloped Areas: |  |  |  |
| Range | 0 | . 20 | . 50 |
| Forest | 0 | . 05 | . 30 |
| Streets/Roads: |  |  |  |
| Paved | 100 | . 88 | . 93 |
| Gravel | 20 | . 25 | . 50 |
| Drives/Walks: | 95 | . 87 | . 90 |
| Roof: | 90 | . 85 | . 87 |

Notes:

1. Composite runoff coefficients shown for Residential, Industrial, and Business/Commercial Areas assume irrigated grass landscaping for all pervious areas. For development with landscaping other than irrigated grass, the designer must develop project specific composite runoff coefficients from the surface characteristics presented in this table.

| VERSION: April 30, 2009 |
| :--- |
| $W /=-N G\|N F=\| N G$ |

## REFERENCE:

USDCM, DROCOG, 1969

TABLE (with modifications)




Project: BMCHS Expansion
Project Location: Reno NV
Time of Concentration Table, Existing 5-year storm event
BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS ONE PROJECTATA TIME

| Drainage Basin | Drainage <br> Area (AC) | Weighted <br> Average <br> C-Factor 5- <br> Year | Overland |  |  | Channelized Flow |  |  |  | Gutter Flow |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{T}+\mathrm{Tt}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Urbanized Basins Check | Final | NOAA <br> ATLAS 14 <br> Rainfall <br> Intensity | Rational Flow |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Li (ft) | S (ft/ft) | Ti (min) | Ls (ft) | $\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | V (ft/s) | Tt1 (min) | Lt (ft) | S (ft/ft) | V (ft/s) | Tt2 (min) | Tc (min) | Tc*(min) | Tc (min) | (in/hour) | Q5-year (cfs) |
| X-1 | 11.62 | 0.20 | 1779.3 | 0.028 | 49.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 49.0 | 19.9 | 19.9 | 1.02 | 2.3 |
| X-10 | 0.40 | 0.76 | 241.0 | 0.021 | 7.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.4 | 11.3 | 7.4 | 1.60 | 0.5 |
| X-2 | 2.01 | 0.51 | 77.2 | 0.113 | 4.2 |  |  |  |  | 962.5 | 0.011 | 2.1 | 7.7 | 11.9 | 15.8 | 11.9 | 1.29 | 1.3 |
| X-3 | 1.87 | 0.35 | 193.3 | 0.048 | 11.2 | 329.3 | 0.005 | 1.2 | 4.7 |  |  |  |  | 15.8 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 1.24 | 0.8 |
| X-4 | 1.69 | 0.64 | 115.5 | 0.010 | 8.8 | 407.3 | 0.032 | 2.9 | 2.3 |  |  |  |  | 11.2 | 12.9 | 11.2 | 1.32 | 1.4 |
| X-5 | 0.35 | 0.05 | 61.2 | 0.095 | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 | 10.3 | 7.0 | 1.64 | 0.0 |
| X-6 | 0.11 | 0.23 | 110.5 | 0.070 | 8.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.6 | 10.6 | 8.6 | 1.50 | 0.0 |
| X-7 | 1.37 | 0.32 | 23.6 | 0.051 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  | 492.9 | 0.018 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 12.9 | 7.0 | 1.64 | 0.7 |
| X-8 | 0.69 | 0.85 | 88.5 | 0.010 | 4.2 | 66.6 | 0.010 | 1.6 | 0.7 |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 10.9 | 5.0 | 1.81 | 1.1 |
| X-9 | 2.77 | 0.54 | 214.0 | 0.035 | 9.7 | 507.6 | 0.007 | 1.4 | 6.3 |  |  |  |  | 16.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 1.19 | 1.8 |

Project: BMCHS Expansion
Project Location: Reno NV
Time of Concentration Table, Existing 100-year storm event

## 

| Drainage <br> Basin | Drainage <br> Area (AC) | Weighted Average C-Factor 100-Year | Overland |  |  | Channelized Flow |  |  |  | Gutter Flow |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{Ti}+\mathrm{Tt}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ <br> Tc (min) | Urbanized <br> Basins <br> Check <br> Tc*(min) | FinalTc (min) | NOAA ATLAS 14 <br> Rainfall <br> Intensity <br> (in/hour) | Rational FlowQ100-year (cfs) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Li (ft) | $\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | Ti (min) | Ls (ft) | $\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | V (ft/s) | Tt1 (min) | Lt (ft) | $\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | V (ft/s) | Tt2 (min) |  |  |  |  |  |
| X-1 | 11.62 | 0.46 | 1779.3 | 0.028 | 49.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 49.0 | 19.9 | 19.9 | 2.55 | 13.5 |
| X-10 | 0.40 | 0.86 | 241.0 | 0.021 | 7.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.4 | 11.3 | 7.4 | 4.00 | 1.4 |
| X-2 | 2.01 | 0.69 | 77.2 | 0.113 | 4.2 |  |  |  |  | 962.5 | 0.011 | 2.1 | 7.7 | 11.9 | 15.8 | 11.9 | 3.22 | 4.5 |
| X-3 | 1.87 | 0.55 | 193.3 | 0.048 | 11.2 | 329.3 | 0.005 | 1.2 | 4.7 |  |  |  |  | 15.8 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 3.10 | 3.2 |
| X-4 | 1.69 | 0.74 | 115.5 | 0.010 | 8.8 | 407.3 | 0.032 | 2.9 | 2.3 |  |  |  |  | 11.2 | 12.9 | 11.2 | 3.30 | 4.1 |
| X-5 | 0.35 | 0.30 | 61.2 | 0.095 | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 | 10.3 | 7.0 | 4.08 | 0.4 |
| X-6 | 0.11 | 0.52 | 110.5 | 0.070 | 8.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.6 | 10.6 | 8.6 | 3.74 | 0.2 |
| X-7 | 1.37 | 0.51 | 23.6 | 0.051 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  | 492.9 | 0.018 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 12.9 | 7.0 | 4.09 | 2.9 |
| X-8 | 0.69 | 0.87 | 88.5 | 0.010 | 4.2 | 66.6 | 0.010 | 1.6 | 0.7 |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 10.9 | 5.0 | 4.52 | 2.7 |
| X-9 | 2.77 | 0.68 | 214.0 | 0.035 | 9.7 | 507.6 | 0.007 | 1.4 | 6.3 |  |  |  |  | 16.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 2.97 | 5.6 |

Project：BMCHS Expansion
Project Location：Reno NV
Time of Concentration Table，Proposed 5－year storm event
யロロロ マロロGERS BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS ONEPROJECTATATIME

| Drainage Basin | Drainage <br> Area（AC） | Weighted Average C－Factor 5－ Year | Overland |  |  | Channelized Flow |  |  |  | Gutter Flow |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{Ti}+\mathrm{Tt}) \end{array} \\ \hline \\ \mathrm{Tc}(\mathrm{~min}) \end{gathered}$ | Urbanized <br> Basins <br> Check <br> Tc＊（min） |  |  | Rational Flow Q5－year（cfs） |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Li（ft） | $\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | Ti（min） | Ls（ft） | $\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | V （ft／s） | Tt1（min） | Lt（ft） | $\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | V （ft／s） | Tt2（min） |  |  |  |  |  |
| P－1 | 11.60 | 0.25 | 1779.3 | 0.028 | 45.9 | 12.7 | 0.107 | 5.3 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 46.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 1.02 | 3.0 |
| P－10 | 0.40 | 0.76 | 241.0 | 0.021 | 7.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.4 | 11.3 | 7.4 | 1.60 | 0.5 |
| P－2 | 1.99 | 0.56 | 77.2 | 0.113 | 3.9 |  |  |  |  | 962.5 | 0.011 | 2.1 | 7.7 | 11.5 | 15.8 | 11.5 | 1.31 | 1.4 |
| P－3 | 2.30 | 0.74 | 46.0 | 0.051 | 2.6 | 666.2 | 0.009 | 1.5 | 7.2 |  |  |  |  | 9.8 | 14.0 | 9.8 | 1.40 | 2.4 |
| P－4 | 1.70 | 0.64 | 115.5 | 0.010 | 8.8 | 407.3 | 0.032 | 2.9 | 2.3 |  |  |  |  | 11.2 | 12.9 | 11.2 | 1.32 | 1.5 |
| P－5 | 0.15 | 0.66 | 44.7 | 0.057 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  | 121.3 | 0.006 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 4.4 | 10.9 | 5.0 | 1.81 | 0.2 |
| P－6 | 0.14 | 0.62 | 49.1 | 0.059 | 3.3 |  |  |  |  | 98.1 | 0.023 | 3.1 | 0.5 | 3.9 | 10.8 | 5.0 | 1.81 | 0.2 |
| P－7 | 0.82 | 0.43 | 23.6 | 0.051 | 3.4 |  |  |  |  | 492.9 | 0.018 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 6.4 | 12.9 | 6.4 | 1.69 | 0.6 |
| P－8 | 1.22 | 0.85 | 88.5 | 0.010 | 4.2 | 66.6 | 0.010 | 1.6 | 0.7 |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 10.9 | 5.0 | 1.81 | 1.9 |
| P－9 | 2.50 | 0.81 | 144.2 | 0.010 | 6.3 | 440.6 | 0.003 | 0.9 | 8.3 |  |  |  |  | 14.6 | 13.2 | 13.2 | 1.22 | 2.5 |

Project: BMCHS Expansion
Project Location: Reno NV
Time of Concentration Table, Proposed 100-year storm event

## 

| Drainage <br> Basin | Drainage <br> Area (AC) | Weighted <br> Average <br> C-Factor <br> 100-Year | Overland |  |  | Channelized Flow |  |  |  | Gutter Flow |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{Ti}+\mathrm{Tt}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ <br> Tc (min) | Urbanized <br> Basins <br> Check <br> Tc*(min) | FinalTc (min) | NOAA ATLAS 14 <br> Rainfall <br> Intensity <br> (in/hour) | Rational FlowQ100-year (cfs) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Li (ft) | $\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | Ti (min) | Ls (ft) | $\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | V (ft/s) | Tt1 (min) | Lt (ft) | $\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | V (ft/s) | Tt2 (min) |  |  |  |  |  |
| P-1 | 11.60 | 0.49 | 1779.3 | 0.028 | 45.9 | 12.7 | 0.107 | 5.3 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 46.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 2.54 | 14.6 |
| P-10 | 0.40 | 0.86 | 241.0 | 0.021 | 7.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.4 | 11.3 | 7.4 | 4.00 | 1.4 |
| P-2 | 1.99 | 0.72 | 77.2 | 0.113 | 3.9 |  |  |  |  | 962.5 | 0.011 | 2.1 | 7.7 | 11.5 | 15.8 | 11.5 | 3.26 | 4.7 |
| P-3 | 2.30 | 0.82 | 46.0 | 0.051 | 2.6 | 666.2 | 0.009 | 1.5 | 7.2 |  |  |  |  | 9.8 | 14.0 | 9.8 | 3.49 | 6.6 |
| P-4 | 1.70 | 0.74 | 115.5 | 0.010 | 8.8 | 407.3 | 0.032 | 2.9 | 2.3 |  |  |  |  | 11.2 | 12.9 | 11.2 | 3.30 | 4.2 |
| P-5 | 0.15 | 0.76 | 44.7 | 0.057 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  | 121.3 | 0.006 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 4.4 | 10.9 | 5.0 | 4.52 | 0.5 |
| P-6 | 0.14 | 0.73 | 49.1 | 0.059 | 3.3 |  |  |  |  | 98.1 | 0.023 | 3.1 | 0.5 | 3.9 | 10.8 | 5.0 | 4.52 | 0.5 |
| P-7 | 0.82 | 0.59 | 23.6 | 0.051 | 3.4 |  |  |  |  | 492.9 | 0.018 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 6.4 | 12.9 | 6.4 | 4.21 | 2.0 |
| P-8 | 1.22 | 0.87 | 88.5 | 0.010 | 4.2 | 66.6 | 0.010 | 1.6 | 0.7 |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 10.9 | 5.0 | 4.52 | 4.8 |
| P-9 | 2.50 | 0.85 | 144.2 | 0.010 | 6.3 | 440.6 | 0.003 | 0.9 | 8.3 |  |  |  |  | 14.6 | 13.2 | 13.2 | 3.06 | 6.5 |

APPENDIX C

Worksheet for Pressurized North 12"

| Project Description | Manning <br> Formula <br> Friction Method <br> Solve For |
| :--- | :---: |
| Input Data |  |
| Pressure 2 at 1 |  |
| Elevation 1 | 0.00 psi |
| Elevation 2 | $4,552.50 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Length | $4,552.38 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Roughness Coefficient | 44.0 ft |
| Diameter | 0.013 |
| Discharge | 12.0 in |
| Results | 6.50 cfs |
| Pressure 1 |  |
| Headloss | 0.58 psi |
| Energy Grade 1 | 1.46 ft |
| Energy Grade 2 | $4,554.91 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Hydraulic Grade 1 | $4,553.44 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Hydraulic Grade 2 | $4,553.84 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Flow Area | $4,552.38 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Wetted Perimeter | $0.8 \mathrm{ft}{ }^{2}$ |
| Velocity | 3.1 ft |
| Velocity Head | $8.28 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Friction Slope | 1.06 ft |

Worksheet for Pressurized South 12"

| Project Description | Manning <br> Formula |
| :--- | :---: |
| Friction Method | Pressure at 1 |
| Solve For |  |
| Input Data | 0.00 psi |
| Pressure 2 | $4,555.03 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Elevation 1 | $4,554.18 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Elevation 2 | 120.0 ft |
| Length | 0.013 |
| Roughness Coefficient | 12.0 in |
| Diameter | 6.60 cfs |
| Discharge |  |
|  |  |
| Results | 1.42 psi |
| Pressure 1 | 4.12 ft |
| Headloss | $4,559.40 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Energy Grade 1 | $4,555.28 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Energy Grade 2 | $4,558.30 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Hydraulic Grade 1 | $4,554.18 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Hydraulic Grade 2 | $0.8 \mathrm{ft}{ }^{2}$ |
| Flow Area | 3.1 ft |
| Wetted Perimeter | $8.40 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Velocity | 1.10 ft |
| Velocity Head | $3.432 \%$ |
| Friction Slope |  |
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# Bishop Manogue Business Park Flood Control Master Plan Washoe County, Nevada 

The Bishop Manogue Business Park Flood Control Master Plan was developed in order to provide a framework and guidance for future development of the Bishop Manogue property. This property is located west of US 395 and approximately two miles north of the US 395/Mount Rose highway intersection.

This Flood Control Master Plan is intended to:

1. Quantify flow of Whites Creek drainage which originates off-site, with branch 1 A flowing through the proposed development site.
2. Provide conceptual design of a storm water detention basin located between the two main roads entering into the property off of US 395, and
3. Include hydrologic and hydraulic analyses which will be performed in accordance with currently accepted engineering practices.

The Flood Control Master Plan was prepared by Nimbus Engineers at the request of Jeff Codega Planning/Design, Inc. The plan has been developed to meet all of the requirements of Washoe County for the overall project development. The on-site hydrology for the property has been done in keeping with the master planning effort; however, this should not be construed to mean that individual hydrologic and hydraulic analyses are not needed for development of individual properties and phases of the overall program.

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Bishop Manogue Business Park property lies adjacent to US 395 (South Virginia Street) along its west side, and north of the Zolezzi Lane intersection with US 395. The Business Park parcel is comprised of approximately 86 acres (Figure 1).

This Flood Control Master Plan has been prepared to address the issues of incorporating the Bishop Manogue Business Park on-site detention facilities into the overall development plan for the property. This plan was developed to ensure that under developed conditions the amount of surface water leaving the site will not exceed the amount of flow which occurs under existing conditions. Under existing conditions, the amount of flow leaving the property at its northeast corner was calculated to be 87 cubic feet per second (cfs) by Nimbus Engineers. This amount was determined using a HEC-1 hydrologic model for the previously approved Eccles Subdivision originally proposed for this property in 1996. The HEC-1 model is included in Appendix B. The purpose of the Master Plan is to provide a workable approach to storm water and flood control for the proposed property development.

Plates 1 and 2, contained within the report, show the existing and the proposed development conditions addressing the surface water flow from Whites Creek Branch 1A.


FIGURE 1
Vicinity Map

### 2.0 PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA

The approximate 86 acre Bishop Manogue Business Park lies within the Whites Creek Drainage Basin. Figure 1 shows its location within respect to the rest of the valley and its proximity to the City of Reno. The entire parcel is located within Section 17, Township 18 North, Range 20 East.

The majority of the property is covered with native grasses, with some small trees alongside of Whites Creek Branch 1A. Branch 1A is the main surface water feature found within the boundaries of the Bishop Manogue Business Park. This branch enters the property at the southwest corner and flows in a northeasterly direction until coming into contact with US 395. At US 395, there is a $2 \times 7$-foot box culvert and a 24 -inch diameter circular culvert which convey the water underneath the highway. These two culverts are capable of handling approximately 100 cfs during a 100 -year, 24-hour storm event. The remaining water flows either northward or southward in drainage ditches that parallel the highway. This water eventually crosses underneath US 395 via other culverts and flows eastward until it enters Steamboat Creek.

### 3.0 MASTER PLAN CONCEPT

The following Master Plan Concept, which shows developed conditions, is a follow-on to the existing conditions report for Eccles Ranch Subdivision which was prepared and submitted by Nimbus Engineers to Washoe County in November 1996. This Master Plan will provide information regarding new development plans for the Bishop Manogue Business Park since the 1996 existing conditions report.

During the 100 -year, 24 -hour storm event, the existing conditions hydrologic model calculates a surface water flow entering the property at its southwest corner of 200 cfs and 87 cfs leaving the property at the northeast corner. The remaining portion of the flow will either go underneath US 395 via a $2 \times 7$ foot box culvert and a 24 -inch culvert, or flow northward or southward through drainage ditches which parallel the highway. The amount of water that goes under the highway via the two culverts was calculated to be 100 cfs. The amount that flows southward in the drainage ditch was calculated to be approximately $40-50 \mathrm{cfs}$, and the amount that flows northward was calculated to be 46 cfs.

Under proposed conditions, at the end of total property build-out, the HEC-1 model calculated the exit flow from a 100-year, 24-hour storm event to be 82 cfs . This is the amount of water which will exit the property in the northeast corner.

### 4.0 MASTER PLAN APPLICATION

As noted earlier and throughout the document, this Master Plan is a plan and concept document. The technical analyses which were performed for the document were done in sufficient detail to develop the peak flows. The on-site hydrology for Bishop Manogue has been done in keeping with the master planning effort. The technical analyses which support this Flood Control Master Plan are based upon methodologies which are currently acceptable to Washoe County.

The major components of this Flood Control Master Plan have been sufficiently evaluated for the purposes of preliminary design and conceptual designs. It is not envisioned that any of the "regional" features of this project will be significantly modified. However, the structures which were used in the analysis are only one approach to the actual design which may be used in the ultimate configuration. It will be the responsibility of the design engineer to utilize current standards of practice and to perform final analysis on any proposed improvements, prior to submitting plans or specifications for any of the improvements.

### 5.0 PREVIOUS STUDIES

In 1994 Cella Barr Associates prepared a report for Washoe County entitled Preliminary Whites Creek Basin Management Study. This report is used by Washoe County as a basis for drainage design within the Whites Creek drainage basin.

In October 1995, Nimbus Engineers completed a HEC-1 hydrologic model for the Wedge Meadows sub-division which is located south of Zolezzi Lane and west of US 395. Where Branch 1A enters the Bishop Manogue property in the southwest corner, the HEC-1 model calculated a flow of 200 cfs from the 100 -year, 24 -hour storm event.

In November 1996, Nimbus Engineers completed an existing conditions HEC-1 hydrologic and HEC-2 hydraulic model for the Eccle's Ranch Subdivision. This property is the same as the Bishop Manogue Business Park property. The surface water model which was developed for Branch 1A ( 200 cfs ) indicated that 154 cfs exits the property either at the Branch 1A/US 395 culvert, or as flow which flows either southward or northward in drainage ditches which parallel the highway. At the exit point in the northeast corner of the property, where water which flows northward from Branch 1A and the surface water runoff from the property commingle, the model calculates that 87 cfs will flow northward at this point.

### 6.0 HYDROLOGIC ANALYSES

The hydrologic analyses which were performed for this project were developed using the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer's Flood Hydrograph HEC-1 program 4.0. The base model which was used for the hydrologic analysis for this report was the Nimbus HEC-1 model which was developed in support of the Eccles Ranch Sub-Division Report (reference 3).

### 6.1 Methodology

The HEC-1 model, version 4.0 was utilized to estimate the peak flow of a 100-year, 24-hour storm event for developed conditions. The following hydrologic parameters were used within the HEC-1 model for the Whites Creek Hydrographic Basin.

## Rainfall Depth and Distribution

The rainfall depths used in the HEC-1 model were obtained from the National Weather Service's Southwest Semi-arid Precipitation Frequency Study Group (SSPFS, 1997). This precipitation data was incorporated into the Department of Water Resources, Washoe County Precipitation Frequency map for the 24 -hour, 100 -year storm event. The actual data used in the model was developed from the base model and was not modified for this model and report.

## Drainage Basin Delineation

All of the basins used within the model are the same as those used for the existing conditions Nimbus model with exceptions to reflect Bishop Manogue development drainage patterns. The drainage basins within and adjacent to the Bishop Manogue property are shown on Plate 1 for existing conditions and on Plate 2 for proposed conditions.

## Runoff Curve Number

To calculate the curve number, the types of soil contained within each of the sub-basins were identified by soil hydrologic groups. Soils in the U.S. have been classified by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service (SCS) into four hydrologic soil groups: A, B, C, and D. Group A soils have a rapid infiltration rate and include very porous soils such as sandy soils. Group D soils have a very slow infiltration rate which results in a larger percentage of the rainfall expressed as runoff. Water infiltration rates decrease from soil groups A through D. The soil groups were obtained from the Soil Survey of Washoe County, South Part, Nevada.

Relative soil moisture content is described in the SCS methodology by a term identified as "antecedent moisture condition" (AMC). Three different relative conditions are described by the SCS: AMC I, II, and III. AMC I is an extremely dry condition where soil moisture has been depleted and infiltration rates for the soil are near their maximum. AMC III is a saturated condition and AMC II is an average condition. AMC II is the condition that is used for hydrologic analyses in the western states and was used in the present analysis.

## Basin Lag Time

Basin lag time, is the time between the center of mass of rainfall excess and the peak of the unit
hydrograph. Methodologies outlined in the Washoe County's Hydrologic Criteria and Drainage Design Manual (reference 5) were used to calculate basin lag time for the new sub-basins added as part of the development phase.

## Hydrograph Routing

Channel routing and overland flow routing were performed mostly with the Muskingum method in the original base model. In the constructed channels that were modeled as part of the developed phase, the Muskingum-Cunge Routing method was used. The routing parameters for the reaches modeled included channel and overbank characteristics, lengths, slopes, and typical roughness. The Modified Puls Routing Method was used to route the hydrograph through the proposed detention basins.

Table 1 highlights the existing and the proposed sub-basin parameters with regard to surfacewater flow, which include basin area, curve number, and lag time. Total flow at the northeast property corner is 87 cfs under existing conditions, and 82 cfs under proposed conditions.

Table 1 HEC-1 Sub-basin Modeling Parameters for Existing and Proposed Conditions

| Sub-basin (No.) |  | Basin Area (sq. mi) |  | Curve Number |  | Lag Time (hours) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing | Proposed | Existing | Proposed | Existing | Proposed | Existing | Proposed |
| EC-1 |  | 0.148 |  | 80 |  | 0.58 |  |
|  | EC-1A |  | 0.0191 |  | 79 |  | 0.20 |
|  | EC-1B |  | 0.0128 |  | 94 |  | 0.12 |
|  | EC-1C |  | 0.0232 |  | 94 |  | 0.09 |
|  | EC-1D |  | 0.023 |  | 94 |  | 0.14 |
|  | EC-1E |  | 0.0172 |  | 92 |  | 0.05 |
|  | EC-1H |  | 0.0112 |  | 74 |  | 0.14 |
|  | EC-1G |  | 0.0235 |  | 80 |  | 0.18 |
| EC-2 | EC-2 | 0.149 | 0.104 | 73 | 77 | 0.16 | 0.22 |

### 7.0 HYDRAULIC ANALYSES

Under developed conditions, the 100-year, 24-hour storm event peak flow will overflow the banks of Whites Creek Branch 1A and travel across the proposed Bishop Manogue Business Park property in a northeasterly direction. At the intersection of the creek branch with US 395, approximately 100 cfs will flow eastward underneath the highway via two culverts. One of the culverts is 24 inches in diameter, while the second is a $2 \times 7$-foot box culvert. Not all of the water will flow eastward through these two culverts. Some water will flow southward via a drainage ditch and go underneath the highway near the US 395/Zolezzi lane intersection. The remaining portion ( 46 cfs ) will flow northward via a drainage ditch, until coming into contact with Cara Blanca Drive. At this street, the water will flow through two 24 -inch culverts capable of handling 60 cfs . The capacity of the culverts allows all of the water to flow through the culverts and not overtop Cara Blanca Drive. After flowing past Cara Blanca, the water will flow into the 50 foot wide by 840 foot long detention basin. This detention basin will be constructed to a depth of approximately 3 feet, contain 3 to 1 side slopes and have a storage capacity of approximately 3 acre-feet. As the water is flowing northward out of the detention basin, the water will flow through two elliptical $30 \times 19$-inch culverts at Sierra Nevada Drive. At peak flow, the water will overtop Sierra Nevada drive and flow through a designed dip section in the road. The depth of the water flowing through the dip section will be approximately 0.6 feet. The surface water will then flow through a channel that is 285 feet long and has a bottom width of 12 -feet. This channel will be constructed approximately 2 feet deep with 3 to 1 side slopes. This channel will convey all of the surface water and will exit the property in the northeast comer.

Commingling with the surface water flow from Branch 1 A will be the surface runoff which is generated from development of the seven on-site sub-basins. Total flow leaving the site was calculated to be 82 cfs under developed conditions.

A HEC-2 model was developed by Nimbus to better define the existing conditions for the Whites Creek Branch 1A channel flow. A print-out of the HEC-2 existing conditions model is included in Appendix D.

Flow diversion and detention facilities will be utilized to safely convey the 100 -year, 24 -hour storm event peak flow through the proposed Bishop Manogue Business Park development and limit the amount of water leaving the property via the northeast corner to not greater than the existing conditions flow of 87 cfs , flow diversions and detention facilities will be utilized. The three detention facilities which will be constructed on-site, are described as follows.

Within the northwest property corner, the football practice field with a capacity of 9.73 acre-feet will serve as a detention facility for the surface flow which originates from on-site sub-basin EC1 A , and sub-basins EC-3, EC-4, EC-5, and EC-6 which originate off-site to the west. By holding the surface runoff within the practice field detention basin and allowing it to slowly drain through an 18 -inch culvert, the water arrives at the northeast corner exit point after the peak flow and does not add or contribute to the peak flow amount of 82 cfs .

A second detention facility (South Virginia Detention Basin) was constructed between two streets (Sierra Nevada and Cara Blanca). These two streets serve as entrance points to the property from the east, off US 395 . The detention facility was developed by widening the proposed drainage ditch from 12 feet to 50 feet over its entire length of 840 feet. This increased the storage capacity to approximately 3 acre-feet. The actual capacity is dependent upon depth of water prior to flowing northward through the culverts and overtopping Sierra Nevada Drive. By installing the detention basin along this reach, the surface water is held for a longer period of time, which allows for a lower peak flow at the exit point.

The third on-site detention facility is located in the northeast corner of the US Post Office parcel. This site is the second parcel west of US 395 and is located along the northern property boundary. All surface water runoff which is generated on-site is conveyed to the 0.214 acre-feet detention facility. For modeling purposes, no water from this parcel was considered to be conveyed off-site.

Surface water from EC-7 will be collected and conveyed down-gradient along the northern property boundary in a storm drain. Surface water from the practice field detention basin outlet, and water from EC-1H are both added, to the storm drain further down-gradient. All of this water will be conveyed via an 18 -inch storm drain to the northeast corner were it will daylight into the open channel at the exit point. It is anticipated that an energy dissipater will be required at the storm drain exit point.

### 8.0 CONCLUSIONS

Given the current data available, its interpretation, and the results of the HEC-1 modeling runs, the following conclusions have been arrived at for development of the Flood Control Master Plan at the proposed Bishop Manogue Business Park.

- For existing conditions, the HEC-1 model calculated the surface water flow exiting the property in the northeast corner to be 87 cfs . This flow amount was submitted to Washoe County and approved as the accepted amount.
- For developed conditions, the HEC-1 model calculated the surface runoff water which exited the property in the northeast corner to be 82 cfs .
- Under developed conditions, sub-basin EC-1 was divided into 7 smaller sub-basins which were categorized by grading plans, parking lots, building structures, and open areas.
- The amount of surface water runoff from sub-basin EC-2 was also evaluated. This evaluation of EC-2 was completed because some of the Bishop Manogue Business Park development is proposed to take place in this sub-basin, in addition to EC-1. Under proposed conditions for the development, the amount of runoff for EC-2 was calculated to be 49 cfs . Under existing conditions the flow for EC-2 was calculated to be 66 cfs . The flow reduction occurred because the basin area was reduced from 0.149 square miles to 0.099 square miles. This reduction in size of EC-2 occurred because the grading and development of EC-1 caused some of the surface water to drain towards EC-1 instead of EC-2.
- Three on-site detention facilities will be required to enable the developed conditions runoff peak flow not to exceed the existing conditions limit of 87 cfs .
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December 13， 2023
Project No． 4412001

Mr．Jeff Klippenstein
H＋K Architects
5485 Reno Corporate Drive，Suite 100
Reno，NV 89511

Re：Geotechnical Review Letter
Bishop Manogue Catholic High School Expansion
APN 162－010－28－ 110 Bishop Manogue Drive
Reno，Washoe County，Nevada

Ref：International Building Code（IBC） 2018

Dear Mr．Klippenstein：
Wood Rodgers is pleased to present our geotechnical letter for the special use permit process specific to proposed additions to Bishop Manogue Catholic High School（BMCHS）．The purpose of this review is to develop a summary of geotechnical considerations that could influence design for the planned improvements to the property．

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The campus is located within the south suburban area of Washoe County．The project consists of extending the central portion of the two－story school to the west to increase the size of the cafeteria，and extending the theater，digital art，music，gymnasium and weight rooms，while adding additional classrooms（FIGURE A）．Total improvement area approaches 140，000 square feet．

## CODE CONSIDERATIONS

Based on a construction window of 2003 to 2004，BMCHS would have been originally designed under the 1997 Uniform Building Code．Contemporary code，as adopted by Washoe County，is the 2018 International Building Code（IBC）．The most significant change between codes is specific to seismic design．Attached with this report is the ASCE 7 seismic hazard report based on Site Class D and Risk Category III，which presents a PGA $_{M}$ of 0.918 g for the project．

It has been assumed the property has been vetted for fault structures regarding potential activity，recency of movement，and potential for surface rupture．The original geotechnical report should be reviewed（if available），or seismic surveys performed during the performance of a design level report，to vet seismic risk with regard to liquefaction potential．

Jeff Klippenstein
$\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{K}$ Architects
December 13, 2023
Project No. 4412001
Page $\mathbf{2}$ of $\mathbf{3}$

## SITE CONDITIONS

The BMCHS campus encompasses an area of approximately 48 acres with a central latitude and longitude of $39.4238^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ and $-119.7647^{\circ} \mathrm{E}$, respectively. Site access from the east off South Virginia Street onto Bishop Manogue Drive. The property is bordered by residential developments to the west and the south, and commercial developments to the north and east. The project area is comprised of one parcel, Washoe County APN 162-010-28.

From the southwest portion of project area, the site slopes downward to the northeast at approximately 2-percent. The school is situated at approximately the center of the parcel, and is surrounded by baseball fields, tennis courts and football and soccer fields to the south, west and north. The bulk of the addition area is occupied by landscaping and/or rough graded zones capped with aggregate.

## GEOLOGIC AND SOIL AND GROUNDWATER CONDITIONS

Based on the United States Geologic Survey (USGS), Preliminary Geologic Map of the Reno Urban Area, Nevada, Southern Half, the site is mapped in Holocene aged alluvial deposits. Natural Resource Conservation Services' (NRCS) Soil Survey Maps indicate that most of the site soils consist of fine-grained soils characterized as low plasticity silts and sands, and high plasticity gravelly clays. It is anticipated that during initial development the site was graded to mitigate the presence of near surface clay soils. However, the extent of that mitigation likely did not extend throughout the footprint of the proposed additions. Therefore, selective site grading is likely to be required.

Proximate to the project area, Nevada Division of Water Resources (NDWR) well logs indicate static water level approximately 25 -feet below the existing ground surface.

## CORROSION POTENTIAL FOR CONCRETE AND STEEL

NRCS maps present a low to moderate corrosion potential to concrete and a high corrosion potential for steel. Type II cement is anticipated to be suitable for all sitework and structural concrete.

## SITE GRADING AND DEVELOPMENT

As site development progresses and existing improvements are removed from within the footprint of the proposed additions, any exposed fine-grained soils (soils presenting more than 15-percent passing the \#200 sieve and a plasticity index greater than 15) should be removed and replaced with structural fill. Structural fill should be placed in 12 -inch loose lifts (maximum) and compacted to not less than 90 -percent of the soil's maximum dry density. Where existing fill is encountered, the fill should be verified to be
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structural quality and compacted (as indicated herein) prior to allowing the construction of footings, structural improvements, or placement of aggregate base for slab support.
Concrete slabs-on-grade, subject solely to foot traffic, should be underlain by at least 6 -inches of compacted aggregate base. In addition to the base course, a moisture vapor barrier should be installed as part of the overall slab-on-grade system.

## FOUNDATIONS

Based on NRCS mapping, it is anticipated standard spread foundations will perform adequately for the planned improvements.

## SUMMARY

We appreciate the opportunity to provide this review. Please note that this document has been prepared based on published data. Varying conditions, and conditions not yet identified, may come to light or may be encountered during development of a design-level geotechnical report. Please contact our office if you have any related questions.

Sincerely,
WOOD RODGERS, INCORPORATED



Engineering Assistant

## Attachments

Attachment A - Proposed Expansion \& Improvement Map
Attachment B - ASCE 7 Hazards Report


## Address:

No Address at This Location

## ASCE 7 Hazards Report

| Standard: | ASCE/SEI 7-16 | Latitude: 39.4238 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Risk Category: | III | Longitude: -119.7647 |
| Soil Class: | D - Stiff Soil | Elevation: 4560.47453167337 ft (NAVD |



## Seismic

Site Soil Class: $\quad$ D - Stiff Soil
Results:

| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{S}}:$ | 1.921 | $\mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{D} 1}:$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{S}_{1}:$ | 0.67 | $\mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{L}}:$ | 6 |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{a}}:$ | 1 | $\mathrm{PGA}:$ | 0.834 |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{V}}:$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{PGA}_{\mathrm{M}}:$ | 0.918 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{MS}}:$ | 1.921 | $\mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{PGA}}:$ | 1.1 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{M} 1}:$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{e}}:$ | 1.25 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{DS}}:$ | 1.281 | $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{V}}:$ | 1.484 |

Ground motion hazard analysis may be required. See ASCE/SEI 7-16 Section 11.4.8.

Data Accessed:
Wed Dec 132023
Date Source:

USGS Seismic Design Maps

The ASCE 7 Hazard Tool is provided for your convenience, for informational purposes only, and is provided "as is" and without warranties of any kind. The location data included herein has been obtained from information developed, produced, and maintained by third party providers; or has been extrapolated from maps incorporated in the ASCE 7 standard. While ASCE has made every effort to use data obtained from reliable sources or methodologies, ASCE does not make any representations or warranties as to the accuracy, completeness, reliability, currency, or quality of any data provided herein. Any third-party links provided by this Tool should not be construed as an endorsement, affiliation, relationship, or sponsorship of such third-party content by or from ASCE.

ASCE does not intend, nor should anyone interpret, the results provided by this Tool to replace the sound judgment of a competent professional, having knowledge and experience in the appropriate field(s) of practice, nor to substitute for the standard of care required of such professionals in interpreting and applying the contents of this Tool or the ASCE 7 standard.

In using this Tool, you expressly assume all risks associated with your use. Under no circumstances shall ASCE or its officers, directors, employees, members, affiliates, or agents be liable to you or any other person for any direct, indirect, special, incidental, or consequential damages arising from or related to your use of, or reliance on, the Tool or any information obtained therein. To the fullest extent permitted by law, you agree to release and hold harmless ASCE from any and all liability of any nature arising out of or resulting from any use of data provided by the ASCE 7 Hazard Tool.
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report has been prepared to present the results of a Transportation Operations Analysis (TOA) performed by Wood Rodgers, Inc. for the proposed Bishop Manogue High School Expansion Project (Project) located at 110 Bishop Manogue Drive within unincorporated Washoe County (County), Nevada. This analysis has been performed to determine any impacts the proposed Project may have on surrounding transportation facilities and identify potential mitigation measures that could be implemented to address any significant impacts. This TOA report was prepared in accordance with the City of Reno Development Code and traffic study guidelines.

## 1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

### 1.1 Project Description

The Project proposes to add 157,000 square feet in building expansion and expand enrollment up to 1,200 students from the existing 780 students. The Project is located west of Virginia Street between McCabe Drive and Bishop Manogue Drive.

The Project would maintain the existing access points at the north and south end of the site, at McCabe Drive and Bishop Manogue Drive respectively.

### 1.2 Project Generated Trips

New trips generated by the proposed Project were estimated using rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition (ITE). The Project site currently generates a total of 1,693 daily trips, 515 AM Peak Hour Trips (304 Inbound, 211 Outbound) and 312 Afternoon Peak Hour Trips (122 Inbound, 190 Outbound) under typical traffic demand conditions. With the Project, site traffic is estimated to increase generation by 911 daily trips, 277 AM Peak Hour Trips (164 Inbound, 114 Outbound), and 168 Afternoon Peak Hour Trips (66 Inbound, 102 Outbound) under typical weekday traffic demand conditions.

### 1.3 Intersection Operations

The TOA analyzed four (4) existing study intersections, including two (2) roundabouts, during weekday AM and weekday Afternoon site peak hour time periods under Existing, Existing Plus Project, Background, and Background Plus Project scenarios, respectively, using Synchro 11 software and HCM $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition methodologies. Peak hour queue lengths were checked using SimTraffic methodology. All study intersections and roadway segments are projected to operate at acceptable LOS under all study scenarios.

### 1.4 Pedestrian, Bicycle, Transit Facility Impacts

Pedestrians will be able to use the existing sidewalks to access the Project site on foot and bicycle. The Project is not projected to have any adverse effects on existing or planned pedestrian, bicycle, or transit facilities.

### 1.5 Safety Impacts

The Project proposes land uses consistent with other existing land uses in the vicinity. The Project is projected to operate similarly to the existing land uses and driveways in the area. Crash data did not display any areas of specific concern along Virginia Street or in the vicinity of the Project site that are likely associated with the Project.

### 1.6 Driveway Access

The Project would continue to access the surrounding roadway network via Virginia Street (US 395) at McCabe Drive and Bishop Manogue Drive. The Project trips are distributed between McCabe Drive and Bishop Manogue Drive. Project buildings and parking lots could be accessed by emergency vehicles via the existing Project driveway and internal drive aisles.

## 2 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

This report has been prepared to present the results of a TOA performed by Wood Rodgers, Inc. for the proposed Bishop Manogue High School Expansion Project (Project) located in unincorporated Washoe County, Nevada. This analysis has been performed to determine any impacts the proposed Project may have on surrounding intersections and identify potential mitigation measures that could be implemented to address any significant impacts. This analysis focuses on typical weekday operating conditions in and around the Project site.

The purpose of this TOA is to address the Project's impacts under Washoe County, City of Reno and Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) requirements and evaluate the Project's potential off-site and on-site traffic operations. A traffic operations analysis was conducted to evaluate the Project's potential traffic operational deficiencies and identify improvements as needed.

### 2.1 Project Description

The Project is located at 110 Bishop Manogue Drive, west of Virginia Street (US 395 Alt), between McCabe Drive and Bishop Manogue Drive, and consists of an existing approximately 152,300 square foot private high school with 780 students. The Project site is zoned as Medium Density Suburban (MDS).

The Project would maintain access to the existing roadway network via access at Virginia Street at McCabe Drive and Bishop Manogue Drive. The Project proposes to develop approximately 157,000 square feet in various building space to expand the student population from 780 students to 1,200 students.

The TOA analyzes full enrollment which would be able to accommodate up to 1,200 students, however the Project is projected to gradually gain the 320 students over the course of 10 years. The current location is shown in Figure 1. The Project Site Plan is included in Appendix A.


### 2.2 Study Area

Study facilities include the intersections and roadway segments described below.

### 2.2.1 Intersections

Study intersections and roadway segments were selected based on the Project trip generation estimate and distribution, and input from County staff. The following four (4) study intersections were analyzed in this TOA:

1. Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive
2. Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive
3. Bishop Manogue HS Access \& McCabe Drive (roundabout)
4. Bishop Manogue HS Access \& Bishop Manogue Drive (roundabout)

Note that the Virginia Street and Bishop Manogue Drive intersection is a channelized right-in, right-out access. The locations of the above study intersections are shown Figure 1

### 2.2.2 Pedestrian, Bicycle, Transit Facilities

This TOA analyzes Project impacts on pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities located in the vicinity of the study area intersections listed above and which would be used to gain access to the Project site.

### 2.3 Analysis Scenarios

The study facilities were evaluated under weekday AM peak hour (highest hour of traffic between 7 AM and 9 AM) and Afternoon Project peak hour (highest hour of traffic between 2 PM and 4 PM) conditions. All study intersections were evaluated under the following scenarios:

- Existing Conditions: Existing traffic volumes from collected traffic counts.
- Existing Plus Project Conditions: Existing traffic volumes plus traffic projected to be generated by the proposed Project.
- Background Conditions: Background condition volumes based on historical data found in the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) Traffic Records Information Access (TRINA) Application Data (2022).
- Background Plus Project Conditions: Background projected traffic volumes plus traffic projected to be generated by the proposed Project.


### 2.4 Analysis Methods

Traffic operations in this TOA have been quantified through the determination of "Level of Service" (LOS). Level of Service is a qualitative measure of traffic operating conditions, whereby a letter grade "A" through "F" is assigned to an intersection or roadway segment, representing progressively worsening traffic operations. LOS "A" represents free-flow conditions with little to no delays, while LOS " $F$ " represents jammed or grid-lock conditions.

### 2.4.1 Intersections

Intersection LOS has been calculated for all intersection control types using methods documented in the Transportation Research Board Publication Highway Capacity Manual, 6th Edition (HCM $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition) (Transportation Research Board, 2016). For one-way-stop-controlled (OWSC) and two-way-stop-controlled (TWSC) intersections, the "worst-case" movement delays and LOS are reported. For signalized intersections, the intersection delays and LOS reported are the "average" values for the whole intersection, similarly all-way-stopcontrolled (AWSC) intersection LOS is expressed in terms of the average vehicle delay of all of the movements. The calculated intersection delays correspond to the LOS designations shown in Table 1, which were derived from Exhibits 19-8 and 20-2 of the HCM $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition.

Table 1. HCM ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition Based Intersection LOS Thresholds

| Level of Service | Description | Intersection Control Delay (seconds/vehicle) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unsignalized | Signalized |
| A | Free-flow conditions with negligible to minimal delays. | delay $\leq 10.0$ | delay $\leq 10.0$ |
| B | Good progression with slight delays. | 10.0 < delay $\leq 15.0$ | 10.0 < delay $\leq 20.0$ |
| C | Relatively higher delays. | 15.0 < delay $\leq 25.0$ | 20.0 < delay $\leq 35.0$ |
| D | Somewhat congested conditions with longer but tolerable delays. | $25.0<$ delay $\leq 35.0$ | $35.0<$ delay $\leq 55.0$ |
| E | Congested conditions with significant delays. | 35.0 < delay $\leq 50.0$ | 55.0 < delay $\leq 80.0$ |
| F | Jammed or grid-lock type operating conditions. | delay $>50.0$ | delay $>80.0$ |
| Source: HCM 6th Edition Exhibit 19-8 and 20-2. |  |  |  |

HCM 6th Edition reports were generated to determine the delay and LOS at the study intersections in Synchro 11 software.

Because of the channelized free right on the eastbound turn at Bishop Manogue Drive, HCM 6 does not analyze the Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive intersection. LOS is determined utilizing microsimulation models of the study network using Sim Traffic 11. Ten (10) 1 hour model runs (with a 10-minute warm-up period) were run and averaged to obtain the movement delay for the intersection.

### 2.5 Level of Service Standards

The signalized intersection of Virginia Street and McCabe Drive is located within the City of Reno jurisdiction. Except for certain overlay districts, the City of Reno utilizes LOS "D" as the minimum LOS threshold for intersections during the AM and PM peak periods per the RTC 2040 Regional Transportation Plan. The Project is not located within one of these districts; therefore, this study uses LOS "D" as the minimum threshold at the signalized study intersections for traffic impact purposes.

The rest of the Project study intersections are considered to be part of unincorporated Washoe County. The Washoe County Development Code Division Four - Development Standards Contents (June 2023) Section 110.436.20 states that all major intersections and roadway segments should maintain LOS C or better. Therefore, this study uses LOS "C" as the minimum threshold at all non-signalized study intersections for traffic impact purposes.

### 2.6 Report Organization

The remainder of this report is divided into the following chapters:

- Chapter 2: Existing Conditions - Describes existing conditions and operations of the study area intersections, transit system, pedestrian facilities, and bicycle facilities.
- Chapter 3: Existing Plus Project Conditions - Describes the methods used to estimate and distribute Project generated traffic and the resulting study area operations under Existing Plus Project conditions.
- Chapter 4: Background Conditions - Describes projected conditions and operations of study area facilities under future growth Background conditions.
- Chapter 5: Background Plus Project Conditions - Describes projected conditions and operations of study area facilities under future Background Plus Project conditions.
- Chapter 6: Queueing Analysis- Describes the $95^{\text {th }}$ Percentile of vehicle queueing at the study intersections for all stop-controlled movements and movements with turn pockets.
- Chapter 7: Safety Evaluation- Describes the collision history at study facilities.


## 3 EXISTING CONDITIONS

This chapter describes the Existing roadway network, transit services, pedestrian facilities, and bicycle facilities within the study area. It also presents Existing traffic volumes at study intersections and traffic operations under Existing weekday AM and Afternoon peak hour conditions.

### 3.1 Existing Roadway Network

This section provides descriptions of the study area roadways.

Virginia Street, also known as US 395 Alt, is a north-south highway that provides connectivity to Interstate 580 1.6 miles north of the Project and 1.25 miles south of the Project. Within the Project area, Virginia Street is currently classified as a principal arterial by the NDOT Roadway Functional Classification map. The posted speed limit is 55 mph .

McCabe Drive/Auto Center Drive is an east-west 2-lane local roadway with the western limit in the Bishop Manogue High School parking lot and the eastern limit at Old Virginia Road. The speed limit is assumed to be 25 mph .

Bishop Manogue Drive is an east-west 2-lane local roadway with the western limit in the Bishop Manogue High School parking lot and the eastern limit at Virgina Street. The posted speed limit is 25 mph .

The Bishop Manogue HS Access is a north-south 2-lane semi-private roadway that runs along Bishop Manogue High School with two 1-lane roundabouts between McCabe Drive and Bishop Manogue Drive. The speed limit is assumed to be 25 mph .

### 3.2 Existing Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Facilities

Sidewalks exist along the eastern side of Virginia Street approximately 1,000 feet north of McCabe Drive to 400 feet north of Bishop Manogue Drive, and western side of Virgina Street 250 feet north of McCabe Drive to Bishop Manogue Drive. The Project site frontage currently has sidewalks and pedestrian access curb ramps. The signalized intersection of Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive has pedestrian crosswalks with push buttons and curb ramps on all legs. The unsignalized intersection of Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive has a pedestrian crosswalk with signage and curb ramps along the west leg of the intersection. The roundabouts of Bishop Manogue HS Access have curb ramps on all legs and a pedestrian crosswalk on the Bishop Manogue HS Access \& McCabe Drive south leg.

### 3.3 Bicycle Facilities

The Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County (RTC) Bicycle \& Pedestrian Master Plan (June 2017), classifies bikeway facilities as follows:

- Shared-Use Path - Shared use paths are facilities separated from the roadway, for the exclusive use of bicyclists and pedestrians, with minimal cross flow by motor vehicles.
- Bicycle Lane - A bicycle lane is within the paved street and are identified with striping, stencils, and signs for semi-exclusive use by bicyclists. Vehicle cross flow is generally permitted at intersections and driveways.
- Buffered Bike Lane - A buffered bike lane can be provided on roadways with sufficient width providing cyclists with a greater sense of security as they can travel farther away from vehicle traffic.
- Shared Lanes - Shared roadways provide right-of-way for bicycles in the vehicle travel lane with signs and pavement markings designating the shared travel way. A Shared Lane Marking (or "sharrow") can be marked in the outside lane of a shared roadway to show the suggested path of travel for bicyclists.
－Cycle Track－A cycle track is an exclusive bicycle facility that combines the user experience of a separated path with the on－street infrastructure of a conventional bike lane．A cycle track is physically separated from motor traffic distinct from the sidewalk．

Study area bicycle facilities have been identified using information from the latest aerial images and field visits． Within or near the Project study area，bicycle lanes were marked and identified along Virginia Street．

## 3．4 Transit Facilities

Existing transit service in the Project study area is provided by the RTC．The RTC operates transit service along fixed Route 56 and the Carson Express．

Route 56 travels through Sierra Center Parkway；Huffaker Lane；Bluestone Drive；Offenhauser Drive；Gateway Drive；Prototype Drive；Double Diamond Parkway；South Meadows Parkway；Double R Boulevard；Damonte Ranch Parkway；and Virginia Street，nearby the Project study area．Route 56 has stops located on Virginia Street north－ south of the Project site．The location of the Virginia Street and Auto Center Drive transit stop is approximately 175 feet north of the Virginia Street \＆McCabe Drive intersection．The location of the Virginia Street and McCabe Drive transit stop is approximately 155 feet south of the Virginia Street and McCabe Drive intersection．The location of the South Virginia Street and Damonte Ranch Parkway transit stop is approximately 0.2 miles south of the Virginia Street \＆Bishop Manogue Drive intersection．A summary of the local route is provided below：

Route 56 （South Meadowood）is a route service that runs northbound－westbound from Meadowood Mall at Sierra Center Parkway to the Walmart Supercenter at Virginia Street and Damonte Ranch Parkway．Near the Project study area，Route 56 primarily runs northbound along Virginia Street．On weekdays，Route 56 operates between 5：30 AM and 11：00 PM on 30－minute to one hour headways．On Saturdays and Sundays，Route 56 operates between 6：00 AM and 9：00 PM on approximately one hour headways．

Carson Express travels through $4^{\text {th }}$ Street；Vassar Street；McCarran Boulevard；Virginia Street；Mt Rose Highway； Interstate 580；Hot Springs Road；Carson Street；and Stewart Street，nearby the Project study area．Carson Express has stops located both north and south of the Project site．The location of the Virginia Street and McCabe Drive transit stops are approximately 200 feet north－south of the Virginia Street \＆McCabe Drive intersection．The location of the Virginia Street and Damonte Ranch Parkway transit stops are approximately 0.7 miles south of the Virginia Street \＆Bishop Manogue Drive intersection．

Carson Express is a route service that runs northbound－southbound from RTC $4^{\text {th }}$ Street Station at $4^{\text {th }}$ Street to the Nevada Department of Transportation in Carson City，Nevada．Near the Project study area，Carson Express primarily runs northbound－southbound along Virginia Street．On weekdays，Carson Express operates on 30－ minute headways between 5：45 AM and 7：45 AM and approximately one hour headways between 3：00 PM and 6：30 PM．Carson Express does not operate on weekends．

## 3．5 Existing Traffic Volumes and Intersection Lane Geometrics

Project study intersection traffic operations were evaluated for the weekday AM and Afternoon peak hours．The AM peak hour is defined as the highest one hour of traffic flow counted between 7：00 AM and 9：00 AM on a typical weekday．The Afternoon peak hour was determined as the highest one－hour flow counted between 2：00 PM and 4：00 PM on a typical weekday．Wood Rodgers obtained AM and Afternoon peak hour vehicular，pedestrian and bicycle traffic counts at four study intersections（one signalized intersection and three unsignalized intersections／roundabouts）on Thursday，November 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}, 2023$.

Bishop Manogue Drive is a channelized right-in, right-out only access, and all northbound left and eastbound left Project traffic was distributed to the Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive intersection.

Figure 2 on the following page illustrates Existing intersection lane geometrics and control. Figure 3 on the following pages illustrates Existing conditions weekday AM and Afternoon peak hour intersection turning movement volumes. Intersection raw count sheets are included in Appendix B.

### 3.6 Existing Intersection Operations

Table $\mathbf{2}$ presents existing study intersection traffic operations analysis under Existing intersection geometrics and control (illustrated in Figure 2) and Existing intersection traffic volumes (illustrated in Table 3). All study intersection traffic operations were calculated using Synchro 11 software. Because the stop-controlled intersection is a right-in, right-out with a free channelized right turn, HCM 6 does not analyze the Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive intersection and LOS is determined utilizing microsimulation models of the study network using Sim Traffic 11. Ten (10) 1 hour model runs (with a 10 -minute warm-up period) were run and averaged to obtain the movement delay for the intersection.

Table 2. Existing Intersection Operations

| \# | Intersection | Control Type | LOS Criteria | Peak Hour | Delay $(\text { sec/veh })^{4}$ | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive | Signal | $\mathrm{D}^{1}$ | AM | 23.4 | C |
|  |  |  |  | AFT | 23.2 | C |
| 2 | Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive ${ }^{2}$ | OWSC ${ }^{3}$ | C | AM | 2.5 | A |
|  |  |  |  | AFT | 1.1 | A |
| 3 | Bishop Manogue HS Access \& McCabe Drive | Roundabout | C | AM | 16.0 | C |
|  |  |  |  | AFT | 8.3 | A |
| 4 | Bishop Manogue HS Access \& Bishop Manogue Drive | Roundabout | C | AM | 5.0 | A |
|  |  |  |  | AFT | 4.6 | A |

[^2]As shown in Table 2, all study intersections currently operate at acceptable or better LOS conditions during the weekday AM and Afternoon peak hours. Synchro software intersection LOS output reports are included in Appendix C.



## 4 EXISTING PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS

This chapter provides a description of the proposed Project, a discussion of the trip generation and distribution/assignment methods used to assign Project trips to study intersections, and an analysis of projected traffic operations once the proposed Project is completed.

### 4.1 Project Site

The Project site consists of an existing private high school located at 110 Bishop Manogue Drive, west of Virginia Street between McCabe Drive and Bishop Manogue Drive, and consists of an existing approximately 152,300 square feet. The Project site is currently zoned as Medium Density Suburban (MDS).

The Project would propose to expand approximately 157,000 square feet of building space to expand the student population from 780 students to 1,200 students. The site would maintain its current parking and circulation to provide access to Virginia Street at McCabe Drive and Bishop Manogue Drive. The current Project land use plan is illustrated in Figure 1.

This TOA analyzes the existing conditions and maximum full enrollment with the proposed expansion.

### 4.2 Project Generated Trips

### 4.2.1 Trip Generation

The trip generation data contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition, was used to approximate the number of trips generated by the Project. Table $\mathbf{3}$ summarizes the trip generation rates used for the proposed Project and Table 4 summarizes the trip generation volumes for the proposed Project.

Table 3. Project Trip Generation Rates

| Land Use | Source | ITE Code | Units | Weekly Daily <br> Trip Rate/Unit ${ }^{1}$ | Weekday AM Peak Hour Rate/Unit |  |  | Weekday Afternoon Peak Hour Rate/Unit ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| Private High School | ITE | 534 | Students | 2.17 | . 66 | 59\% | 41\% | . 40 | 39\% | 61\% |

## Notes:

${ }^{1}$ The daily trip rate and peak hour trip rates are based on the average rates for the proposed land use consistent with information contained in the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition
${ }^{2}$ Afternoon Peak Hour is calculated based on the Weekday PM Peak Hour Generator.

Table 4. Project Trip Generation Volumes

| Land Use | ITE Code | Quantity ${ }^{1}$ | Units | Daily <br> Trips | AM Peak Hour Trips |  |  | Afternoon Peak Hour Trips ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| Private High School | 534 | 1,200 | Students | 2,604 | 792 | 467 | 325 | 480 | 187 | 293 |
| Existing Private High School Occupancy | 534 | 780 | Students | 1,693 | 515 | 304 | 211 | 312 | 122 | 190 |
| Net Total Primary Trips ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  | 911 | 277 | 164 | 114 | 168 | 66 | 102 |

## Notes:

${ }^{1}$ Quantities provided by Project Applicant in the Project Description.
${ }^{2}$ Net Total Primary Trips calculates the Project volumes based on the increase of students due to Project expansion from existing traffic under Existing Students.
${ }^{3}$ Afternoon Peak Hour is calculated based on the Weekday PM Peak Hour Generator.
As illustrated in Table 4, the proposed Project is anticipated to generate a total of 911 new daily trips, 277 AM Peak Hour Trips (164 Inbound, 114 Outbound), and 168 Afternoon Peak Hour Trips (66 Inbound, 102 Outbound) under typical weekday traffic demand conditions in addition to existing traffic for an enrollment of 1,200 students. The trip generation analysis did not include any reductions for transit availability, bus drop-off, or bicycle/pedestrian trips as part of the variables used to determine the trips generated to provide a conservative analysis.

### 4.2.2 Trip Distribution and Assignment

The Project trip distribution was determined based on existing traffic volumes and travel patterns, knowledge of the area, and engineering judgement. Project generated trips were assigned to the study area network based on the Project trip distribution derived from existing and anticipated travel patterns based on the study area access points. Project trip distribution and assignment is shown in Figure 4.

Figure 4 on the following page illustrates the estimated weekday Project directional trip distribution and assignment patterns projected to be generally applicable for the Project under Plus Project conditions on an annualized average usage basis and the estimated weekday Project Only traffic volumes.

Project Only traffic volumes were added on top of Existing conditions traffic volumes at study intersections and roadway segments to create Existing Plus Project conditions traffic volumes. Figure 5 on the following pages illustrates the estimated weekday Existing Plus Project conditions traffic volumes at study intersections.

The Project trips circulate through the Project driveways as follows, based on information provided by the Project applicant:

Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive: This intersection is signalized full access, utilized by Project trips access Bishop Manogue HS and other developments including USPS office and Bill Pearce Volvo Car dealership.

Bishop Manogue HS Access \& McCabe Drive: This roundabout provides access to the USPS office, Bill Pearce Volvo Car parking lot, and northern Bishop Manogue HS parking lot. The south leg of the roundabout connects to Bishop Manogue Drive.

Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive: This intersection is channelized right-in, right-out access only for access to Bishop Manogue HS and St Rose of Lima Catholic Church.

Bishop Manogue Access \& Bishop Manogue Drive: This roundabout provides access to the Bishop Manogue HS pick-up/drop-off queue and southern Bishop Manogue HS parking lot.


## 4．3 Existing Plus Project Conditions Intersection Level of Service

Project trips were added to Existing conditions traffic volumes to obtain Existing Plus Project conditions traffic volumes，shown in Figure 5．Table 5 presents Existing Plus Project study intersection traffic operations under Existing intersection lane geometrics and control（illustrated in Figure 2）and Existing Plus Project traffic volumes （Figure 3）．Table 5 also shows operations under Existing conditions for comparison purposes．All study intersection traffic operations were calculated using Synchro 11 software．

Table 5．Existing Plus Project Intersection Operations

|  | Intersection | Control Type | LOS Criteria | Peak Hour | Existing Conditions |  | Existing Plus Project |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Delay ${ }^{2}$ | LOS | Delay | LOS |
| 1 | Virginia Street \＆McCabe Drive | Signal | $\mathrm{D}^{1}$ | AM | 23.2 | C | 37.1 | D |
|  |  |  |  | AFT | 23.4 | C | 33.3 | C |
| 2 | Virginia Street \＆Bishop Manogue Drive ${ }^{2}$ | OWSC ${ }^{3}$ | C | AM | 2.5 | A | 2.5 | A |
|  |  |  |  | AFT | 1.1 | A | 1.2 | A |
| 3 | Bishop Manogue HS Access \＆McCabe Drive | Roundabout | C | AM | 16.0 | C | 19.7 | C |
|  |  |  |  | AFT | 8.3 | A | 10.2 | B |
| 4 | Bishop Manogue HS Access \＆Bishop Manogue Drive | Roundabout | C | AM | 5.0 | A | 5.4 | A |
|  |  |  |  | AFT | 4.6 | A | 4.8 | A |

Notes：Bold values indicate unacceptable LOS．
${ }^{1}$ Virginia Street \＆McCabe Street is located within City of Reno limits，and has a Level of Service standard of D
${ }^{2}$ The Virginia Street \＆Bishop Manogue Drive intersection is determined by Sim Traffic 11 movement delay
${ }^{3}$ OWSC＝One－Way Stop－Controlled（i．e．，minor street stop－controlled）
${ }^{4}$ For OWSC，the worst approach／movement delay and LOS is reported．
As shown in Table 5，all study intersections are projected to operate at acceptable LOS conditions．Synchro software intersection LOS output reports are included in Appendix C．


## 520 YEAR HORIZON BACKGROUND (NO PROJECT) CONDITIONS

This chapter presents the study area intersection traffic operations results under Background conditions without Project generated trips. Background conditions traffic volumes were obtained by applying a 0.64 percent ( $0.64 \%$ ) per year growth rate to existing volumes over 20 years. Background conditions are a long-term future condition that could reasonably represent study area conditions approximately 20 years after Project completion.

### 5.1 Background Volumes and Roadway Network

Future Background conditions traffic volumes were developed by applying an annual average growth rate of 0.64percent to Existing traffic volumes. A historical trend projection analysis was performed to provide a method of guidance for forecasting future volumes. The applied growth rate was obtained and derived from the Washoe County RTC website that provides basic traffic modeling data to the general public based on the official Travel Demand Model (TMD). The information pulled from the online tool comes from the base model, which includes roadway projects from the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and incorporates population and employment projections from the latest Consensus Forecast. Based on years 2025 to 2050 projected trends in the study area, the growth rate was applied, resulting in an estimated growth rate of 0.64 -percent per year.

Background (No Project) study intersection turning movement volumes are presented Figure 6 on the following page.

### 5.2 Background (No Project) Intersection Operations

Background intersection operations were quantified under Background traffic volumes (shown in Figure 6). Table 6 illustrates the for the 20 -year horizon intersection LOS operations. All study intersection traffic operations were calculated using Synchro 11 software under optimized signal timing.

Table 6. Background (No Project) Intersection Operations

| \# | Intersection | Control Type | LOS Criteria | Peak Hour | Background (No Project) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Delay $(\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh})^{2}$ | LOS |
| 1 | Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive | Signal | D | AM | 25.1 | C |
|  |  |  |  | AFT | 27.2 | C |
| 2 | Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive ${ }^{3}$ | OWSC ${ }^{1}$ | D | AM | 2.5 | A |
|  |  |  |  | AFT | 1.1 | A |
| 3 | Bishope Manogue HS Access \& McCabe Drive | Roundabout | D | AM | 6.5 | A |
|  |  |  |  | AFT | 5.6 | A |
| 4 | Marysville Boulevard \& Bishop Manogue Drive | Roundabout | D | AM | 3.7 | A |
|  |  |  |  | AFT | 3.3 | A |

Notes: Bold values indicate unacceptable LOS.
${ }^{1}$ OWSC = One-Way Stop-Controlled
${ }^{2}$ For OWSC, the worst approach/movement delay and LOS is reported.
${ }^{3}$ HCM 6 does not analyze channelized right at Virginia Street \& Bishope Manogue Drive, so Level of Service was determined per Sim Movement,

As shown in Table 6 all study intersections are projected to operate at acceptable LOS conditions under Background conditions. Synchro software intersection LOS output reports are included in Appendix C.


Background Without Project Conditions Traffic Volumes
Bishop Manogue High School Expansion－Traffic Operations Analysis

## 6 BACKGROUND PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS INTERSECTION LOS

Project trips were added to Background conditions traffic volumes to obtain Background Plus Project conditions traffic volumes，shown in Figure 7．Table $\mathbf{7}$ presents Background Plus Project study intersection traffic operations under Background Plus Project traffic volumes．All study intersection traffic operations were calculated using Synchro 11 software under optimized signal conditions．

Table 7．Background and Background Plus Project Intersection Operations

|  | Intersection | Control Type | LOS Criteria | Peak Hour | Background Conditions |  | Background Plus Project |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Delay ${ }^{2}$ | LOS | Delay ${ }^{2}$ | LOS |
| 1 | Virginia Street \＆McCabe Drive | Signal | D | AM | 25.1 | C | 30.1 | C |
|  |  |  |  | AFT | 26.7 | C | 30.0 | C |
| 2 | Virginia Street \＆Bishop Manogue Drive ${ }^{3}$ | OWSC ${ }^{1}$ | C | AM | 2.6 | A | 2.5 | A |
|  |  |  |  | AFT | 1.1 | A | 1.1 | A |
| 3 | Bishope Manogue HS Access \＆McCabe Drive | Roundabout | C | AM | 5.1 | A | 6.1 | A |
|  |  |  |  | AFT | 4.6 | A | 5.1 | A |
| 4 | Marysville Boulevard \＆Bishop Manogue Drive | Roundabout | C | AM | 3.8 | A | 3.9 | A |
|  |  |  |  | AFT | 3.3 | A | 3.4 | A |

Notes：Bold values indicate unacceptable LOS．
${ }^{1}$ OWSC＝One－Way Stop－Controlled
${ }^{2}$ For OWSC，the worst approach／movement delay and LOS is reported．
${ }^{3}$ HCM 6 does not analyze channelized right at Virginia Street \＆Bishope Manogue Drive，so Level of Service was determined per Sim Movement，
As shown in Table 7，all study intersections are projected to operate at acceptable LOS conditions under Background and Background Plus Project conditions．Synchro software intersection LOS output reports are included in Appendix C．


## 7 QUEUEING ANALYSIS

Vehicle queueing was analyzed at the study intersections for all stop-controlled movements and movements with turn pockets that the Project would add trips to. For the purposes of this analysis, a Project-related deficiency is considered to occur when the addition of Project trips causes a queue to exceed available storage or causes a queue that already exceeds storage to increase by 100 feet (i.e., five or more vehicle lengths). Table 8 shows the available storage lengths and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues under all scenarios.

Table 8．95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Intersection Queueing

| Intersection | Movement | Available Storage $(\mathrm{ft})^{1}$ | Peak Hour | 95th Percentile Queue（ft） |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Existing | Existing Plus Project | Background Without Project | Background Plus Project |
| \＃1 Virginia Street \＆ McCabe Drive | NBL | 400 | AM | 238 | 364 | 236 | 317 |
|  |  |  | AFT | 164 | 202 | 157 | 157 |
|  | NB | －－ | AM | 117 | 227 | 140 | 133 |
|  |  |  | AFT | 157 | 161 | 173 | 182 |
|  | NBR | 200 | AM | ＜20 | ＜20 | ＜20 | ＜20 |
|  |  |  | AFT | $<20$ | ＜20 | ＜20 | $<20$ |
|  | SBL | 200 | AM | 72 | 75 | 70 | 73 |
|  |  |  | AFT | 89 | 88 | 87 | 88 |
|  | SB | －－ | AM | 211 | 241 | 200 | 204 |
|  |  |  | AFT | 237 | 231 | 238 | 246 |
|  | SBR | 200 | AM | 150 | 221 | 139 | 169 |
|  |  |  | AFT | 129 | 133 | 127 | 120 |
|  | EBL | 150 | AM | 177 | 217 | 150 | 169 |
|  |  |  | AFT | 222 | 242 | 179 | 179 |
|  | EB | 500 | AM | 73 | 120 | 80 | 125 |
|  |  |  | AFT | 102 | 199 | 180 | 175 |
|  | EBR | 120 | AM | 48 | 80 | 38 | 76 |
|  |  |  | AFT | 100 | 131 | 122 | 121 |
|  | WBL | 55 | AM | 39 | 37 | 34 | 35 |
|  |  |  | AFT | 31 | 31 | 31 | 34 |
|  | WB | 55 | AM | 68 | 74 | 66 | 61 |
|  |  |  | AFT | 50 | 61 | 56 | 59 |
| \＃2 Virginia Street \＆ Bishop Manogue Drive | SBR | 200 | AM | $<20$ | ＜20 | ＜20 | $<20$ |
|  |  |  | AFT | ＜20 | ＜20 | ＜20 | ＜20 |
|  | EBR | 800 | AM | ＜20 | ＜20 | $<20$ | ＜20 |
|  |  |  | AFT | ＜20 | ＜20 | ＜20 | ＜20 |
| \＃3 Bishop Manogue HS Access \＆McCabe Drive | NB | －－ | AM | 21 | 34 | ＜20 | 30 |
|  |  |  | AFT | 36 | 41 | 29 | 26 |
|  | SB | －－ | AM | 25 | 28 | ＜20 | 28 |
|  |  |  | AFT | 54 | 57 | 47 | 44 |
|  | EB | －－ | AM | ＜20 | 35 | 25 | 33 |
|  |  |  | AFT | 71 | 55 | 40 | 42 |
|  | WB | －－ | AM | 44 | 70 | 20 | 39 |
|  |  |  | AFT | 49 | 22 | ＜20 | $<20$ |
| \＃4 Bishop Manogue HS Access \＆Bishop Manogue Drive | NB | －－ | AM | 33 | 43 | ＜20 | 24 |
|  |  |  | AFT | 33 | 40 | 21 | 20 |
|  | SB | －－ | AM | ＜20 | ＜20 | ＜20 | 20 |
|  |  |  | AFT | 36 | 31 | 30 | 27 |
|  | WB | －－ | AM | 41 | 50 | 25 | 30 |
|  |  |  | AFT | ＜20 | ＜20 | $<20$ | $<20$ |

Notes：Bold values indicate queue exceeds storage length．Highlighted values indicate queue exceeds storage length by greater than 100 feet．｜${ }^{1}$ Storage reported is available queueing length within a turn pocket．Storage reported for through movements is the distance to the nearest major cross－street．
As shown in Table 8，two（2）movements are found to exceed available storage in the Existing AM Peak Hour and two（2） movements are found to exceed available storage in the Existing Afternoon Peak Hour．With the Existing Plus Project conditions，three（3）movements in the AM Peak Hour and three（3）movements in the Afternoon Peak Hour are found to exceed available storage．Under both Background and Background Plus Project conditions，two（2）movements are found to exceed available storage in the AM Peak Hour and three（3）movements are found to exceed available storage in the Afternoon Peak Hour．None of these movements are found to exceed the storage lane at a significant level under any conditions，and all queues are projected to be cleared within one cycle length of the traffic signal．SimTraffic intersection queueing reports are included in Appendix D．

## 8 PROJECT IMPACTS

This chapter of the TOA evaluates the study intersection operations results presented in Table 5 (Existing plus Project conditions) and Table $\mathbf{7}$ (Background plus Project conditions) against the LOS impact criteria.

### 8.1 Existing plus Project Impacts

All study intersections are currently operating at and projected to operate at acceptable LOS or better under Existing and Existing plus Project conditions. Therefore, the Project was found to have minimal impact on all four study intersections.

### 8.2 Background plus Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

As illustrated in Table 6 and Table 7, all four intersections and driveways, respectively, are projected to operate at acceptable LOS or better under Background and Background plus Project AM and/or Afternoon future peak hour conditions. As a result, the Project was found to have negligible impact on all four study intersections under all future Background study conditions.

### 8.3 Queueing Analysis

Queueing analysis for AM and Afternoon peak hour movements was performed at all study intersection approaches under Existing, Existing plus Project, Background, and Background plus Project conditions. Table 8 shows total available storage length and total projected $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues for each approach. Although some queues were found exceed available storage for a short duration, the queues are not found to exceed the storage lane at a significant level under any conditions, and all queues are projected to be cleared within one cycle length of the traffic signal.

### 8.4 Crash Data Evaluation

The Project proposes land uses consistent with other land uses in the vicinity. The Project is projected to operate similarly to the other land uses and driveways in the area.

Crash data has been provided by NDOT for the five-year period from January $1^{\text {st }}, 2016$ to January $1^{\text {st, }}, 2021$ (see Appendix E), and is summarized in Table 9.

Table 9 summarizes collisions within the Project area and describes the collision severity (fatal, injury, and PDO). The NDOT data indicates that a total 12 collisions occurred within the Project area over five years.

Table 9. Collision Rates Within the Project Area (5-Year Crash Data)

| Roadway |  | Severity |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ¢ |  | O |
| Roadway Segment: Virginia Street between McCabe Drive and Bishop Manogue Drive | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Study Intersection: Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive | 9 | 0 | 5 | 4 |
| Study Intersection: Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Total | 12 | 0 | 7 | 5 |
| Notes: <br> ${ }^{1}$ PDO= Property Damage Only |  |  |  |  |

As shown in Table 9 , the data reports that the study area including study intersections and the roadway along the Project site, had 12 crashes over the five-year period within 500 feet of the study intersections. The majority of the crashes were angle crashes (42\%), rear-end crashes ( $25 \%$ ), and non-collision crashes ( $25 \%$ ), mainly due to failure to yield right of way. NDOT's crash data is provided in Appendix E.

No pedestrian or bicycle involved fatalities were reported over the five-year period within 500 -feet of the signalized intersection or within the other study intersection or driveways.

The Project is not expected to measurably increase crash rates and improvements should be constructed to appropriate standards.

### 8.5 Project Impacts To Pedestrian, Bicyclist and Transit Facilities

Bicycle users will be able to access the Project site via the existing driveway access point within the Project site vicinity. The Project is not projected to have any adverse effect on existing or planned bicycle facilities and no improvements are recommended.

Pedestrians will be able to use the existing sidewalks at Project intersections within the Project site vicinity to access the Project site on foot. The Project is not projected to have any adverse effect on existing or planned pedestrian or transit facilities.

### 8.6 On-Site Circulation Access Analysis

The Project would access the surrounding roadway network via the McCabe Drive and Bishop Manogue Drive intersections along Virginia Street. Access at the intersections are anticipated to operate as follows:

Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive: This intersection is signalized full access, utilized by Project trips access Bishop Manogue HS and other developments including USPS office and Bill Pearce Volvo Car dealership.

Bishop Manogue HS Access \& McCabe Drive: This roundabout provides access to the USPS office, Bill Pearce Volvo Car parking lot, and northern Bishop Manogue HS parking lot. The south leg of the roundabout connects to Bishop Manogue Drive.

Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive: This intersection is channelized right-in, right-out access only for access to Bishop Manogue HS and St Rose of Lima Catholic Church.
Bishop Manogue Access \& Bishop Manogue Drive: This roundabout provides access to the Bishop Manogue High School pick-up/drop-off queue and southern Bishop Manogue HS parking lot.

School queueing was observed at both roundabouts at Bishop Manogue HS access via drone footage in both the AM and Afternoon pick-up and drop-off times (November 27, 2023). These processing times were incorporated into the observation of the SimTraffic microsimulation. In these observations, queue lengths were observed to exceed storage lengths for a few minutes during peak pick-up and drop-off times but were found to dissipate within one cycle length of traffic signal.

Emergency vehicle access to the school is provided via either Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive or Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive. The site currently provides adequate emergency vehicle access and is anticipated to remain accessible.

## APPENDIX A \| SITE PLAN

## BISHOP MANOGUE CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL <br> EXPANSION

## SPECIAL USE PERMIT

PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN
OFFENHAUSER ADDITION SOUTH HILLS ESTATES (NOT A PART)


## APPENDIX B | TRAFFIC COUNTS

County of Washoe
N/S: Virginia Street (US Route 395)
E/W: McCabe Drive/Auto Center Drive
Weather: Clear

File Name : 02_CWS_Vir_McC AM
Site Code : 231026
Start Date : 11/2/2023
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Total Volume

|  | Virginia Street Southbound |  |  |  | Auto Center Drive Westbound |  |  |  | Virginia Street Northbound |  |  |  | McCabe Drive Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 5 | 86 | 23 | 114 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 61 | 2 | 75 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 198 |
| 07:15 AM | 3 | 73 | 64 | 140 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 24 | 81 | 2 | 107 | 17 | 0 | 7 | 24 | 278 |
| 07:30 AM | 7 | 146 | 88 | 241 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 13 | 60 | 137 | 3 | 200 | 34 | 1 | 7 | 42 | 496 |
| 07:45 AM | 12 | 166 | 116 | 294 | 6 | 21 | 4 | 31 | 95 | 138 | 5 | 238 | 73 | 6 | 6 | 85 | 648 |
| Total | 27 | 471 | 291 | 789 | 12 | 33 | 10 | 55 | 191 | 417 | 12 | 620 | 126 | 7 | 23 | 156 | 1620 |
| 08:00 AM | 10 | 94 | 37 | 141 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 21 | 120 | 2 | 143 | 33 | 0 | 7 | 40 | 334 |
| 08:15 AM | 7 | 131 | 18 | 156 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 23 | 117 | 1 | 141 | 11 | 1 | 7 | 19 | 326 |
| 08:30 AM | 10 | 118 | 23 | 151 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 24 | 113 | 1 | 138 | 16 | 0 | 8 | 24 | 319 |
| 08:45 AM | 9 | 133 | 22 | 164 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 19 | 118 | 3 | 140 | 15 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 328 |
| Total | 36 | 476 | 100 | 612 | 9 | 4 | 17 | 30 | 87 | 468 | 7 | 562 | 75 | 1 | 27 | 103 | 1307 |
| Grand Total | 63 | 947 | 391 | 1401 | 21 | 37 | 27 | 85 | 278 | 885 | 19 | 1182 | 201 | 8 | 50 | 259 | 2927 |
| Apprch \% | 4.5 | 67.6 | 27.9 |  | 24.7 | 43.5 | 31.8 |  | 23.5 | 74.9 | 1.6 |  | 77.6 | 3.1 | 19.3 |  |  |
| Total \% | 2.2 | 32.4 | 13.4 | 47.9 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 2.9 | 9.5 | 30.2 | 0.6 | 40.4 | 6.9 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 8.8 |  |


|  | Virginia Street Southbound |  |  |  | Auto Center Drive Westbound |  |  |  | Virginia Street Northbound |  |  |  | McCabe Drive Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:30 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:30 AM | 7 | 146 | 88 | 241 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 13 | 60 | 137 | 3 | 200 | 34 | 1 | 7 | 42 | 496 |
| 07:45 AM | 12 | 166 | 116 | 294 | 6 | 21 | 4 | 31 | 95 | 138 | 5 | 238 | 73 | 6 | 6 | 85 | 648 |
| 08:00 AM | 10 | 94 | 37 | 141 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 21 | 120 | 2 | 143 | 33 | 0 | 7 | 40 | 334 |
| 08:15 AM | 7 | 131 | 18 | 156 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 23 | 117 | 1 | 141 | 11 | 1 | 7 | 19 | 326 |
| Total Volume | 36 | 537 | 259 | 832 | 18 | 31 | 15 | 64 | 199 | 512 | 11 | 722 | 151 | 8 | 27 | 186 | 1804 |
| \% App. Total | 4.3 | 64.5 | 31.1 |  | 28.1 | 48.4 | 23.4 |  | 27.6 | 70.9 | 1.5 |  | 81.2 | 4.3 | 14.5 |  |  |
| PHF | . 750 | . 809 | . 558 | . 707 | 750 | . 369 | . 625 | 516 | 524 | 928 | . 550 | 758 | 517 | 333 | . 964 | 547 | . 69 |

County of Washoe
N/S: Virginia Street (US Route 395)
E/W: McCabe Drive/Auto Center Drive
Weather: Clear

File Name : 02_CWS_Vir_McC AM
Site Code : 231026
Start Date : 11/2/2023
Page No : 2


Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Each Approach Begins at:

|  | 07:30 AM |  |  |  | 07:30 AM |  |  |  | 07:30 AM |  |  |  | 07:15 AM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| +0 mins. | 7 | 146 | 88 | 241 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 13 | 60 | 137 | 3 | 200 | 17 | 0 | 7 | 24 |
| +15 mins. | 12 | 166 | 116 | 294 | 6 | 21 | 4 | 31 | 95 | 138 | 5 | 238 | 34 | 1 | 7 | 42 |
| +30 mins. | 10 | 94 | 37 | 141 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 21 | 120 | 2 | 143 | 73 | 6 | 6 | 85 |
| +45 mins. | 7 | 131 | 18 | 156 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 23 | 117 | 1 | 141 | 33 | 0 | 7 | 40 |
| Total Volume | 36 | 537 | 259 | 832 | 18 | 31 | 15 | 64 | 199 | 512 | 11 | 722 | 157 | 7 | 27 | 191 |
| \% App. Total | 4.3 | 64.5 | 31.1 |  | 28.1 | 48.4 | 23.4 |  | 27.6 | 70.9 | 1.5 |  | 82.2 | 3.7 | 14.1 |  |
| PHF | . 750 | . 809 | . 558 | . 707 | . 750 | . 369 | . 625 | . 516 | . 524 | . 928 | . 550 | . 758 | . 538 | . 292 | . 964 | . 562 |

County of Washoe
N/S: Virginia Street (US Route 395)
E/W: McCabe Drive/Auto Center Drive
Weather: Clear

File Name : 02_CWS_Vir_McC PM
Site Code : 231026
Start Date : 11/2/2023
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Total Volume

|  | Virginia Street Southbound |  |  |  | Auto Center Drive Westbound |  |  |  | Virginia Street Northbound |  |  |  | McCabe Drive Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 02:00 PM | 14 | 189 | 51 | 254 | 6 | 3 | 18 | 27 | 43 | 178 | 7 | 228 | 39 | 1 | 34 | 74 | 583 |
| 02:15 PM | 15 | 215 | 75 | 305 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 25 | 52 | 161 | 1 | 214 | 44 | 3 | 29 | 76 | 620 |
| 02:30 PM | 17 | 222 | 86 | 325 | 5 | 2 | 13 | 20 | 46 | 196 | 9 | 251 | 108 | 8 | 54 | 170 | 766 |
| 02:45 PM | 17 | 235 | 55 | 307 | 3 | 1 | 14 | 18 | 25 | 170 | 8 | 203 | 52 | 4 | 31 | 87 | 615 |
| Total | 63 | 861 | 267 | 1191 | 17 | 15 | 58 | 90 | 166 | 705 | 25 | 896 | 243 | 16 | 148 | 407 | 2584 |
| 03:00 PM | 10 | 227 | 39 | 276 | 5 | 3 | 11 | 19 | 31 | 203 | 1 | 235 | 46 | 2 | 27 | 75 | 605 |
| 03:15 PM | 12 | 237 | 55 | 304 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 16 | 37 | 162 | 4 | 203 | 40 | 1 | 26 | 67 | 590 |
| 03:30 PM | 12 | 229 | 46 | 287 | 9 | 5 | 22 | 36 | 36 | 182 | 7 | 225 | 47 | 3 | 32 | 82 | 630 |
| 03:45 PM | 12 | 258 | 45 | 315 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 15 | 24 | 202 | 5 | 231 | 37 | 1 | 24 | 62 | 623 |
| Total | 46 | 951 | 185 | 1182 | 18 | 9 | 59 | 86 | 128 | 749 | 17 | 894 | 170 | 7 | 109 | 286 | 2448 |
| Grand Total | 109 | 1812 | 452 | 2373 | 35 | 24 | 117 | 176 | 294 | 1454 | 42 | 1790 | 413 | 23 | 257 | 693 | 5032 |
| Apprch \% | 4.6 | 76.4 | 19 |  | 19.9 | 13.6 | 66.5 |  | 16.4 | 81.2 | 2.3 |  | 59.6 | 3.3 | 37.1 |  |  |
| Total \% | 2.2 | 36 | 9 | 47.2 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 2.3 | 3.5 | 5.8 | 28.9 | 0.8 | 35.6 | 8.2 | 0.5 | 5.1 | 13.8 |  |


|  | Virginia Street Southbound |  |  |  | Auto Center Drive Westbound |  |  |  | Virginia Street Northbound |  |  |  | McCabe Drive Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 02:00 PM to 03:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 02:15 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:15 PM | 15 | 215 | 75 | 305 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 25 | 52 | 161 | 1 | 214 | 44 | 3 | 29 | 76 | 620 |
| 02:30 PM | 17 | 222 | 86 | 325 | 5 | 2 | 13 | 20 | 46 | 196 | 9 | 251 | 108 | 8 | 54 | 170 | 766 |
| 02:45 PM | 17 | 235 | 55 | 307 | 3 | 1 | 14 | 18 | 25 | 170 | 8 | 203 | 52 | 4 | 31 | 87 | 615 |
| 03:00 PM | 10 | 227 | 39 | 276 | 5 | 3 | 11 | 19 | 31 | 203 | 1 | 235 | 46 | 2 | 27 | 75 | 605 |
| Total Volume | 59 | 899 | 255 | 1213 | 16 | 15 | 51 | 82 | 154 | 730 | 19 | 903 | 250 | 17 | 141 | 408 | 2606 |
| \% App. Total | 4.9 | 74.1 | 21 |  | 19.5 | 18.3 | 62.2 |  | 17.1 | 80.8 | 2.1 |  | 61.3 | 4.2 | 34.6 |  |  |
| PHF | . 868 | . 956 | 741 | . 933 | . 800 | . 417 | . 911 | . 820 | 740 | . 899 | . 528 | . 899 | . 579 | 531 | . 653 | . 600 | . 85 |

County of Washoe
N/S: Virginia Street (US Route 395)
E/W: McCabe Drive/Auto Center Drive
Weather: Clear

File Name : 02_CWS_Vir_McC PM
Site Code : 231026
Start Date : 11/2/2023
Page No : 2


Peak Hour Analysis From 02:00 PM to 03:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Each Approach Begins at:

|  | 02:15 PM |  |  |  | 02:00 PM |  |  |  | 02:15 PM |  |  |  | 02:15 PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| +0 mins. | 15 | 215 | 75 | 305 | 6 | 3 | 18 | 27 | 52 | 161 | 1 | 214 | 44 | 3 | 29 | 76 |
| +15 mins. | 17 | 222 | 86 | 325 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 25 | 46 | 196 | 9 | 251 | 108 | 8 | 54 | 170 |
| +30 mins. | 17 | 235 | 55 | 307 | 5 | 2 | 13 | 20 | 25 | 170 | 8 | 203 | 52 | 4 | 31 | 87 |
| +45 mins. | 10 | 227 | 39 | 276 | 3 | 1 | 14 | 18 | 31 | 203 | 1 | 235 | 46 | 2 | 27 | 75 |
| Total Volume | 59 | 899 | 255 | 1213 | 17 | 15 | 58 | 90 | 154 | 730 | 19 | 903 | 250 | 17 | 141 | 408 |
| \% App. Total | 4.9 | 74.1 | 21 |  | 18.9 | 16.7 | 64.4 |  | 17.1 | 80.8 | 2.1 |  | 61.3 | 4.2 | 34.6 |  |
| PHF | . 868 | . 956 | . 741 | . 933 | . 708 | . 417 | . 806 | . 833 | . 740 | . 899 | . 528 | . 899 | . 579 | . 531 | . 653 | . 600 |


| Location: | County of Washoe |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| N/S: | Virginia Street |  |
| E/W: | McCabe Drive | Unlimited |


| PEDESTRIANS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | North Leg Virginia Street | East Leg <br> Auto Center Drive | South Leg Virginia Street | West Leg McCabe Drive |  |
|  | Pedestrians | Pedestrians | Pedestrians | Pedestrians |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL VOLUMES: | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |


|  | North Leg Virginia Street | East Leg <br> Auto Center Drive | South Leg Virginia Street | West Leg McCabe Drive |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pedestrians | Pedestrians | Pedestrians | Pedestrians |  |
| 2:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:15 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| TOTAL VOLUMES: | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |


| Location: | County of Washoe |
| :--- | :--- |
| N/S: | Virginia Street |
| E/W: | McCabe Drive |

Date: 11/2/2023
N/S: Virginia Street
E/W: McCabe Drive
Day: Thursday

| BICYCLES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Southbound Virginia Street |  |  | Westbound <br> Auto Center Drive |  |  | Northbound Virginia Street |  |  | Eastbound McCabe Drive |  |  |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL VOLUMES: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |


|  | Southbound Virginia Street |  |  | Westbound <br> Auto Center Drive |  |  | Northbound Virginia Street |  |  | Eastbound McCabe Drive |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |  |
| 2:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 3:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| TOTAL VOLUMES: | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

County of Washoe
N/S: Virginia Street (US Route 395)
E/W: Bishop Manogue Drive
Weather: Clear

File Name : 03_CWS_Vir_BM AM
Site Code : 231026
Start Date : 11/2/2023
Page No : 1

|  | Virginia Street Southbound |  |  | Virginia Street Northbound |  |  | Bishop Manogue Drive Eastbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | App. Total | Left | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 80 | 6 | 86 | 3 | 70 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 |
| 07:15 AM | 73 | 6 | 79 | 8 | 122 | 130 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 219 |
| 07:30 AM | 126 | 36 | 162 | 14 | 210 | 224 | 1 | 31 | 32 | 418 |
| 07:45 AM | 127 | 68 | 195 | 63 | 231 | 294 | 6 | 101 | 107 | 596 |
| Total | 406 | 116 | 522 | 88 | 633 | 721 | 8 | 141 | 149 | 1392 |
| 08:00 AM | 95 | 13 | 108 | 5 | 137 | 142 | 1 | 14 | 15 | 265 |
| 08:15 AM | 121 | 26 | 147 | 11 | 133 | 144 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 294 |
| 08:30 AM | 124 | 8 | 132 | 5 | 142 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 279 |
| 08:45 AM | 134 | 8 | 142 | 6 | 143 | 149 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 297 |
| Total | 474 | 55 | 529 | 27 | 555 | 582 | 1 | 23 | 24 | 1135 |
| Grand Total | 880 | 171 | 1051 | 115 | 1188 | 1303 | 9 | 164 | 173 | 2527 |
| Apprch \% | 83.7 | 16.3 |  | 8.8 | 91.2 |  | 5.2 | 94.8 |  |  |
| Total \% | 34.8 | 6.8 | 41.6 | 4.6 | 47 | 51.6 | 0.4 | 6.5 | 6.8 |  |



Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:30 AM

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $07: 30$ AM | 126 | 36 | 162 | 14 | 210 | 224 | 1 | 31 | 32 | 418 |
| $07: 45$ AM | $\mathbf{1 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 7}$ | 596 |
| $08: 00$ AM | 95 | 13 | 108 | 5 | 137 | 142 | 1 | 14 | 15 | 265 |
| $08: 15$ AM | 121 | 26 | 147 | 11 | 133 | 144 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 294 |
| Total Volume | 469 | 143 | 612 | 93 | 711 | 804 | 8 | 149 | 157 | 1573 |
| \% App. Total | 76.6 | 23.4 |  | 11.6 | 88.4 |  | 5.1 | 94.9 |  |  |
| PHF | .923 | .526 | .785 | .369 | .769 | .684 | .333 | .369 | .367 | .660 |

County of Washoe
N/S: Virginia Street (US Route 395)
E/W: Bishop Manogue Drive
Weather: Clear

File Name : 03_CWS_Vir_BM AM
Site Code : 231026
Start Date : 11/2/2023
Page No : 2


Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Each Approach Begins at:

|  | 07:30 AM |  |  | 07:30 AM |  |  | 07:15 AM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| +0 mins. | 126 | 36 | 162 | 14 | 210 | 224 | 1 | 9 | 10 |
| +15 mins. | 127 | 68 | 195 | 63 | 231 | 294 | 1 | 31 | 32 |
| +30 mins. | 95 | 13 | 108 | 5 | 137 | 142 | 6 | 101 | 107 |
| +45 mins. | 121 | 26 | 147 | 11 | 133 | 144 | 1 | 14 | 15 |
| Total Volume | 469 | 143 | 612 | 93 | 711 | 804 | 9 | 155 | 164 |
| \% App. Total | 76.6 | 23.4 |  | 11.6 | 88.4 |  | 5.5 | 94.5 |  |
| PHF | . 923 | . 526 | . 785 | . 369 | . 769 | . 684 | . 375 | . 384 | . 383 |

County of Washoe
N/S: Virginia Street (US Route 395)
E/W: Bishop Manogue Drive
Weather: Clear

File Name : 03_CWS_Vir_BM PM
Site Code : 231026
Start Date : 11/2/2023
Page No : 1

|  | Virginia Street Southbound |  |  | Virginia Street Northbound |  |  | Bishop Manogue Drive Eastbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | App. Total | Left | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 02:00 PM | 251 | 7 | 258 | 1 | 237 | 238 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 506 |
| 02:15 PM | 237 | 18 | 255 | 11 | 208 | 219 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 478 |
| 02:30 PM | 251 | 21 | 272 | 4 | 257 | 261 | 17 | 117 | 134 | 667 |
| 02:45 PM | 263 | 5 | 268 | 0 | 215 | 215 | 4 | 25 | 29 | 512 |
| Total | 1002 | 51 | 1053 | 16 | 917 | 933 | 21 | 156 | 177 | 2163 |
| 03:00 PM | 258 | 13 | 271 | 5 | 213 | 218 | 4 | 14 | 18 | 507 |
| 03:15 PM | 259 | 11 | 270 | 0 | 211 | 211 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 486 |
| 03:30 PM | 294 | 10 | 304 | 3 | 231 | 234 | 3 | 13 | 16 | 554 |
| 03:45 PM | 274 | 4 | 278 | 2 | 219 | 221 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 506 |
| Total | 1085 | 38 | 1123 | 10 | 874 | 884 | 8 | 38 | 46 | 2053 |
| Grand Total | 2087 | 89 | 2176 | 26 | 1791 | 1817 | 29 | 194 | 223 | 4216 |
| Apprch \% | 95.9 | 4.1 |  | 1.4 | 98.6 |  | 13 | 87 |  |  |
| Total \% | 49.5 | 2.1 | 51.6 | 0.6 | 42.5 | 43.1 | 0.7 | 4.6 | 5.3 |  |



Peak Hour Analysis From 02:00 PM to 03:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 02:30 PM

| 02:30 PM | 251 | 21 | 272 | 4 | 257 | 261 | 17 | 117 | 134 | 667 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02:45 PM | 263 | 5 | 268 | 0 | 215 | 215 | 4 | 25 | 29 | 512 |
| 03:00 PM | 258 | 13 | 271 | 5 | 213 | 218 | 4 | 14 | 18 | 507 |
| 03:15 PM | 259 | 11 | 270 | 0 | 211 | 211 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 486 |
| Total Volume | 1031 | 50 | 1081 | 9 | 896 | 905 | 25 | 161 | 186 | 2172 |
| \% App. Total | 95.4 | 4.6 |  | 1 | 99 |  | 13.4 | 86.6 |  |  |
| PHF | . 980 | . 595 | . 994 | . 450 | . 872 | . 867 | . 368 | . 344 | . 347 | . 814 |

County of Washoe
N/S: Virginia Street (US Route 395)
E/W: Bishop Manogue Drive
Weather: Clear

File Name : 03_CWS_Vir_BM PM
Site Code : 231026
Start Date : 11/2/2023
Page No : 2


Peak Hour Analysis From 02:00 PM to 03:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Each Approach Begins at:

|  | 03:00 PM |  |  | 02:00 PM |  |  | 02:30 PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| +0 mins. | 258 | 13 | 271 | 1 | 237 | 238 | 17 | 117 | 134 |
| +15 mins. | 259 | 11 | 270 | 11 | 208 | 219 | 4 | 25 | 29 |
| +30 mins. | 294 | 10 | 304 | 4 | 257 | 261 | 4 | 14 | 18 |
| +45 mins. | 274 | 4 | 278 | 0 | 215 | 215 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Total Volume | 1085 | 38 | 1123 | 16 | 917 | 933 | 25 | 161 | 186 |
| \% App. Total | 96.6 | 3.4 |  | 1.7 | 98.3 |  | 13.4 | 86.6 |  |
| PHF | . 923 | . 731 | . 924 | . 364 | . 892 | . 894 | . 368 | . 344 | . 347 |


| Location: | County of Washoe |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| N/S: | Virginia Street |  |
| E/W: | Bishop Manogue Drive |  |

Date: 11/2/2023
Day: Thursday

| PEDESTRIANS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | North Leg Virginia Street | East Leg Dead End | South Leg Virginia Street | West Leg <br> Bishop Manogue Drive |  |
|  | Pedestrians | Pedestrians | Pedestrians | Pedestrians |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL VOLUMES: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |


|  | North Leg Virginia Street | East Leg <br> Dead End | South Leg Virginia Street | West Leg <br> Bishop Manogue Drive |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pedestrians | Pedestrians | Pedestrians | Pedestrians |  |
| 2:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| TOTAL VOLUMES: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |


| Location: | County of Washoe |
| :--- | :--- |
| N/S: | Virginia Street |
| E/W: | Bishop Man |

BICYCLES

|  | Southbound Virginia Street |  |  | Westbound Dead End |  |  | Northbound Virginia Street |  |  | Eastbound Bishop Manogue Drive |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL VOLUMES: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |


|  | Southbound Virginia Street |  |  | Westbound Dead End |  |  | Northbound Virginia Street |  |  | EastboundBishop Manogue Drive |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |  |
| 2:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 3:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL VOLUMES: | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |

County of Washoe
N/S: School Access Road
E/W: McCabe Drive
Weather: Clear

File Name : 05_CWS_SAR_McC AM
Site Code : 231026
Start Date : 11/2/2023
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Total Volume

|  | USPS Driveway Southbound |  |  |  | McCabe Drive Westbound |  |  |  | School Access Road Northbound |  |  |  | McCabe Drive Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 26 |
| 07:15 AM | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 59 | 2 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 91 |
| 07:30 AM | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 124 | 1 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 25 | 170 |
| 07:45 AM | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 178 | 0 | 187 | 3 | 0 | 28 | 31 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 61 | 283 |
| Total | 19 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 34 | 374 | 4 | 412 | 3 | 0 | 41 | 44 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 95 | 570 |
| 08:00 AM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 16 | 2 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 38 |
| 08:15 AM | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| 08:30 AM | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| 08:45 AM | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Total | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 37 | 16 | 3 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 104 |
| Grand Total | 49 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 71 | 390 | 7 | 468 | 3 | 0 | 57 | 60 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 97 | 674 |
| Apprch \% | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 15.2 | 83.3 | 1.5 |  | 5 | 0 | 95 |  | 0 | 100 | 0 |  |  |
| Total \% | 7.3 | 0 | 0 | 7.3 | 10.5 | 57.9 | 1 | 69.4 | 0.4 | 0 | 8.5 | 8.9 | 0 | 14.4 | 0 | 14.4 |  |


|  | USPS Driveway Southbound |  |  |  | McCabe Drive Westbound |  |  |  | School Access Road Northbound |  |  |  | McCabe Drive Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:15 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:15 AM | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 59 | 2 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 91 |
| 07:30 AM | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 124 |  | 133 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 25 | 170 |
| 07:45 AM | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 178 | 0 | 187 | 3 | 0 | 28 | 31 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 61 | 283 |
| 08:00 AM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 16 | 2 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 38 |
| Total Volume | 20 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 34 | 377 | 5 | 416 | 3 | 0 | 47 | 50 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 96 | 582 |
| \% App. Total | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 8.2 | 90.6 | 1.2 |  | 6 | 0 | 94 |  | 0 | 100 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 625 | . 000 | . 000 | . 625 | . 773 | . 529 | . 625 | . 556 | . 250 | . 000 | . 420 | 403 | . 000 | . 393 | . 000 | .393 | 514 |

County of Washoe
N/S: School Access Road
E/W: McCabe Drive
Weather: Clear

File Name : 05_CWS_SAR_McC AM
Site Code : 231026
Start Date : 11/2/2023
Page No : 2


Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Each Approach Begins at:

|  | 08:00 AM |  |  |  | 07:15 AM |  |  |  | 07:15 AM |  |  |  | 07:15 AM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| +0 mins. | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 59 | 2 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| +15 mins. | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 124 | 1 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 25 |
| +30 mins. | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 178 | 0 | 187 | 3 | 0 | 28 | 31 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 61 |
| +45 mins. | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 16 | 2 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Total Volume | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 34 | 377 | 5 | 416 | 3 | 0 | 47 | 50 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 96 |
| \% App. Total | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 8.2 | 90.6 | 1.2 |  | 6 | 0 | 94 |  | 0 | 100 | 0 |  |
| PHF | . 750 | . 000 | . 000 | . 750 | . 773 | . 529 | . 625 | . 556 | . 250 | 000 | . 420 | . 403 | . 000 | . 393 | . 000 | 393 |

County of Washoe
N/S: School Access Road
E/W: McCabe Drive
Weather: Clear

File Name : 05_CWS_SAR_McC PM
Site Code : 231026
Start Date : 11/2/2023
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Total Volume

|  | USPS Driveway Southbound |  |  |  | McCabe Drive Westbound |  |  |  | School Access Road Northbound |  |  |  | McCabe Drive Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 02:00 PM | 28 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 18 | 37 | 1 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 100 |
| 02:15 PM | 23 | 1 | 0 | 24 | 17 | 80 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 145 |
| 02:30 PM | 27 | 4 | 1 | 32 | 13 | 69 | 4 | 86 | 1 | 0 | 29 | 30 | 1 | 93 | 2 | 96 | 244 |
| 02:45 PM | 25 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 11 | 34 | 2 | 47 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 35 | 115 |
| Total | 103 | 5 | 2 | 110 | 59 | 220 | 7 | 286 | 2 | 0 | 48 | 50 | 1 | 155 | 2 | 158 | 604 |
| 03:00 PM | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 11 | 34 | 0 | 45 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 89 |
| 03:15 PM | 26 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 10 | 45 | 1 | 56 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | 107 |
| 03:30 PM | 26 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 13 | 21 | 3 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 83 |
| 03:45 PM | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 14 | 15 | 2 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 60 |
| Total | 97 | 0 | 1 | 98 | 48 | 115 | 6 | 169 | 3 | 0 | 26 | 29 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 43 | 339 |
| Grand Total | 200 | 5 | 3 | 208 | 107 | 335 | 13 | 455 | 5 | 0 | 74 | 79 | 1 | 198 | 2 | 201 | 943 |
| Apprch \% | 96.2 | 2.4 | 1.4 |  | 23.5 | 73.6 | 2.9 |  | 6.3 | 0 | 93.7 |  | 0.5 | 98.5 | 1 |  |  |
| Total \% | 21.2 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 22.1 | 11.3 | 35.5 | 1.4 | 48.3 | 0.5 | 0 | 7.8 | 8.4 | 0.1 | 21 | 0.2 | 21.3 |  |


|  | USPS Driveway Southbound |  |  |  | McCabe Drive Westbound |  |  |  | School Access Road Northbound |  |  |  | McCabe Drive Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 02:00 PM to 03:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 02:00 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00 PM | 28 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 18 | 37 | 1 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 100 |
| 02:15 PM | 23 | 1 | 0 | 24 | 17 | 80 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 145 |
| 02:30 PM | 27 | 4 | 1 | 32 | 13 | 69 | 4 | 86 | 1 | 0 | 29 | 30 | 1 | 93 | 2 | 96 | 244 |
| 02:45 PM | 25 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 11 | 34 | 2 | 47 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 35 | 115 |
| Total Volume | 103 | 5 | 2 | 110 | 59 | 220 | 7 | 286 | 2 | 0 | 48 | 50 | 1 | 155 | 2 | 158 | 604 |
| \% App. Total | 93.6 | 4.5 | 1.8 |  | 20.6 | 76.9 | 2.4 |  | 4 | 0 | 96 |  | 0.6 | 98.1 | 1.3 |  |  |
| PHF | . 920 | . 313 | . 500 | . 859 | . 819 | . 688 | . 438 | . 737 | . 500 | . 000 | . 414 | . 417 | . 250 | . 417 | . 250 | . 411 | 619 |

County of Washoe
N/S: School Access Road
E/W: McCabe Drive
Weather: Clear

File Name : 05_CWS_SAR_McC PM
Site Code : 231026
Start Date : 11/2/2023
Page No : 2


Peak Hour Analysis From 02:00 PM to 03:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Each Approach Begins at:

|  | 02:00 PM |  |  |  | 02:00 PM |  |  |  | 02:15 PM |  |  |  | 02:30 PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| +0 mins. | 28 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 18 | 37 | 1 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 93 | 2 | 96 |
| +15 mins. | 23 | 1 | 0 | 24 | 17 | 80 | 0 | 97 | 1 | 0 | 29 | 30 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 35 |
| +30 mins. | 27 | 4 | 1 | 32 | 13 | 69 | 4 | 86 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| +45 mins. | 25 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 11 | 34 | 2 | 47 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 |
| Total Volume | 103 | 5 | 2 | 110 | 59 | 220 | 7 | 286 | 4 | 0 | 52 | 56 | 1 | 156 | 2 | 159 |
| \% App. Total | 93.6 | 4.5 | 1.8 |  | 20.6 | 76.9 | 2.4 |  | 7.1 | 0 | 92.9 |  | 0.6 | 98.1 | 1.3 |  |
| PHF | . 920 | . 313 | . 500 | . 859 | . 819 | . 688 | . 438 | . 737 | . 500 | . 000 | . 448 | . 467 | . 250 | . 419 | . 250 | . 414 |


| Location: | County of Washoe |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| N/S: | School Access Road |  |
| E/W: | McCabe Drive | Unlimited |


| PEDESTRIANS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | North Leg USPS Driveway | East Leg <br> McCabe Drive | South Leg <br> School Access Road | West Leg McCabe Drive |  |
|  | Pedestrians | Pedestrians | Pedestrians | Pedestrians |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 7:45 AM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:00 AM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL VOLUMES: | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 |


|  | North Leg USPS Driveway | East Leg McCabe Drive | South Leg School Access Road | West Leg McCabe Drive |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pedestrians | Pedestrians | Pedestrians | Pedestrians |  |
| 2:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 2:30 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 3:00 PM | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| 3:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:45 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| TOTAL VOLUMES: | 6 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 15 |


| Location: | County of Washoe |
| :--- | :--- |
| N/S: | School Access Road |
| E/W: | McCabe Drive |

Date: 11/2/2023
N/S: School Access Road
E/W: McCabe Drive

BICYCLES

|  | Southbound USPS Driveway |  |  | Westbound McCabe Drive |  |  | Northbound <br> School Access Road |  |  | Eastbound McCabe Drive |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL VOLUMES: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


|  | Southbound USPS Driveway |  |  | Westbound McCabe Drive |  |  | Northbound School Access Road |  |  | Eastbound McCabe Drive |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |  |
| 2:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL VOLUMES: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

County of Washoe
N/S: School Access Road
E/W: Bishop Manogue Drive
Weather: Clear

File Name : 06_CWS_SAR_BM AM
Site Code : 231026
Start Date : 11/2/2023
Page No : 1

|  | School Access Road Southbound |  |  | Bishop Manogue Drive Westbound |  |  | School Access Road Northbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | App. Total | Left | Right | App. Total | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
| 07:15 AM | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 13 | 14 | 25 |
| 07:30 AM | 6 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 40 | 43 | 2 | 35 | 37 | 86 |
| 07:45 AM | 23 | 0 | 23 | 6 | 115 | 121 | 1 | 106 | 107 | 251 |
| Total | 30 | 0 | 30 | 17 | 166 | 183 | 4 | 155 | 159 | 372 |
| 08:00 AM | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 19 |
| 08:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 15 |
| 08:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| 08:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 17 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 19 |
| Total | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 31 | 37 | 0 | 21 | 21 | 59 |
| Grand Total | 31 | 0 | 31 | 23 | 197 | 220 | 4 | 176 | 180 | 431 |
| Apprch \% | 100 | 0 |  | 10.5 | 89.5 |  | 2.2 | 97.8 |  |  |
| Total \% | 7.2 | 0 | 7.2 | 5.3 | 45.7 | 51 | 0.9 | 40.8 | 41.8 |  |



Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:15 AM

| Peak Hour for Entire |  | at 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07:15 AM | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 13 | 14 | 25 |
| 07:30 AM | 6 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 40 | 43 | 2 | 35 | 37 | 86 |
| 07:45 AM | 23 | 0 | 23 | 6 | 115 | 121 | 1 | 106 | 107 | 251 |
| 08:00 AM | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 19 |
| Total Volume | 31 | 0 | 31 | 12 | 167 | 179 | 4 | 167 | 171 | 381 |
| \% App. Total | 100 | 0 |  | 6.7 | 93.3 |  | 2.3 | 97.7 |  |  |
| PHF | . 337 | . 000 | . 337 | . 500 | . 363 | . 370 | . 500 | . 394 | . 400 | . 379 |

County of Washoe
N/S: School Access Road
E/W: Bishop Manogue Drive
Weather: Clear

File Name : 06_CWS_SAR_BM AM
Site Code : 231026
Start Date : 11/2/2023
Page No : 2


Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Each Approach Begins at:

|  | 07:15 AM |  |  | 07:00 AM |  |  | 07:15 AM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| +0 mins. | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 1 | 13 | 14 |
| +15 mins. | 6 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 2 | 35 | 37 |
| +30 mins. | 23 | 0 | 23 | 3 | 40 | 43 | 1 | 106 | 107 |
| +45 mins. | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 115 | 121 | 0 | 13 | 13 |
| Total Volume | 31 | 0 | 31 | 17 | 166 | 183 | 4 | 167 | 171 |
| \% App. Total | 100 | 0 |  | 9.3 | 90.7 |  | 2.3 | 97.7 |  |
| PHF | . 337 | . 000 | . 337 | . 708 | . 361 | . 378 | . 500 | . 394 | . 400 |

County of Washoe
N/S: School Access Road
E/W: Bishop Manogue Drive
Weather: Clear

File Name : 06_CWS_SAR_BM PM
Site Code : 231026
Start Date : 11/2/2023
Page No : 1

|  | School Access Road Southbound |  |  | Bishop Manogue Drive <br> Westbound |  |  | School Access Road Northbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | App. Total | Left | Right | App. Total | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 02:00 PM | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 21 |
| 02:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 21 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 26 |
| 02:30 PM | 62 | 0 | 62 | 6 | 27 | 33 | 0 | 69 | 69 | 164 |
| 02:45 PM | 6 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 12 | 21 |
| Total | 72 | 0 | 72 | 17 | 50 | 67 | 4 | 89 | 93 | 232 |
| 03:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 14 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 26 |
| 03:15 PM | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 12 |
| 03:30 PM | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 27 |
| 03:45 PM | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 12 |
| Total | 11 | 0 | 11 | 7 | 33 | 40 | 0 | 26 | 26 | 77 |
| Grand Total | 83 | 0 | 83 | 24 | 83 | 107 | 4 | 115 | 119 | 309 |
| Apprch \% | 100 | 0 |  | 22.4 | 77.6 |  | 3.4 | 96.6 |  |  |
| Total \% | 26.9 | 0 | 26.9 | 7.8 | 26.9 | 34.6 | 1.3 | 37.2 | 38.5 |  |



Peak Hour Analysis From 02:00 PM to 03:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 02:15 PM

| 02:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 21 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 26 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02:30 PM | 62 | 0 | 62 | 6 | 27 | 33 | 0 | 69 | 69 | 164 |
| 02:45 PM | 6 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 12 | 21 |
| 03:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 14 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 26 |
| Total Volume | 70 | 0 | 70 | 18 | 53 | 71 | 3 | 93 | 96 | 237 |
| \% App. Total | 100 | 0 |  | 25.4 | 74.6 |  | 3.1 | 96.9 |  |  |
| PHF | . 282 | 000 | . 282 | . 643 | . 491 | . 538 | . 375 | . 337 | 348 | . 361 |

County of Washoe
N/S: School Access Road
E/W: Bishop Manogue Drive
Weather: Clear

File Name : 06_CWS_SAR_BM PM
Site Code : 231026
Start Date : 11/2/2023
Page No : 2


Peak Hour Analysis From 02:00 PM to 03:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Each Approach Begins at:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| +0 mins. | $02: 00 \mathrm{PM}$ |  |  | $02: 15 \mathrm{PM}$ |  |  | $02: 15 \mathrm{PM}$ |  |
| +15 mins. | 0 | 0 | 4 | $\mathbf{7}$ | 14 | 21 | $\mathbf{2}$ | 3 |
| +30 mins. | 62 | 0 | 0 | 6 | $\mathbf{2 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 3}$ | 0 | 69 |
| +45 mins. | 6 | 0 | $\mathbf{6 2}$ | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 11 |
| Total Volume | 72 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 12 | 14 | 0 | 10 |
| \% App. Total | 100 | 0 | 72 | 18 | 53 | 71 | 3 | 93 |
| PHF | .290 | .000 | .290 | .643 | .49 |  | 12 |  |


| Location: | County of Washoe |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| N/S: | School Access Road |  |
| E/W: | Bishop Manogue Drive | Unlimited |

pedestrians

|  | North Leg <br> School Access Road | East Leg <br> Bishop Manogue Drive | South Leg <br> School Access Road | West Leg <br> Dead End |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pedestrians | Pedestrians | Pedestrians | Pedestrians |


|  | North Leg School Access Road | East Leg Bishop Manogue Drive | South Leg School Access Road | West Leg Dead End |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pedestrians | Pedestrians | Pedestrians | Pedestrians |  |
| 2:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 2:15 PM | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 2:30 PM | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 2:45 PM | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 3:00 PM | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 3:15 PM | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 3:30 PM | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL VOLUMES: | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |


| Location: | County of Washoe |
| :--- | :--- |
| N/S: | School Access Road |
| E/W: | Bishop Manogue Drive |

Date: 11/2/2023
N/S: School Access Road
E/W: Bishop Manogue Drive
Day: Thursday

| BICYCLES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Southbound School Access Road |  |  | Westbound Bishop Manogue Drive |  |  | Northbound School Access Road |  |  | Eastbound Dead End |  |  |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL VOLUMES: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |


|  | Southbound School Access Road |  |  | Westbound Bishop Manogue Drive |  |  | Northbound School Access Road |  |  | Eastbound Dead End |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |  |
| 2:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 3:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL VOLUMES: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

## APPENDIX C | SYNCHRO LOS REPORTS

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\checkmark$ | 7 | $4$ | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\frac{1}{1}$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | F | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | 444 | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | 444 | 7 |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 159 | 8 | 27 | 18 | 31 | 15 | 292 | 504 | 11 | 36 | 537 | 259 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 159 | 8 | 27 | 18 | 31 | 15 | 292 | 504 | 11 | 36 | 537 | 259 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 227 | 11 | 39 | 26 | 44 | 21 | 417 | 720 | 16 | 51 | 767 | 227 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 375 | 442 | 374 | 412 | 283 | 135 | 475 | 2408 | 730 | 65 | 1234 | 383 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.27 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.04 | 0.24 | 0.24 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1337 | 1870 | 1583 | 1353 | 1197 | 571 | 1781 | 5106 | 1548 | 1781 | 5106 | 1585 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 227 | 11 | 39 | 26 | 0 | 65 | 417 | 720 | 16 | 51 | 767 | 227 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1337 | 1870 | 1583 | 1353 | 0 | 1768 | 1781 | 1702 | 1548 | 1781 | 1702 | 1585 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 11.9 | 0.3 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 16.4 | 6.3 | 0.4 | 2.1 | 9.8 | 9.3 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 14.0 | 0.3 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 16.4 | 6.3 | 0.4 | 2.1 | 9.8 | 9.3 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.32 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 375 | 442 | 374 | 412 | 0 | 418 | 475 | 2408 | 730 | 65 | 1234 | 383 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.60 | 0.02 | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.88 | 0.30 | 0.02 | 0.79 | 0.62 | 0.59 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 1027 | 1354 | 1146 | 943 | 0 | 1111 | 852 | 2790 | 846 | 365 | 2790 | 866 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 27.7 | 21.5 | 21.9 | 22.0 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 25.7 | 11.9 | 10.3 | 35.0 | 24.8 | 24.6 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 5.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 18.5 | 0.5 | 1.5 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 3.8 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 6.6 | 1.9 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 3.5 | 3.2 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 29.3 | 21.5 | 22.0 | 22.1 | 0.0 | 22.3 | 31.1 | 12.0 | 10.3 | 53.5 | 25.3 | 26.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | C | C | C | C | A | C | C | B | B | D | C | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 277 |  |  | 91 |  |  | 1153 |  |  | 1045 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 27.9 |  |  | 22.3 |  |  | 18.9 |  |  | 26.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 8.9 | 42.1 |  | 22.2 | 25.7 | 25.3 |  | 22.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 6.2 | 7.6 |  | 4.9 | 6.2 | 7.6 |  | 4.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 15.0 | 40.0 |  | 53.0 | 35.0 | 40.0 |  | 46.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 4.1 | 8.3 |  | 16.0 | 18.4 | 11.8 |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.1 | 4.7 |  | 0.9 | 1.1 | 5.7 |  | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 23.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 8.3 |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  | WB | SB |
| Approach | EB | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 916 | 39 |  |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 188 | 100 | 40 |  |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 192 | 832 | 828 |  |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 108 | 6 | 68 | 10 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 760 | 326 | 2 | 2 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#/h | 2 | 0 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.00 | 1.000 | 7.0 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 4.3 | 9.7 | A | A |
| Approach LOS | A | A |  |  |


| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Left |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 2.000 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 | 4.976 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 | 40 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 192 | 832 | 100 | 593 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 1236 | 1371 | 0.975 |  |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.980 | 0.981 | 0.980 | 39 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 188 | 816 | 98 | 578 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 1211 | 1345 | 1067 | 0.067 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.155 | 0.607 | 0.092 | 7.0 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 4.3 | 9.7 | 4.2 | A |
| LOS | A | 4 | 0 | 0 |

HCM 6th Roundabout
6: Bishop Managoe HS Access/Bishop Manogue HS School Access \& Bishop Manoguex|st|Bg Bllive


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ＊ | 4 | 7 | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | \％ | 444 | F＇ | ${ }^{7}$ | 中革 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 275 | 17 | 141 | 16 | 15 | 51 | 163 | 723 | 19 | 59 | 899 | 255 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 275 | 17 | 141 | 16 | 15 | 51 | 163 | 723 | 19 | 59 | 899 | 255 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 324 | 20 | 78 | 19 | 18 | 60 | 192 | 851 | 22 | 69 | 1058 | 153 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 467 | 593 | 503 | 495 | 120 | 400 | 240 | 1988 | 604 | 90 | 1558 | 472 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.13 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.05 | 0.31 | 0.31 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1320 | 1870 | 1585 | 1297 | 379 | 1263 | 1781 | 5106 | 1552 | 1781 | 5106 | 1548 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 324 | 20 | 78 | 19 | 0 | 78 | 192 | 851 | 22 | 69 | 1058 | 153 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1320 | 1870 | 1585 | 1297 | 0 | 1642 | 1781 | 1702 | 1552 | 1781 | 1702 | 1548 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 17.9 | 0.6 | 2.7 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 8.0 | 9.4 | 0.7 | 2.9 | 14.0 | 5.9 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 20.6 | 0.6 | 2.7 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 8.0 | 9.4 | 0.7 | 2.9 | 14.0 | 5.9 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.77 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 467 | 593 | 503 | 495 | 0 | 521 | 240 | 1988 | 604 | 90 | 1558 | 472 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.69 | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.80 | 0.43 | 0.04 | 0.77 | 0.68 | 0.32 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 959 | 1289 | 1093 | 860 | 0 | 982 | 811 | 2657 | 807 | 348 | 2657 | 805 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 26.2 | 18.1 | 18.9 | 18.6 | 0.0 | 18.8 | 32.3 | 17.2 | 14.5 | 36.1 | 23.4 | 20.6 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 6.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 12.9 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（ $50 \%$ ），veh／In | 5.7 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 4.9 | 1.9 |

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh

| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 28.0 | 18.1 | 19.0 | 18.6 | 0.0 | 19.0 | 38.4 | 17.3 | 14.6 | 49.0 | 23.9 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| CnGrp LOS | C | B | B | B | A | B | D | B | B | D | C |
| Cpproach Vol，veh／h |  | 422 |  |  | 97 |  | 1065 |  | 1280 |  |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 25.9 |  |  | 18.9 |  |  | 21.1 |  | 24.9 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  | C |  |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 10.1 | 37.5 | 29.3 | 16.5 | 31.1 | 29.3 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 6.2 | 7.6 | 4.9 | 6.2 | 7.6 | 4.9 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 15.0 | 40.0 | 53.0 | 35.0 | 40.0 | 46.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 4.9 | 11.4 | 22.6 | 10.0 | 16.0 | 4.6 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.1 | 5.6 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 7.5 | 0.6 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 23.4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

## Notes

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green．

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 5.9 |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  | NB | SB |
| Approach | EB | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 461 | 80 | 177 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 255 | 470 | 82 | 180 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 260 | 5 | 426 | 462 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 274 | 503 | 108 | 13 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 368 | 0 | 4 | 6 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#/h | 5 | 0.999 | 0.999 |  |
| Ped Cap Adj | 0.999 | 5.000 | 6.4 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 5.9 | 5.8 | A | A |


| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Left |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 | 4.609 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 | 180 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 260 | 470 | 82 | 861 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 1043 | 1373 | 894 | 0.982 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.981 | 0.981 | 177 |  |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 255 | 461 | 846 |  |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 1023 | 1346 | 809 | 0.209 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.249 | 5.82 | 671 | 6.4 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 5.9 | A | 0.092 | A |
| LOS | A | 2 | 5.0 | 1 |

HCM 6th Roundabout
6: Bishop Managoe HS Access/Bishop Manogue HS School Access \& Bishop Manoguexi\&t| ATrive


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | 7 | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 性4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 虫㐱 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 212 | 11 | 66 | 18 | 38 | 15 | 383 | 504 | 11 | 36 | 559 | 303 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 212 | 11 | 66 | 18 | 38 | 15 | 383 | 504 | 11 | 36 | 559 | 303 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 303 | 16 | 94 | 26 | 54 | 21 | 547 | 720 | 16 | 51 | 799 | 290 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 390 | 523 | 443 | 412 | 359 | 139 | 601 | 2719 | 824 | 66 | 1185 | 368 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.04 | 0.23 | 0.23 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1325 | 1870 | 1583 | 1282 | 1282 | 499 | 1781 | 5106 | 1548 | 1781 | 5106 | 1585 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 303 | 16 | 94 | 26 | 0 | 75 | 547 | 720 | 16 | 51 | 799 | 290 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1325 | 1870 | 1583 | 1282 | 0 | 1781 | 1781 | 1702 | 1548 | 1781 | 1702 | 1585 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 26.3 | 0.7 | 5.4 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 34.7 | 9.1 | 0.6 | 3.4 | 16.8 | 20.3 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 30.1 | 0.7 | 5.4 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 34.7 | 9.1 | 0.6 | 3.4 | 16.8 | 20.3 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.28 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 390 | 523 | 443 | 412 | 0 | 498 | 601 | 2719 | 824 | 66 | 1185 | 368 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.78 | 0.03 | 0.21 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.91 | 0.26 | 0.02 | 0.77 | 0.67 | 0.79 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 457 | 618 | 523 | 477 | 0 | 588 | 601 | 2719 | 824 | 137 | 1185 | 368 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 43.3 | 30.9 | 32.5 | 31.8 | 0.0 | 32.0 | 37.4 | 15.0 | 13.0 | 56.3 | 41.2 | 42.6 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 7.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 20.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 17.3 | 3.1 | 15.6 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 9.4 | 0.3 | 2.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 17.4 | 3.2 | 0.2 | 1.8 | 7.0 | 9.1 |

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh

| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 50.4 | 30.9 | 32.8 | 31.8 | 0.0 | 32.1 | 57.7 | 15.1 | 13.0 | 73.7 | 44.3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | D | C | C | C | A | C | E | B | B | E | D |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 413 |  |  | 101 |  | 1283 | E |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 45.6 |  |  | 32.0 |  |  | 33.2 |  | 1140 |  |
| Approach LOS | D |  |  | C |  |  | C | 49.2 |  |  |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 10.6 | 69.3 | 38.1 | 46.0 | 33.9 | 38.1 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 6.2 | 6.5 | 5.1 | 6.2 | 6.5 | 5.1 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 9.1 | 58.1 | 39.0 | 39.8 | 27.4 | 39.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 5.4 | 11.1 | 32.1 | 36.7 | 22.3 | 5.7 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 4.8 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 2.6 | 0.5 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 41.1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | $D$ |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 13.5 |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 314 | 1094 | 159 | 39 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 320 | 1116 | 162 | 40 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 132 | 6 | 360 | 1112 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 1020 | 516 | 92 | 10 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#/h | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 5.5 | 17.2 | 5.5 | 9.6 |
| Approach LOS | A | C | A | A |


| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Left |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| RT Channelized |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 2.000 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 | 4.976 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | 1676 | 40 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 320 | 1116 | 956 | 444 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 1206 | 1371 | 0.975 |  |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.980 | 0.980 | 159 | 39 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 314 | 1094 | 933 |  |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 1182 | 1345 | 0.938 | 0.090 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.265 | 0.814 | 5.170 | 9.6 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 5.5 | 17.2 | A | A |
| LOS | C | 10 | 1 | 0 |

HCM 6th Roundabout
6: Bishop Managoe HS Access/Bishop Manogue HS School Access \& Bishop MeximigutePiof(BtBlive


3: Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive Performance by movement

| Movement | EBT | EBR | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 0.1 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 1.2 |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  | \％ | 中4个 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 个个中 | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 322 | 20 | 180 | 16 | 17 | 51 | 204 | 705 | 19 | 59 | 902 | 275 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 322 | 20 | 180 | 16 | 17 | 51 | 204 | 705 | 19 | 59 | 902 | 275 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 379 | 24 | 124 | 19 | 20 | 60 | 240 | 829 | 22 | 69 | 1061 | 177 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 479 | 645 | 547 | 485 | 142 | 426 | 392 | 2247 | 683 | 89 | 1380 | 418 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.22 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.05 | 0.27 | 0.27 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1318 | 1870 | 1585 | 1240 | 412 | 1235 | 1781 | 5106 | 1552 | 1781 | 5106 | 1547 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 379 | 24 | 124 | 19 | 0 | 80 | 240 | 829 | 22 | 69 | 1061 | 177 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1318 | 1870 | 1585 | 1240 | 0 | 1647 | 1781 | 1702 | 1552 | 1781 | 1702 | 1547 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 29.3 | 0.9 | 5.9 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 12.8 | 11.5 | 0.8 | 4.0 | 20.2 | 10.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 32.9 | 0.9 | 5.9 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 12.8 | 11.5 | 0.8 | 4.0 | 20.2 | 10.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.75 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 479 | 645 | 547 | 485 | 0 | 568 | 392 | 2247 | 683 | 89 | 1380 | 418 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.79 | 0.04 | 0.23 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.61 | 0.37 | 0.03 | 0.78 | 0.77 | 0.42 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 597 | 814 | 690 | 597 | 0 | 716 | 392 | 2439 | 741 | 176 | 1820 | 551 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（1） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 35.1 | 22.9 | 24.6 | 23.6 | 0.0 | 23.8 | 37.1 | 19.7 | 16.8 | 49.5 | 35.5 | 31.7 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 5.7 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 7.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 1.5 | 0.7 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 10.1 | 0.4 | 2.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 6.0 | 4.1 | 0.3 | 2.0 | 8.0 | 3.6 |

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh

| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 40.8 | 22.9 | 24.8 | 23.6 | 0.0 | 23.9 | 44.1 | 19.8 | 16.8 | 62.8 | 37.0 | 32.4 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | D | C | C | C | A | C | D | B | B | E | D | C |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 527 |  |  | 99 |  |  | 1091 |  | 1307 |  |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 36.2 |  |  | 23.8 |  |  | 25.1 |  | 37.7 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  | D |  |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$ ，s | 11.1 | 52.9 | 41.5 | 29.0 | 35.0 | 41.5 |
| Change Period $(\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc})$ ，s | 5.8 | 6.5 | 5.1 | 5.8 | 6.5 | 5.1 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 10.4 | 50.4 | 45.9 | 23.2 | 37.6 | 45.9 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 6.0 | 13.5 | 34.9 | 14.8 | 22.2 | 5.5 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 5.7 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 6.3 | 0.6 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 32.5

HCM 6th LOS C

## Notes

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green．

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 7.1 |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 328 | 563 | 103 | 226 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 334 | 574 | 105 | 230 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 345 | 5 | 550 | 562 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 447 | 650 | 129 | 17 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#h | 5 | 0 | 4 | 6 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 0.999 | 1.000 | 0.999 | 0.999 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 7.5 | 6.7 | 6.0 | 8.2 |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A | A |


| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Left |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| RT Channelized |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 334 | 574 | 105 | 230 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 971 | 1373 | 787 | 778 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.981 | 0.981 | 0.981 | 0.982 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 328 | 563 | 103 | 226 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 951 | 1347 | 772 | 763 |
| VIC Ratio | 0.344 | 0.418 | 0.133 | 0.296 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 7.5 | 6.7 | 6.0 | 8.2 |
| LOS | A | A | A | A |
| 95th \%tile Queue, veh | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 |

HCM 6th Roundabout
6: Bishop Managoe HS Access/Bishop Manogue HS School Access \& Bishop Maxistioguerdjes ablive


3: Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive Performance by movement

| Movement | EBT | EBR | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 0.1 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 1.1 |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ＊ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | \％ | 率 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 虫中 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 159 | 8 | 27 | 18 | 31 | 15 | 292 | 610 | 11 | 36 | 610 | 259 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 159 | 8 | 27 | 18 | 31 | 15 | 292 | 610 | 11 | 36 | 610 | 259 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 173 | 9 | 29 | 20 | 34 | 16 | 317 | 663 | 12 | 39 | 663 | 173 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 277 | 330 | 280 | 307 | 212 | 100 | 624 | 3147 | 955 | 58 | 1525 | 473 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.35 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.03 | 0.30 | 0.30 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1355 | 1870 | 1582 | 1368 | 1203 | 566 | 1781 | 5106 | 1549 | 1781 | 5106 | 1585 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 173 | 9 | 29 | 20 | 0 | 50 | 317 | 663 | 12 | 39 | 663 | 173 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1355 | 1870 | 1582 | 1368 | 0 | 1768 | 1781 | 1702 | 1549 | 1781 | 1702 | 1585 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 12.7 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 14.4 | 5.8 | 0.3 | 2.2 | 10.7 | 8.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 15.1 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 14.4 | 5.8 | 0.3 | 2.2 | 10.7 | 8.8 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.32 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 277 | 330 | 280 | 307 | 0 | 312 | 624 | 3147 | 955 | 58 | 1525 | 473 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.62 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.51 | 0.21 | 0.01 | 0.67 | 0.43 | 0.37 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 567 | 731 | 618 | 599 | 0 | 691 | 624 | 3147 | 955 | 136 | 1525 | 473 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 42.0 | 34.8 | 35.3 | 35.5 | 0.0 | 35.6 | 26.2 | 8.6 | 7.6 | 48.9 | 28.9 | 28.2 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.4 | 0.9 | 2.2 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 4.4 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 4.2 | 3.4 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 44.3 | 34.8 | 35.4 | 35.6 | 0.0 | 35.9 | 29.1 | 8.7 | 7.6 | 61.2 | 29.8 | 30.4 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | C | D | D | A | D | C | A | A | E | C | C |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 211 |  |  | 70 |  |  | 992 |  |  | 875 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 42.7 |  |  | 35.8 |  |  | 15.2 |  |  | 31.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 9.5 | 69.5 | 23.1 | 42.0 | 37.0 | 23.1 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 6.2 | 6.5 | 5.1 | 6.2 | 6.5 | 5.1 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 7.8 | 58.5 | 39.9 | 35.8 | 30.5 | 39.9 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 4.2 | 7.8 | 17.1 | 16.4 | 12.7 | 4.4 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 4.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 4.2 | 0.3 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 25.1

HCM 6th LOS C

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 5.1 |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  | WB | SB |
| Approach | EB | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 54 | 22 |  |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 104 | 461 | 55 | 22 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 106 | 3 | 128 | 459 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 60 | 180 | 5 |  |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 421 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#/h | 2 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.00 | 5.7 | 4.4 | 4.4 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 3.5 | A | A | A |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  |  |


| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Left |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 | 4.609 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 | 276 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 106 | 461 | 55 | 22 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 1298 | 1376 | 1211 | 864 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.980 | 0.980 | 0.982 | 1.000 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 104 | 452 | 54 | 22 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 1272 | 1348 | 1189 | 064 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.082 | 0.335 | 0.045 | 4.4 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 3.5 | 5.7 | 3.4 | A |
| LOS | A | 1 | 0 | 0 |

HCM 6th Roundabout
6: Bishop Managoe HS Access/Bishop Manogue HS School Access \& BishopadkrenqogNeP iof


3: Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive Performance by movement

| Movement | EBR | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.2 | 0.2 | 2.6 | 1.4 | 1.1 |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | \％ | 中冓 | 「 | \％ | 虫㐱 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 275 | 17 | 141 | 16 | 15 | 51 | 163 | 801 | 19 | 59 | 1021 | 255 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 275 | 17 | 141 | 16 | 15 | 51 | 163 | 801 | 19 | 59 | 1021 | 255 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 299 | 18 | 71 | 17 | 16 | 55 | 177 | 871 | 21 | 64 | 1110 | 141 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 413 | 534 | 453 | 441 | 106 | 363 | 420 | 2467 | 750 | 83 | 1500 | 455 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.24 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.05 | 0.29 | 0.29 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1328 | 1870 | 1585 | 1308 | 370 | 1270 | 1781 | 5106 | 1552 | 1781 | 5106 | 1547 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 299 | 18 | 71 | 17 | 0 | 71 | 177 | 871 | 21 | 64 | 1110 | 141 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1328 | 1870 | 1585 | 1308 | 0 | 1640 | 1781 | 1702 | 1552 | 1781 | 1702 | 1547 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 20.4 | 0.7 | 3.2 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 7.9 | 10.0 | 0.7 | 3.3 | 18.5 | 6.7 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 23.5 | 0.7 | 3.2 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 7.9 | 10.0 | 0.7 | 3.3 | 18.5 | 6.7 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.77 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 413 | 534 | 453 | 441 | 0 | 469 | 420 | 2467 | 750 | 83 | 1500 | 455 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.72 | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.42 | 0.35 | 0.03 | 0.77 | 0.74 | 0.31 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 667 | 892 | 756 | 691 | 0 | 782 | 420 | 2798 | 851 | 193 | 2147 | 651 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 33.9 | 24.3 | 25.2 | 24.8 | 0.0 | 25.1 | 30.5 | 15.2 | 12.8 | 44.4 | 30.0 | 25.8 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 3.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 14.1 | 0.8 | 0.4 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（ $50 \%$ ），veh／In | 6.8 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 0.2 | 1.7 | 6.9 | 2.3 |

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh

| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 36.3 | 24.3 | 25.3 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 25.3 | 33.6 | 15.3 | 12.8 | 58.5 | 30.8 | 26.2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | D | C | C | C | A | C | C | B | B | E | C | C |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 388 |  |  | 88 |  |  | 1069 |  | 1315 |  |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 33.7 |  |  | 25.2 |  |  | 18.2 |  | 31.7 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 10.2 | 52.0 | 32.0 | 28.0 | 34.2 | 32.0 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 5.8 | 6.5 | 5.1 | 5.8 | 6.5 | 5.1 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 10.2 | 51.6 | 44.9 | 22.2 | 39.6 | 44.9 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 5.3 | 12.0 | 25.5 | 9.9 | 20.5 | 5.0 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 6.1 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 7.2 | 0.5 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 26.7 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

## Notes

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green．

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 4.6 |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 171 | 311 | 54 | 119 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 174 | 317 | 55 | 121 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 184 | 3 | 286 | 311 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 248 | 338 | 72 | 9 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#/h | 5 | 0 | 4 | 6 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 0.999 | 1.000 | 0.999 | 0.999 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 4.5 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.8 |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A | A |


| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Left |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 | 4.609 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 | 121 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 174 | 317 | 55 | 1005 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 1144 | 1376 | 1031 | 0.983 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.981 | 0.982 | 119 |  |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 171 | 311 | 9.982 | 987 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 1121 | 1351 | 54 | 0.121 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.152 | 0.230 | 4.8 | 4.8 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 4.5 | 4.6 | 4.0 | A |
| LOS | A | 1 | A | 0 |

HCM 6th Roundabout
6: Bishop Managoe HS Access/Bishop Manogue HS School Access \& Bishopchdraundgla erdjes ablive


3: Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive Performance by movement

| Movement | EBR | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 1.1 |


|  | $\stackrel{*}{ }$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | $4$ | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\frac{1}{\dagger}$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 4 | 7 | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 來革 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 中革 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 212 | 11 | 66 | 18 | 38 | 15 | 383 | 573 | 11 | 36 | 632 | 303 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 212 | 11 | 66 | 18 | 38 | 15 | 383 | 573 | 11 | 36 | 632 | 303 |
| Initial Q $(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 230 | 12 | 72 | 20 | 41 | 16 | 416 | 623 | 12 | 39 | 687 | 220 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 329 | 413 | 350 | 350 | 283 | 110 | 591 | 2973 | 902 | 57 | 1443 | 448 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.33 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1346 | 1870 | 1583 | 1312 | 1281 | 500 | 1781 | 5106 | 1549 | 1781 | 5106 | 1585 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 230 | 12 | 72 | 20 | 0 | 57 | 416 | 623 | 12 | 39 | 687 | 220 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1346 | 1870 | 1583 | 1312 | 0 | 1780 | 1781 | 1702 | 1549 | 1781 | 1702 | 1585 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 17.9 | 0.5 | 4.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 22.0 | 6.3 | 0.4 | 2.3 | 12.0 | 12.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 20.7 | 0.5 | 4.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 22.0 | 6.3 | 0.4 | 2.3 | 12.0 | 12.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.28 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 329 | 413 | 350 | 350 | 0 | 393 | 591 | 2973 | 902 | 57 | 1443 | 448 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.70 | 0.03 | 0.21 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.70 | 0.21 | 0.01 | 0.69 | 0.48 | 0.49 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 530 | 691 | 585 | 545 | 0 | 658 | 591 | 2973 | 902 | 129 | 1443 | 448 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 42.2 | 33.0 | 34.3 | 33.7 | 0.0 | 33.8 | 31.5 | 10.7 | 9.5 | 51.7 | 32.1 | 32.3 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.6 | 1.1 | 3.8 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 6.2 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 9.8 | 2.0 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 4.8 | 4.9 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 44.8 | 33.0 | 34.6 | 33.8 | 0.0 | 34.0 | 38.4 | 10.8 | 9.5 | 65.3 | 33.2 | 36.1 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | C | C | C | A | C | D | B | A | E | C | D |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 314 |  |  | 77 |  |  | 1051 |  |  | 946 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 42.0 |  |  | 33.9 |  |  | 21.7 |  |  | 35.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 9.6 | 69.4 |  | 29.0 | 42.0 | 37.0 |  | 29.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s | 6.2 | 6.5 |  | 5.1 | 6.2 | 6.5 |  | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 7.8 | 58.5 |  | 39.9 | 35.8 | 30.5 |  | 39.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 4.3 | 8.3 |  | 22.7 | 24.0 | 14.5 |  | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 4.1 |  | 0.9 | 1.0 | 4.3 |  | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 30.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 6.1 |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 174 | 606 | 88 | 22 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 177 | 618 | 90 | 22 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 73 | 3 | 199 | 616 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 565 | 286 | 51 | 5 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#/h | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 4.0 | 7.1 | 4.0 | 5.2 |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A | A |


| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Left |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 | 4.609 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 | 276 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 177 | 618 | 90 | 736 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 1281 | 1376 | 1126 | 1.000 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.980 | 0.981 | 0.978 | 22 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 174 | 606 | 88 | 736 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 1255 | 1349 | 1101 | 0.030 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.138 | 0.449 | 0.080 | 5.2 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 4.0 | 7.1 | 4.0 | A |
| LOS | A | 2 | 0 | 0 |

HCM 6th Roundabout
6: Bishop Managoe HS Access/Bishop Manogue HS School Access \& BishopBAdkerpoghtePiofet difive


3: Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive Performance by movement

| Movement | EBR | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.1 | 0.2 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 1.1 |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | \％ | 种4 | F | ${ }^{*}$ | 來中 | 7 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 322 | 20 | 180 | 16 | 17 | 51 | 204 | 801 | 19 | 59 | 1024 | 275 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 322 | 20 | 180 | 16 | 17 | 51 | 204 | 801 | 19 | 59 | 1024 | 275 |
| Initial Q $(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 350 | 22 | 114 | 17 | 18 | 55 | 222 | 871 | 21 | 64 | 1113 | 163 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 456 | 601 | 510 | 464 | 130 | 399 | 390 | 2350 | 714 | 83 | 1468 | 445 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.22 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.05 | 0.29 | 0.29 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1326 | 1870 | 1585 | 1253 | 406 | 1240 | 1781 | 5106 | 1552 | 1781 | 5106 | 1547 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 350 | 22 | 114 | 17 | 0 | 73 | 222 | 871 | 21 | 64 | 1113 | 163 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1326 | 1870 | 1585 | 1253 | 0 | 1646 | 1781 | 1702 | 1552 | 1781 | 1702 | 1547 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 25.8 | 0.8 | 5.3 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 11.3 | 11.2 | 0.7 | 3.6 | 20.1 | 8.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 29.0 | 0.8 | 5.3 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 11.3 | 11.2 | 0.7 | 3.6 | 20.1 | 8.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.75 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 456 | 601 | 510 | 464 | 0 | 529 | 390 | 2350 | 714 | 83 | 1468 | 445 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.77 | 0.04 | 0.22 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.57 | 0.37 | 0.03 | 0.77 | 0.76 | 0.37 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 617 | 829 | 703 | 617 | 0 | 730 | 390 | 2602 | 791 | 179 | 1997 | 605 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 34.7 | 23.6 | 25.1 | 24.2 | 0.0 | 24.4 | 35.3 | 17.8 | 15.0 | 47.8 | 32.9 | 28.7 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 5.9 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 14.1 | 1.2 | 0.5 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 8.7 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 5.2 | 3.9 | 0.2 | 1.8 | 7.8 | 3.0 |

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh

| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 38.7 | 23.6 | 25.3 | 24.2 | 0.0 | 24.5 | 41.2 | 17.9 | 15.0 | 61.9 | 34.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | D | C | C | C | A | C | D | B | B | E | C |
| Cpproach Vol，veh／h |  | 486 |  |  | 90 |  | 1114 |  | 1340 |  |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 34.9 |  |  | 24.5 |  |  | 22.5 |  | 34.8 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | C |  |  | C | $C$ |  |  |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 10.5 | 53.1 | 37.7 | 28.0 | 35.6 | 37.7 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 5.8 | 6.5 | 5.1 | 5.8 | 6.5 | 5.1 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 10.2 | 51.6 | 44.9 | 22.2 | 39.6 | 44.9 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 5.6 | 13.2 | 31.0 | 13.3 | 22.1 | 5.2 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 6.0 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 7.0 | 0.5 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 30.0 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

## Notes

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green．

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 5.1 |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  | WB | SB |
| Approach | EB | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 77 | 121 |  |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 245 | 78 | 123 |  |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 250 | 387 | 381 |  |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 201 | 3 | 96 | 9 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 303 | 437 | 6 |  |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#/h | 5 | 0 | 4 | 6 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 0.999 | 1.000 | 0.999 | 5.2 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 5.3 | 5.1 | 4.6 | A |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A |  |


| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Left |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 | 4.609 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 | 123 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 250 | 387 | 78 | 936 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 1124 | 1376 | 954 | 0.983 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.981 | 0.980 | 121 |  |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 245 | 379 | 9.987 | 919 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 1102 | 1348 | 977 | 0.132 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.281 | 5.2 |  |  |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 5.3 | 5.1 | 4.082 | A |
| LOS | A | A | 0 |  |

HCM 6th Roundabout
6: Bishop Managoe HS Access/Bishop Manogue HS School Access \& Bishopakharproguerdite abrive


3: Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive Performance by movement

| Movement | EBR | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 1.1 |

## APPENDIX D \| SIMTRAFFIC QUEUEING REPORTS

Intersection: 2: Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | TR | L | T | T | T | R | L | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 184 | 92 | 45 | 43 | 76 | 289 | 150 | 152 | 132 | 16 | 97 | 148 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 83 | 7 | 11 | 11 | 24 | 143 | 35 | 42 | 44 | 2 | 30 | 59 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 153 | 46 | 31 | 34 | 58 | 259 | 102 | 103 | 101 | 11 | 67 | 115 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 264 |  |  | 903 |  | 448 | 448 | 448 | 448 |  | 4983 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 200 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 150 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 400 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 2 | 0 |  | 1 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |

## Intersection: 2: Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 169 | 260 | 210 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 60 | 95 | 71 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 124 | 192 | 147 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 4983 | 4983 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 1 | 0 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 3 | 1 |

## Intersection: 3: Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive

| Movement | NB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 23 | 7 | 2 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 11 | 7 | 2 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 105 | 105 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |

Intersection: 5: Bishop Manogue HS Access/USPS Access \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 43 | 64 | 37 | 42 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 4 | 4 | 3 | 5 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 24 | 39 | 19 | 26 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 527 | 196 | 468 | 464 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 6: Bishop Managoe HS Access/Bishop Manogue HS School Access \& Bishop Manogue HS

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 50 | 59 | 38 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 5 | 6 | 3 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 27 | 31 | 18 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 387 | 356 | 487 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Zone Summary |  |  |  |

Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 6

Queuing and Blocking Report
Bishop Manogue High School Expansion TIS
Existing AFT
Intersection: 2: Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | TR | L | T | T | T | R | L | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 227 | 167 | 143 | 47 | 75 | 223 | 192 | 180 | 183 | 20 | 106 | 212 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 129 | 14 | 39 | 13 | 26 | 92 | 73 | 70 | 72 | 4 | 44 | 89 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 206 | 74 | 93 | 38 | 58 | 165 | 143 | 142 | 147 | 16 | 85 | 172 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 264 |  |  | 903 |  | 448 | 448 | 448 | 448 |  | 4983 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 200 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 150 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 400 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 7 |  | 0 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 11 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |

## Intersection: 2: Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 215 | 220 | 142 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 95 | 111 | 56 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 179 | 195 | 110 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 4983 | 4983 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 1 | 200 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 2 | 0 |

## Intersection: 3: Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive

| Movement | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 6 | 3 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 0 | 0 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 6 | 3 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 105 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 5: Bishop Manogue HS Access/USPS Access \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 64 | 31 | 45 | 65 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 14 | 1 | 7 | 15 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 46 | 14 | 30 | 50 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 527 | 196 | 468 | 464 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 6: Bishop Managoe HS Access/Bishop Manogue HS School Access \& Bishop Manogue HS

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 31 | 59 | 45 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 2 | 7 | 7 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 16 | 33 | 31 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 387 | 356 | 487 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Zone Summary |  |  |  |

Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 16

Intersection: 2: Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | NB | NB | B7 | B7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | TR | L | T | T | T | R | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 225 | 204 | 170 | 52 | 101 | 392 | 300 | 210 | 170 | 17 | 40 | 14 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 132 | 23 | 26 | 12 | 31 | 200 | 64 | 59 | 55 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 217 | 120 | 80 | 37 | 74 | 364 | 227 | 150 | 127 | 11 | 60 | 17 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 264 |  |  | 903 |  | 448 | 448 | 448 | 448 | 417 | 417 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 1 |  |  |  | 0 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 150 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 400 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage BIk Time (\%) | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 2: Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | SB | SB | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | T | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 85 | 179 | 213 | 304 | 273 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 33 | 86 | 93 | 139 | 113 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 75 | 150 | 167 | 241 | 221 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 4983 | 4983 | 4983 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  | 200 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 200 |  |  | 2 | 1 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 |  | 9 | 3 |

## Intersection: 3: Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive

| Movement | NB | NB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 30 | 10 | 8 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 15 | 7 | 8 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 105 | 105 | 105 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

Intersection: 5: Bishop Manogue HS Access/USPS Access \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 54 | 129 | 59 | 42 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 8 | 12 | 7 | 6 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 35 | 70 | 34 | 28 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 527 | 196 | 468 | 464 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 6: Bishop Managoe HS Access/Bishop Manogue HS School Access \& Bishop Manogue HS

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 97 | 85 | 30 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 9 | 7 | 2 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 50 | 43 | 16 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 387 | 356 | 487 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

## Zone Summary

Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 35

Intersection: 2: Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | TR | L | T | T | T | R | L | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 239 | 276 | 184 | 45 | 82 | 240 | 214 | 193 | 194 | 25 | 98 | 229 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 162 | 48 | 53 | 9 | 28 | 112 | 85 | 80 | 83 | 5 | 44 | 113 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 242 | 199 | 131 | 31 | 61 | 202 | 170 | 160 | 161 | 18 | 88 | 206 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 264 |  |  | 903 |  | 448 | 448 | 448 | 448 |  | 4983 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 150 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 400 |  |  |  |  | 200 |  |
| Storage BIk Time (\%) | 14 |  | 0 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 29 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |

## Intersection: 2: Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 246 | 252 | 200 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 124 | 139 | 65 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 223 | 231 | 133 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 4983 | 4983 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 3 | 200 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 7 | 1 |

## Intersection: 3: Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive

| Movement | NB | SB | B7 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | R | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 6 | 3 | 36 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 6 | 3 | 37 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 105 |  | 448 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

## Intersection: 5: Bishop Manogue HS Access/USPS Access \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 70 | 48 | 61 | 78 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 19 | 2 | 12 | 21 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 55 | 22 | 41 | 57 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 527 | 196 | 468 | 464 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 6: Bishop Managoe HS Access/Bishop Manogue HS School Access \& Bishop Manogue HS

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 28 | 66 | 51 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 2 | 8 | 7 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 14 | 40 | 31 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 387 | 356 | 487 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Zone Summary |  |  |  |

Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 46

Intersection: 2: Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | NB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | TR | L | T | T | T | R | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 160 | 147 | 66 | 44 | 83 | 272 | 156 | 170 | 187 | 17 | 79 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 97 | 15 | 13 | 11 | 28 | 140 | 36 | 49 | 57 | 2 | 32 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 150 | 80 | 38 | 34 | 66 | 236 | 106 | 124 | 140 | 11 | 70 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 174 |  |  | 903 |  | 447 | 447 | 447 | 447 | 129 |
| Upstream BIk Time (\%) | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 150 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 400 |  |  |  | 200 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 1 | 0 |  | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |

## Intersection: 2: Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 171 | 233 | 188 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 89 | 124 | 74 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 146 | 200 | 139 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 4983 | 4983 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 1 | 200 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 2 | 0 |

## Intersection: 3: Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive

| Movement |
| :--- |
| Directions Served |
| Maximum Queue (ft) |
| Average Queue (ft) |
| 95th Queue (ft) |
| Link Distance (ft) |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |

Intersection: 5: Bishop Manogue HS Access/USPS Access \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 40 | 34 | 25 | 30 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 25 | 20 | 17 | 18 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 527 | 286 | 468 | 464 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 6: Bishop Managoe HS Access/Bishop Manogue HS School Access \& Bishop Manogue HS

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 41 | 32 | 30 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 25 | 17 | 15 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 385 | 356 | 487 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

## Zone Summary

Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 5

Intersection: 2: Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | TR | L | T | T | T | R | L | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 172 | 204 | 167 | 41 | 72 | 176 | 199 | 196 | 207 | 21 | 102 | 230 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 129 | 55 | 49 | 9 | 24 | 86 | 79 | 80 | 83 | 4 | 42 | 113 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 179 | 180 | 122 | 31 | 56 | 157 | 173 | 169 | 171 | 17 | 87 | 216 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 174 |  |  | 903 |  | 447 | 447 | 447 | 447 |  | 4983 |
| Upstream BIk Time (\%) | 2 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 | 8 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 150 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 400 |  |  |  |  | 200 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 12 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |

## Intersection: 2: Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 241 | 248 | 180 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 123 | 140 | 61 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 223 | 238 | 127 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 4983 | 4983 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  | 200 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 3 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 8 | 0 |

## Intersection: 3: Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive

| Movement | SB | B7 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | R | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 3 | 5 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 0 | 0 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 3 | 5 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 447 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 125 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 5: Bishop Manogue HS Access/USPS Access \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 51 | 31 | 47 | 58 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 12 | 2 | 6 | 15 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 40 | 16 | 29 | 47 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 527 | 286 | 468 | 464 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 6: Bishop Managoe HS Access/Bishop Manogue HS School Access \& Bishop Manogue HS

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 28 | 36 | 42 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 2 | 4 | 7 |
| 95th Queue ( ft ) | 14 | 21 | 30 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 385 | 356 | 487 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Zone Summary |  |  |  |

Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 31

Intersection: 2: Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | NB | NB | B7 | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | TR | L | T | T | T | R | T | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 168 | 191 | 137 | 44 | 73 | 338 | 202 | 172 | 173 | 14 | 4 | 85 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 117 | 28 | 26 | 13 | 26 | 192 | 45 | 51 | 60 | 2 | 0 | 32 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 169 | 125 | 76 | 35 | 61 | 317 | 159 | 121 | 133 | 9 | 4 | 73 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 174 |  |  | 903 |  | 447 | 447 | 447 | 447 | 417 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 2 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 | 2 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 150 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 400 |  |  |  |  |  | 200 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 2: Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | SB | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 150 | 166 | 236 | 213 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 85 | 92 | 131 | 91 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 131 | 146 | 204 | 169 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 4983 | 4983 | 4983 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  | 200 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 |  | 3 | 0 |

## Intersection: 3: Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive

| Movement | SB |
| :--- | :---: |
| Directions Served | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 6 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 0 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 4 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 125 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |

Intersection: 5: Bishop Manogue HS Access/USPS Access \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 51 | 80 | 49 | 34 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 7 | 6 | 6 | 7 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 33 | 39 | 30 | 28 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 527 | 286 | 468 | 464 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 6: Bishop Managoe HS Access/Bishop Manogue HS School Access \& Bishop Manogue HS

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 56 | 38 | 37 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 6 | 5 | 3 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 30 | 24 | 20 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 385 | 356 | 487 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Zone Summary |  |  |  |
| Zoner |  |  |  |

Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 12

Intersection: 2: Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | NB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | TR | L | T | T | T | R | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 171 | 201 | 164 | 47 | 83 | 203 | 218 | 216 | 224 | 20 | 106 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 126 | 51 | 51 | 10 | 26 | 85 | 84 | 83 | 83 | 4 | 43 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 179 | 175 | 121 | 34 | 59 | 157 | 182 | 181 | 179 | 15 | 88 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 174 |  |  | 903 |  | 447 | 447 | 447 | 447 | 4983 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 2 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 | 6 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 150 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 400 |  |  |  | 200 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 7 | 0 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 11 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |

## Intersection: 2: Virginia Street \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 239 | 260 | 164 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 128 | 145 | 57 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 231 | 246 | 120 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 4983 | 4983 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 4 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 10 |  |

## Intersection: 3: Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive

| Movement | B7 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 3 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 0 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 3 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 447 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

Intersection: 5: Bishop Manogue HS Access/USPS Access \& McCabe Drive

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 54 | 30 | 31 | 50 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 13 | 2 | 6 | 16 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 42 | 17 | 26 | 44 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 527 | 286 | 468 | 464 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 6: Bishop Managoe HS Access/Bishop Manogue HS School Access \& Bishop Manogue HS

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 29 | 30 | 42 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 1 | 3 | 6 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 12 | 20 | 27 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 385 | 356 | 487 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Zone Summary |  |  |  |

Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 30

## Appendix E

Crash Data

Virgina Street near Bishop Manogue HS Crash Data
Reno, NV

| Year | Primary Rd | Sec Rd | Fatal | Injury | PDO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2016 | Virginia St | McCabe Dr |  |  | Crash Type |
| 2016 | McCabe $\operatorname{Dr}$ | Virginia St |  | Angle |  |
| 2017 | Virginia St | McCabe $\operatorname{Dr}$ |  | 1 | Angle |
| 2017 | Virginia St | McCabe Dr | 1 |  | Non-Collision |
| 2017 | Virginia St | McCabe $\operatorname{Dr}$ | 1 |  | Sideswipe |
| 2018 | Virginia St | McCabe Dr |  | 1 | Non-Collision |
| 2018 | Virginia St | McCabe Dr |  | 1 | Angle |
| 2018 | Virginia St | McCabe Dr | 1 |  | Non-Collision |
| 2018 | Virginia St | Bishop Manogue Dr | 1 |  | Angle |
| 2019 | Virginia St | McCabe Dr |  | 1 | Angle |
| 2020 | Virginia St | McCabe Dr | 1 |  | Rear-End |
| 2020 | Virginia St | Bishop Manogue Dr | 1 |  | Rear-End |
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[^0]:    2 North Elevation

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

[^2]:    Notes: Bold values indicate unacceptable LOS.
    ${ }^{1}$ Virginia Street \& McCabe Street is located within City of Reno limits, and has a Level of Service standard of D
    ${ }^{2}$ The Virginia Street \& Bishop Manogue Drive intersection is determined by Sim Traffic 11 movement delay
    ${ }^{3}$ OWSC = One-Way Stop-Controlled (i.e., minor street stop-controlled)
    ${ }^{4}$ For OWSC, the worst approach/movement delay and LOS is reported.

