

D.1 Introduction

The project consists of targeted amendments to the El Dorado County Plan (TGPA), a comprehensive zoning code update (ZOU), and design standards and guidelines for mixed use development.

This appendix describes the detailed methodology and procedures used to develop the El Dorado County Travel Demand Model (TDM) that served as the basis for evaluating the traffic operations for each of six study scenarios evaluated for the TGPA/ZOU¹. The term “existing” refers to conditions in 2010, not 2014. The methodology has been revised since the release of the Draft EIR and this Appendix D supersedes that included in the Draft EIR.

The methodology described below was used for the traffic analysis in the Recirculated Partial Draft EIR (RPDEIR) that was available for public review from January 29 through March 16, 2015. It was also used in the responses to comments and the traffic projections presented in the Final EIR. The results are reflected in the Final EIR.

The six roadway network scenarios were based on the following.

1. Study Scenario 1 (2010 Baseline Conditions)—Existing conditions; includes road network in 2010.
2. Study Scenario 2 (Project 2035 Impact)—2035 land use buildout (with road network in 2010) + Project (TGPA/ZOU buildout assumption) with existing CIP/RTP Improvements.
3. Study Scenario 3 (2025 Baseline Conditions)—2010 road network with 2025 CIP/RTP Improvements.
4. Study Scenario 4 (Project 2025 Impact)—2010 road network + Project (TGPA/ZOU buildout assumption) with 2025 CIP/RTP Improvements.
5. Study Scenario 5 (2035 Baseline)—2010 road network with 2035 land use buildout outside of El Dorado County with existing CIP/RTP Improvements.
6. Study Scenario 6 (Cumulative Conditions in 2035)—2035 road network + Project (TGPA/ZOU buildout assumption) with 2035 CIP/RTP Improvements.

Information about the model development activities, inputs, and approach is organized in the following topic areas.

- | Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs) development.
- | Roadway Network development.
- | Trip Generation and Trip Distribution overview.

¹ More detailed information regarding development of the model, technical memorandum’s prepared during the development process are located on the El Dorado County website at:
http://www.edcgov.us/Government/Planning/Travel_Demand_Model.aspx?terms=travel%20demand%20model

- | Mode Choice and Model Sensitivity to Smart Growth factors.
- | Traffic Assignment and Validation.
- | Land Use Scenarios.

D.2 Traffic Analysis Zones Development

TAZs are an essential part of the TDM that serve multiple purposes including the following.

- | Provide the basic unit for converting spatial area data into tabular data for use by the TDM.
- | Used to aggregate homogenous or discrete land use for analysis purposes.
- | Used to manage interactions between internal land uses.
- | Basis for channeling trip loading onto the model roadway network.
- | Serves as a repository for land use, employment, population, socioeconomic, and other data.
- | Provides a tool to facilitate understanding of spatial differences between geographical areas, different land use scenarios, and analysis periods.
- | Used to display information related to land use, employment, population, socioeconomic, and other data.

Several TAZ data sets provided by El Dorado County and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) were reviewed in preparation for developing the updated El Dorado County TAZ structure for use in the newly developed TDM.

Previous El Dorado County TAZ Structure – The current 267-zone system is available as a Geographical Information System (GIS) layer from El Dorado County and includes data attributes related to two different residential types and three employment types. Information is provided for the entirety of El Dorado County, except the area of the Tahoe Basin covered by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA).

Draft 2010 El Dorado County TAZ Structure – This 934-zone system is available as a GIS layer from El Dorado County but does not include any data attributes. This interim work product was not finalized and was not utilized in El Dorado County TDM forecasting activities.

SACOG SACMET07 TAZ Structure – The current TAZ structure is available as a GIS layer and has 1,528 zones, of which 126 are in El Dorado County. Similar to the current El Dorado County TAZ structure, this source does not provide coverage for the Tahoe Basin covered by TRPA.

Each of these TAZ structures was reviewed to determine their alignment with the planned base year roadway network, coverage of existing El Dorado County development, and GIS topology. Based on this review and input from El Dorado County staff, it was determined that the Draft 2010 El Dorado County TAZ Structure was of sufficient detail that it would best serve as a starting point for developing a TAZ structure for use in the TDM update.

The general layout of TAZs was approached with the following considerations in mind.

- | The overriding consideration of TAZ development is that the resultant network loading support logical travel demand forecasts.
- | The TAZ structure should reflect overall model accuracy and limitations.
- | Large developments should be disaggregated.

- | Highly concentrated urban zones should be reasonably sized.
- | TAZ borders should follow network roadways/physical constraints.
- | TAZs must have direct access to the roadway network.
- | The TAZ structure should be understandable to the general population.

Based on these considerations and approach, the 2010 El Dorado County TAZ structure was reviewed and modifications to TAZs were recommended. The recommended modifications included the following.

- | 576 zones were recommended for aggregation resulting in 145 new zones (some of which were identified for further disaggregation and/or had network connectivity issues that needed to be addressed).
- | 286 zones were recommended to be kept “as is.”
- | 58 zones were recommended to be redrawn to address network connectivity issues.
- | 14 zones were recommended for disaggregation.

Subsequently, Kimley-Horn staff met with El Dorado County staff to discuss recommended TAZ modifications and the considerations listed above. Based on the comments received from El Dorado County staff, and based on further analysis, the revised TAZs shown in Figure D.2-1 were developed in consideration of the following reasons and inputs:

- | Public comments/additional El Dorado County staff comments.
- | Anticipated locations of the future growth.
- | Inclusion of TAZs outside of the County to improve model performance.
- | Unique land uses.

As a result, the analysis included 493 TAZs within El Dorado County and 193 TAZs outside El Dorado County in Sacramento and Placer Counties.

D.3 Roadway Network Development

The roadway network is an essential part of the TDM that serves multiple purposes including the following.

- | Basis for estimating travel time between TAZs.
- | Basis and repository for traffic assignments.
- | Tool to facilitate an understanding of how trips are distributed.
- | Tool for displaying the level of traffic congestion associated with different land use scenarios.

The following network data sets provided by El Dorado County and SACOG were reviewed.

GPS roads – this GIS layer is an inventory of existing roadways in the County, including all of the highways and major roads identified in the Circulation Element.

2025 SACMET Network – this network from the SACMET model was converted from its Cube format for analysis in GIS.

2025 EDC TDM Network – this network from the current El Dorado County TDM was converted from its MINUTP format for analysis in GIS.

The GPS roads layer is a detailed inventory of existing roadways in El Dorado County. The network classifies roadways in three categories: Highways (freeways and California Department of Transportation [Caltrans] operated arterials), Major Roads, and Minor Roads. This layer consists of line features with several data attributes coded in a GIS database. The review focused on the data attributes that stored information about the physical characteristics of the roadway, including pavement status (paved or unpaved), existing number of lanes, and segment length.

The SACMET roadway network includes regional highways and major arterials in the Sacramento region, including those in El Dorado County. The network is used to assign traffic for the current 2025 SACMET forecast (note that SACOG’s official model of record is now SACSIM). The review focused on the data attributes coded for roadway classification, free-flow speed, capacity, number of lanes, and link distance.

The process for developing the base year and future networks for the updated El Dorado County model consisted of the following.

- l Preparing an overlay of the GPS roads network with the 2025 SACMET and 2025 El Dorado County TDM network to analyze the high-level differences between the detailed GIS network and the coarser, 2025 model networks originally developed in Cube/MINUTP formats.
- l Preparing a comparison map in GIS of the roadway network in the Circulation Element and the 2025 model networks.
- l Distributing network comparison maps to El Dorado County staff and the Board of Supervisors for review and input. Based on El Dorado County staff and public comments, a list of edits for the revised base year and future 2035 networks were developed and subsequently implemented. The final, revised network reflects the El Dorado County staff comments. Roadways in the future network (used as both the basis for 2025 and 2035 analyses), included the following CIP projects (the CIP identifiers are provided in parenthesis).
 - i Headington Road Extension (71375)
 - i Silver Springs Parkway (76107 and 76108)
 - i Country Club Drive Extension (GP124, GP125, and GP126)
 - i Diamond Springs Parkway (72334 and 72368)
 - i Latrobe/White Rock Connector (66116)
 - i Saratoga Way Extension (71324 and GP147)

Additionally, the following improvements were included in the future network.

- l Ray Lawyer Drive Extension (based on direction from El Dorado County staff).
- l High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes extending to Greenstone Road (based their provision in the SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy [MTP/SCS] 2035 and the Transportation Concept Report and Corridor System Management Plan[TCR/CSMP], U.S. Highway 50) (Sacramento Area Council of Governments 2012, California Department of Transportation 2014).

D.4 Trip Generation and Trip Distribution Overview

The El Dorado County TDM as designed relies heavily on the trip generation and trip distribution submodel previously developed for the SACOG's SACMET model. This submodel has its basis in regional survey data collected and reported in the *2000 Sacramento Area Household Travel Survey: Final Report*. This submodel has been refined several times prior to its most recent available description which is provided in the *2008 Model Update Report: SACMET 07*. Based on a review of available documentation and a review of model scripts and procedures, the trip generation and trip distribution submodel was determined to be consistent with standard practices for regional model development, thus statistically valid and appropriate for application to the El Dorado County TDM.

The trip generation submodel consists of estimating trip productions and attractions based on socioeconomic variables (occupied dwelling units, population, and employment). The socioeconomic data inputs that go into the model are derived from land use projections. The trip generation submodel features eight basic trip purposes: Home-based Work; Home-based Shop; Home-based School; Home-based Other; Work-Other; Other-Other; Commercial Vehicle 2 Axle; and Commercial Vehicle 3+ Axle.

The trip distribution submodel uses a gravity model where trips flow from an origin to a destination. The gravity model formula determines destinations according to the size of the destination (level of attractions) and the attractiveness of the destination as determined by travel distance or travel cost. The trip distribution submodel is applied to non-work and non-home based trip purposes; destinations for home-based work purposes are determined within the model choice submodel. In general, people tend to tolerate long travel times and distances during their commute compared to non-work travel such as shopping. The gravity model formula includes a friction factor that considers the automobile travel time for non-commute trips.

D.4.1 Mode Choice Submodel and Sensitivity to Smart Growth Factors

Mode choice refers to the method of transportation that a trip-maker utilizes (e.g., car, transit, bike, or walk). Within the mode choice submodel, the likelihood that a particular travel mode is selected is based on several variables including household socioeconomic profile, the location and availability of mode choices at the beginning and end of a trip, and select transportation costs.

The El Dorado County TDM utilizes the mode choice submodel previously developed for SACOG's SACMET model. This submodel has been refined several times prior to its most recent available description which is provided in the *2008 Model Update Report: SACMET 07*. Based on a review of available documentation and a review of model scripts and procedures, the mode choice submodel was determined to be consistent with standard practices for regional model development, thus statistically valid and appropriate for application to the El Dorado County TDM.

Specific socioeconomic characteristics that the mode choice model considers include the number of persons, workers, automobiles owned, and income. The submodel also takes into account the travel time and costs for each travel mode and the land use characteristics at the trip origin and destination zones. Person trips are assigned to one of seven travel modes.

- | Drive alone
- | HOV – 2 occupants

- | HOV – 3 or more occupants
- | Transit, walk access
- | Transit, drive access (using park and ride lots)
- | Walk
- | Bicycle

Traditional four-step models are limited in their ability to account for adjustments to land use decisions and the built-environment—namely the pursuit of smart growth principles that feature greater mixed-use development and accessibility to transit. These factors have been studied extensively and have been documented to have an effect on increasing the share of trips completed by transit, biking, and walking. Smart-growth strategies that integrate land use decisions and transportation are increasingly relevant for regional planning agencies charged with carrying out the requirements of Senate Bill (SB) 375. This legislation includes the requirement that a SCS be prepared with the RTP.

To improve the sensitivity of traditional TDMs to smart-growth strategies, many agencies have developed and incorporated methodologies into their forecasting processes. Though the tools for improving the sensitivity of TDMs to smart-growth strategies vary, many if not all make reference to the *5Ds*, (*density, diversity, design, destination and distance*) as having an impact on travel behavior. The relationship between the 5Ds and their effect on trip-making is well documented and has been demonstrated in numerous studies. The following is a description of the 5D factors that influence trip-making.

Destination refers to the accessibility to activity centers. Households located in low density developments often experience greater travel time to other destinations.

Distance refers to the proximity to transit stations. Transit service situated near households or employment centers is more attractive to users.

Density refers to the intensity of development. Areas with high concentrations of residences and jobs feature greater transit accessibility and walkability, resulting in less automobile travel.

Diversity measures the balance of housing and jobs. It may also consider demographic inputs such as the number of available vehicles per household to determine if households are more or less likely to be transit-dependent.

Design refers to the attractiveness of the built environment to pedestrians and cyclists. Areas that provide a safe environment for walking or biking enable and encourage more non-motorized trips.

The 5Ds are integrated into the El Dorado County TDM process as a refinement to the mode choice submodel. The non-commercial trips in the assignable vehicle trip tables from the mode choice model are adjusted based on the outcome of the 5D analysis. The result is a vehicle trip table that reflects a reduction in automobile trips based on the sensitivity of the zones in El Dorado County to smart-growth strategies according to the 5D factors. This model refinement is available to be applied, at the discretion of the practitioner, in response to specific analysis requirements.

D.5 Traffic Assignment and Validation

The principle techniques used to validate the El Dorado County TDM involved the use of static validation tests. Static validation tests compare the model's base year traffic volume estimates to traffic counts using standard statistical measures. Although the evaluation criteria for validating travel demand models differ among planning agencies, most California agencies reference standards suggested by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) (Federal Highway Administration 1990) and Caltrans (California Department of Transportation 1992). Basic guidance regarding model validation is also provided in the *2010 California Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines* (California Transportation Commission 2010). The validation techniques, measures of effectiveness (MOEs), and criteria adopted for the El Dorado County TDM conform to the requirements provided in these sources and are consistent with those of other comparable models.

As part of the model development process, two-way traffic counts for local roadways were obtained from El Dorado County for the 5-year period between 2007 and 2011. Additional year 2010 counts for state highways were obtained for State Route (SR) 49 and SR 193 from the Caltrans Traffic and Vehicle Systems Unit website. Freeway traffic counts on U.S. Highway 50 were obtained from the Freeway Performance Measurement System (PeMS) website for mixed-flow and HOV lanes. Based on a review of this data, a total of 219 count locations were identified as being appropriate for use in validating the model.

At the more than 200 locations identified for analysis, the El Dorado County TDM was validated for a 2010 base year using traffic count data provided by El Dorado County for the period covering 2009 to 2011. The base year traffic assignment was validated for the daily (24-hour) assignment, the AM peak hour assignment, and the PM peak hour assignment. Validation analysis was carried out at the aggregate level (the entire model), through the use of screenlines to cordon off discrete areas of the county. The analysis was also stratified by roadway classification.

Validation of other modes, including transit, was completed through reasonableness checks using data collected during the course of this study and/or normal trip estimates for similar areas.

In December 2013, Caltrans staff requested the County perform dynamic validation tests on the El Dorado County TDM. Dynamic validation requires the changing of various individual inputs, such as removing a lane in each direction, adding a lane, deleting or adding a link, adding or deleting dwelling units in a zone, or adding or deleting employment in a zone, and rerunning the model for each separate change. The outputs indicate if the model is correctly adjusting for the variations. County staff performed the dynamic validation tests as requested. Caltrans reviewed the results and indicated the TDM had successfully completed the dynamic validation tests.

D.6 Development of Land Use Scenarios

The approach to developing base year (2010) and future (2025 and 2035) land use and socioeconomic data (required inputs for the El Dorado County TDM) for each of the scenarios are discussed in this section. The foundation of these datasets was the numerous existing regional modeling, land use, and socioeconomic reports and data sets available, including the following.

2008 El Dorado County Housing Element—amended in April 21, 2009 this report includes data and analysis on housing, by type, within El Dorado County.

2010 Living Units database—compiled by El Dorado County staff during the development of the ongoing Housing Element update, this version was revised to include data through only 2010, at the request of Kimley-Horn, to determine multi-family units (as parcel data does not include this as a standard attribute) in the base year.

2010 El Dorado County parcel GIS files—this version which was revised to include data through only 2010 was prepared by El Dorado County at the request of Kimley-Horn for use as the base file for identifying single-family residences and the use and status of individual parcels.

2010 U.S. Census data and GIS files—obtained from the U.S. Census website that includes information on employment, dwelling units, and housing vacancy rates.

2000 Sacramento Area Household Travel Survey: Final Report—this is the most recent household survey available for the SACOG region and includes detailed information on the socioeconomic characteristics and related trip characteristics of its inhabitants.

2008 SACOG Small Area Data Set—prepared by SACOG in support of regional modeling activities, this data set includes detailed parcel level analysis of employment and housing characteristics.

2008 SACOG Traffic Analysis Zones—prepared by SACOG in support of regional modeling activities, this data set includes detailed cross classification information for 2008 and 2035 conditions.

2008 Model Update Report: SACMET 07—although not final this report discusses the major processes carried out by the most recent version of the SACMET model.

Primarily, the base year (2010) dataset was developed using housing and land use data provided in the existing El Dorado County Assessor data provided in the 2010 El Dorado County parcel GIS files, employment data provided in the 2008 SACOG Small Area Data Set, and 2010 U.S. Census data and GIS files. Validation of the base year (2010) model inputs was accomplished through a review of available census data and other readily available data sources. Specifically, 2010 Census data from the decennial census was used as the basis for tabulating the number of dwelling units, vacancy rates, households, and employment in El Dorado County.

Future land use scenarios were developed based on the following process.

1. 2025 and 2035 housing and employment forecasts for future scenarios considering the continuation of the 2004 General Plan and based on implementation of the TGPA and ZOU were prepared. These numerical forecasts were developed based on an evaluation of historical population growth, historical development patterns, anticipated market conditions, and other forecast sources including SACOG and the California Department of Finance (DOF). These resulting forecasts were aggregated using the market area definitions previously utilized by El Dorado County for the purpose of forecasting future growth.
2. Achievable development, defined as an estimate of the reasonably expected intensity of development that is anticipated for a particular land use or parcel given known opportunities, constraints, and assumptions was subsequently defined for more urbanized locations where development is primarily anticipated to occur in the future. This process involved an extensive parcel level analysis of vacant and underdeveloped areas, primarily in Community Regions with the provision of sewer, where residential, multi-family housing, commercial, research and development, public, and industrial development could be situated. This analysis relied heavily on a detailed evaluation of aerial imagery for the purpose of identifying existing development

characteristics and evaluating terrain, wetland, and other physical considerations; and local knowledge of development patterns and regulations.

3. Using the future housing and employment forecasts developed for market areas and the resulting achievable development, 2025 and 2035 growth was spatially assigned and subsequently aggregated into TAZs based on the following considerations.
 - a. El Dorado County 2004 General Plan and/or TGPA and ZOU (depending on scenarios) land use goals and objectives and relevant State legislation.
 - b. Historical trends for Community Regions, Rural Regions, and Rural Centers.
 - c. Proximity to existing or planned infrastructure including site access (transportation, roadways, public water, and sewer).
 - d. Approved project status where applicable.
 - e. Historical growth patterns and trends.
 - f. Proximity to U.S. Highway 50 and other major commute corridors.
 - g. Proximity to other ancillary land uses and public services.

D.7 Roadway Capacity and Level of Service

D.7.1 Level of Service

The level of service (LOS) was calculated for each roadway segment in the regional roadway system to evaluate the quality of existing traffic conditions. LOS is a general measure of traffic operating conditions whereby a letter grade, from A (the best) to F (the worst), is assigned. These grades represent the perspective of drivers and are an indication of the comfort and convenience associated with driving. The LOS grades are generally defined as follows.

- | LOS A—represents free-flow travel with an excellent level of comfort and convenience and the freedom to maneuver.
- | LOS B—has stable operating conditions, but the presence of other road users causes a noticeable, though slight, reduction in comfort, convenience, and maneuvering freedom.
- | LOS C—has stable operating conditions, but the operation of individual users is significantly affected by the interaction with others in the traffic stream.
- | LOS D—represents high-density, but stable flow. Users experience severe restriction in speed and freedom to maneuver, with poor levels of comfort and convenience.
- | LOS E—represents operating conditions at or near capacity. Speeds are reduced to a low but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver is difficult with users experiencing frustration and poor comfort and convenience. Unstable operation is frequent, and minor disturbances in traffic flow can cause breakdown conditions.
- | LOS F—is used to define forced or breakdown conditions. This condition exists wherever the volume of traffic exceeds the capacity of the roadway. Long queues can form behind these bottleneck points with queued traffic traveling in a stop-and-go fashion.

For the TGPA/ZOU, LOS was determined by comparing existing and forecasted traffic volumes for selected roadway segments with peak hour LOS capacity thresholds. These thresholds are shown in Table D.7-1 and were developed based on the methodologies contained in the *Highway Capacity Manual (HCM)* (Transportation Research Board 2010). The HCM methodology is the prevailing measurement standard used throughout the United States.

Table D.7-1. Level of Service Typical Traffic Volumes

Operational Class ^a	Class Code	Peak-Hour Level of Service Traffic Volumes ^d				
		A	B	C	D	E
Minor Two-Lane Highway ^b	2R, W20, W18	-	330	710	1,310	2,480
Major Two-Lane Highway ^b	2U	-	330	710	1,310	2,480
Two-Lane Arterial ^a	2A	-	-	850	1,540	1,650
Four-Lane Arterial, Undivided	4AU	-	-	1,760	3,070	3,130
Four-Lane Arterial, Divided	4AD	-	-	1,850	3,220	3,290
Six-Lane Arterial, Divided	6AD	-	-	2,760	4,680	4,710
Two Freeway Lanes ^c	2F	-	2,070	2,880	3,590	4,150
Two Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane ^c	2FA	-	2,610	3,630	4,520	5,230
Three Freeway Lanes ^c	3F	-	3,100	4,320	5,380	6,230
Three Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane ^c	3FA	-	3,640	5,070	6,320	7,310
Four Freeway Lanes ^c	4F	-	4,140	5,760	7,180	8,310

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2014.

Notes:

^a Roadways are classified based on their operational characteristics which do not necessarily correspond to their functional definition.

^b Only roadways meeting the HCM criteria, including those related to signal spacing, for Two-Lane Highways are designated as such.

^c Service volumes are for a single direction.

^d Some Level of Service thresholds may not be determinable/achievable depending on facility type.

The planning thresholds shown in this table are provided for the purpose of assisting in the identification of locations where operational problems may exist and are based on information provided in the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual and other industry sources. These values not appropriate for making detailed or final determinations regarding operational or design considerations. Those determinations should only be made after a detailed operational analysis, consistent with current Highway Capacity Manual procedures, and/or other design evaluations are completed.

The transportation analysis is based on the AM and PM peak hours because these represents the highest hourly volume during a typical weekday compared to using average daily traffic (ADT). For this analysis peak hour volumes were used because they are better indicators of operational performance as they represent the highest volumes under normal conditions. This volume is used to design future roadways because of its regular weekday occurrence. Using a higher or lower volume hour could lead to inadequate designs or designs that are underused. The one exception to exclusive use of the PM peak hour is for U.S. Highway 50 from the Sacramento County line to Placerville. This section of U.S. Highway 50 serves a high volume of commuter traffic during the AM and PM peak hours. In some cases, the AM peak-hour volumes, which also occur on a regular basis, are higher than PM peak-hour volumes. Further, U.S. Highway 50 is a divided freeway where improvements

can be made to only one direction if desired. Therefore, analyzing the AM peak hour was considered necessary to identify potential impacts that may occur only during this time period.

D.7.2 El Dorado County Performance Standard

The Transportation and Circulation Element of the County's General Plan includes Policy TC-Xd which implements the General Plan GOAL TC-X: To coordinate planning and implementation of roadway improvements with new development to maintain adequate levels of service on County roads.

Policy TC-Xd of the County Transportation and Circulation Element provides the following operational LOS threshold for County maintained road and highway segments within the unincorporated areas of the County:

Level of Service (LOS) for County-maintained roads and state highways within the unincorporated areas of the county shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions or LOS D in the Rural Centers and Rural Regions except as specified in Table TC-2. The volume to capacity ratio of the roadway segments listed in Table TC-2 shall not exceed the ratio specified in that table. Level of Service will be as defined in the latest edition of the Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board, National Research Council) and calculated using the methodologies contained in that manual. Analysis periods shall be based on the professional judgment of the Department of Transportation which shall consider periods including, but not limited to, Weekday Average Daily Traffic (ADT), AM Peak Hour, and PM Peak Hour traffic volumes.

The list of County roads allowed to operate at LOS F is shown in Table D.7-2.

Table D.7-2. El Dorado County Roads Allowed to Operate at Level of Service F^a (Through December 31, 2018)

Road Segment	Max. V/C ^b	
Cambridge Road	Country Club Drive to Oxford Road	1.07
Cameron Park Drive	Robin Lane to Coach Lane	1.11
Missouri Flat Road	U.S. Highway 50 to Mother Lode Drive	1.12
	Mother Lode Drive to China Garden Road	1.20
Pleasant Valley Road	El Dorado Road to State Route 49	1.28
U.S. Highway 50	Canal Street to junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street)	1.25
	Junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street) to Coloma Street	1.59
	Coloma Street to Bedford Avenue	1.61
	Bedford Avenue to beginning of highway	1.73
	Beginning of highway to Washington overhead	1.16
	Ice House Road to Echo Lake	1.16
State Route 49	Pacific/Sacramento Street to new four-lane section	1.31
	U.S. Highway 50 to State Route 193	1.32
	State Route 193 to county line	1.51

Source: El Dorado County 2004:Table TC-2.

Notes:

^a Roads improved to their maximum width given right-of-way and physical limitations.

^b Volume to Capacity ratio.

D.7.3 Caltrans Performance Standard

U.S. Highway 50 is a Caltrans facility, and as such, is subject to the performance standards of Caltrans for assessing LOS. The thresholds for U.S. Highway 50 are established in the *U.S. Highway 50 Transportation Concept Report and Corridor System Management Plan (TCR/CSMP)*. These reports provide the future or concept LOS for the segments in El Dorado County. Table D.7-3 summarizes the existing and concept LOS for U.S. Highway 50 segments in El Dorado County. It should be noted that improvements included in the future concept configurations have been incorporated into the TDM for the applicable scenarios.

- | Segments 8 through 14 are in western El Dorado County where the traffic modeling was conducted. Only the performance standards for U.S. Highway 50 are utilized in this analysis as segments from other state routes under Caltrans jurisdiction were not in the TDM update.

SR 49 is also a Caltrans facility, and is subject to the performance standards of Caltrans for assessing levels of service. The threshold for highway segments of SR 49 in El Dorado County is LOS E, which is established in the SR 49, Transportation Concept Report, which in turn references the El Dorado County General Plan. Table D.7-4 summarizes the concept LOS for SR 49 segments in El Dorado County. Improvements included in the future concept configurations have been incorporated into the traffic demand model for the applicable scenarios.

Table D.7-3 U.S. Highway 50 Transportation Concept Report and Corridor System Management Plan Data

Segment	Description	County	Current LOS	Concept LOS ^a	Existing Facility ^b	20 Year Build Facility ^c	Ultimate Facility ^d
1	I-80 to Yolo/ Sacramento County Line	Yolo	E	E	8F (6F btw Jefferson Blvd ramps)	8F+ITS	8F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+ITS+ICM
2	Yolo/Sacramento County Line to State Routes (SR) 99 and 51	Sacramento	F	E	8F	8F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+ITS	8F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+ITS+ICM
3	SR 99 and SR 51 to Watt Avenue	Sacramento	F	E	8F	8F+2HOV+ ITS	8F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+Transition+IT S+ICM
4	Watt Avenue to Zinfandel Drive	Sacramento	F	E	8F+2HOV	8F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+ITS	8F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+ITS+ICM
5	Zinfandel Drive to Sunrise Blvd	Sacramento	E	E	8F+2HOV	8F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+ITS	8F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+Transition+IT S+ICM
6	Sunrise Blvd to Folsom Blvd	Sacramento	F	E	6F+2HOV to Hazel Ave., 4F+2HOV to Folsom Blvd	8F+2HOV+ITS+Aux Lanes to Hazel Ave., 4F+2HOV+ITS +Aux Lanes to Folsom Blvd	8F+2HOV+ ITS_ICM+ Aux Lanes to Hazel Ave., 4F+2HOV+ITS+ICM+ Aux Lanes to Folsom
7	Folsom Blvd to Sacramento/ El Dorado County Line	Sacramento	F	E	4F+2HOV	4F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+ITS	4F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+ITS+ICM
8	Sacramento/El Dorado County Line to El Dorado Hills Blvd. (Latrobe Road)	El Dorado	F	E	4F+2HOV	4F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+ITS	4F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+ITS+ICM
9	Latrobe Road to Bass Lake Road	El Dorado	E	E	4F+2HOV	4F+2HOV+Aux Lanes +ITS	4F+2HOV+Aux Lanes +ITS+ICM
10	Bass Lake Road to Cameron Park Drive	El Dorado	D	E	4F+2HOV	4F+2HOV+Aux Lanes+ ITS	4F+2HOV+Aux Lanes+ ITS

Segment	Description	County	Current LOS	Concept LOS ^a	Existing Facility ^b	20 Year Build Facility ^c	Ultimate Facility ^d
11	Cameron Park Drive to So. Shingle Road (Ponderosa Rd.) Ponderosa Rd. to	El Dorado	D	E	4F	4F+2HOV+Aux Lanes+ ITS	4F+2HOV+Aux Lanes+ ITS
12	Missouri Flat Road	El Dorado	C	E	4F	4F+2HOV+Aux Lanes+ITS to Greenstone, 4F+Aux Lanes+ITS to Missouri Flat	4F+2HOV+Aux Lanes+ITS to Greenstone, 4F+Aux Lanes+ITS to Missouri Flat
13	Missouri Flat Road to End of Freeway in Placerville	El Dorado	D	E	4F	4F	4F+Aux Lanes+ITS
14	End of Freeway in Placerville to Bedford Avenue	El Dorado	C	D	4E+Merge Lanes (Eastbound)	4E+Merge Lanes+ITS	4E+Merge Lanes+ITS+ICM
15	Bedford Ave. to Cedar Grove Exit	El Dorado	C	E/D	4F to Smith Flat Rd, 4E to Camino	4F to Smith Flat, 4E to Camino	4F+Aux Lanes+ITS to Smith Flat, 4E+ITS to Camino
16	Cedar Grove Exit to 0.67 mile east of Sly Park Rd	El Dorado	B	E	4F	4F	4F+ITS
17	0.67 miles east of Sly Park Road to Ice House Road	El Dorado	B	D	3C, 2.0 miles 4E, 5.3 miles 3C, 0.3 mile	3C, 2.0 miles 4E, 5.3 miles 3C, 0.3 mile	3C+ITS, 2.0 miles 4E+ITS, 5.3 miles 3C+ITS, 0.3 mile
18	Ice House Road to Echo Summit	El Dorado	E	D	2C; 0.35 mile of 2-wy left-turn lane	2C; 0.35 mile of 2-way left-turn lane	2C+ITS+ICM; 0.35 mile of 2-way left-turn lane
19	Echo Summit to SR 89 South/Luther Pass Road	El Dorado	E	D	2C	2C	2C+ITS+ICM+Bike Lanes

Segment	Description	County	Current LOS	Concept LOS ^a	Existing Facility ^b	20 Year Build Facility ^c	Ultimate Facility ^d
20	SR 89 South/Luther Pass Road to State Route 89 North/Lake Tahoe Blvd	El Dorado	E	D	3C, 0.86 mile;2C, 3.64 miles 5C, 0.61 mile	3C, 0.86 mile;2C, 3.64 miles 5C, 0.61 mile	3C+ITS+ICM, 0.86 mile; 2C+ITS+ICM, 3.64 miles; 5C+ITS+ICM, 0.61 mile
21	SR 89 North/Lake Tahoe Blvd to State of Nevada	El Dorado	E	E	5C	5C	5C +ITS+ICM+Bike lanes

Source: California Department of Transportation 2014.

Notes:

^a Concept LOS: The minimum acceptable LOS over the next 20 years.

^b Facility Type Codes: C = Conventional Highway; E = Expressway; F = Freeway; HOV = High Occupancy Vehicle lanes; Aux = Auxiliary lanes; ITS = Intelligent Transportation Systems; ICM = Integrated Corridor Management.

^c Horizon Year **Build Facility**: The long-term vision for how the facility will operate and what its configuration will be in the horizon year.

^d **Ultimate Facility**: The future roadway with improvements needed beyond a 20-year timeframe.

Table D.7-4. State Route 49 Transportation Concept Report Data

Segments in El Dorado County	Description	Current Facility ^a	Current LOS	Concept Facility ^b	Concept LOS ^c	Improvements Towards Concept Facility	Ultimate Facility ^d
1	Amador/El Dorado County line to Union Mine Rd.	2C	E	2C	F	Widen to 40' standard	2C
2	Union Mine Rd. south of El Dorado to Sacramento St. south of Placerville	2C	E	2C	E	Widen to 40' standard	2/4 E
3	Sacramento St. south of Placerville to junction of SR 193	2C	F	2C	F	Improve capacity and operations at SR 49/U.S. 50 junction	2/4 E
4	Junction of SR 193 to El Dorado/Placer County Line	2C	E	2C	E	Widen to 40' standard	2/4 E

Source: California Department of Transportation 2000

^a Facility Type Codes: C = Conventional Highway; E = Expressway; F = Freeway; HOV = High Occupancy Vehicle lanes; Aux = Auxiliary lanes.

^b Concept Facility: The future roadway with improvements needed in the next 20 years. If LOS "F", no further degradation of service from existing "F" is acceptable, as indicated by delay performance measurement.

^c 20-Year Concept LOS: The minimum acceptable LOS over the next 20 years.

^d Ultimate Facility: The future roadway with improvements needed beyond a 20-year timeframe.

D.8 Roadway System Analysis

The results of the transportation analysis are described in this section in the form of six study scenarios. For the roadway system, the analysis focused on modeled project impacts in 2025 and its contribution to 2035 cumulative conditions. Three baselines are represented in the scenarios: 2010, 2025 with future CIP/RTP road improvements, and 2035 cumulative impact. These results focused on regional performance measures, which allow for a comparison of the TGPA to the baselines.

The modeling done for each of the six roadway network study scenarios was based on the following.

- | Study Scenario 1 (2010 Baseline Conditions)—2010 conditions; includes 2010 road network.
- | Study Scenario 2 (Project 2035 Impact)—2035 land use buildout (with 2010 road network) + Project (TGPA/ZOU buildout assumption) with 2010 CIP/RTP Improvements.
- | Study Scenario 3 (2025 Baseline Conditions)—Current road network with 2025 CIP/RTP Improvements.
- | Study Scenario 4 (Project 2025 Impact)—2010 road network + Project (TGPA/ZOU buildout assumption) with 2025 CIP/RTP Improvements.
- | Study Scenario 5 (2035 Baseline)—2010 road network with 2035 land use buildout outside of El Dorado County with 2010 CIP/RTP Improvements.
- | Study Scenario 6 (Cumulative Conditions in 2035)—2035 road network + Project (TGPA/ZOU buildout assumption) with 2035 CIP/RTP Improvements.

For the transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and aviation systems, the analysis was limited to a review of the existing 2004 General Plan policies and implementation measures. If a potential inconsistency was discovered, a significant impact was identified.

D.8.1 Regional Performance Measure Results

Regional transportation performance measures generated by the TDM are shown in Table D.8-1 for each scenario. Key changes in regional travel demand that are projected to occur for each study scenario include an increase in daily vehicle trips, Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), and Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT). Increases occur for both the absolute values of these performance measures as well as the per household values.

Table D.8-1. Vehicle Miles Traveled Comparison of Study Scenarios

Performance Measure	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Scenario 5	Scenario 6
Households (HH)	55,493	71,442	64,472	64,664	55,493	71,442
Employment	44,468	60,139	53,251	53,251	44,468	60,139
Daily Vehicle Trips	449,734	597,855	536,492	537,531	448,701	603,549
Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)	3,660,397	4,729,056	4,336,931	4,334,534	3,868,757	4,831,076
Daily Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT)	102,854	153,816	114,958	115,134	107,776	133,952
Daily Vehicle Trips per HH	8.10	8.37	8.32	8.31	8.09	8.45
Daily VMT per HH	65.96	66.19	67.27	67.03	69.72	67.62
Daily VHT per HH	1.85	2.15	1.78	1.78	1.94	1.87

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2014.

Table D.8-1 demonstrates that with an increase in the number of households and employment, the number of VMT and VHT will increase. However, when looking at the increases on a per household basis, the difference in VMT, and all but Scenario 2 for VHT, is within 5% of the existing condition. This is generally because the TGPA/ZOU affects a limited area within the county and does not result in major changes to the land use pattern in the adopted General Plan.

The TDM analysis evaluated 219 roadway segments for each of the six study scenarios as part of the traffic analysis to evaluate the effects of the TGPA/ZOU on the County's roadway network. Table D.8-8, *LOS Summary Table*, summarizing the analysis results is located at the end of this chapter.

Peak-hour traffic volumes from the TDM were analyzed through a postprocessor developed specifically for the County. This postprocessor is a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet that reads raw traffic volumes from the TDM and then adjusts these volumes to account for under or overestimates that may have occurred in the base-year model. The postprocessor then determines roadway segment LOS based on a table of LOS capacity thresholds as shown in Table D.7-1.

Tables D.8-2 through D.8-7 show which roadway segments have a drop in LOS from an acceptable LOS D or better to a LOS E or F for each of the six study scenarios. While LOS E is considered an acceptable level of service for some areas of the County and U.S. Highway 50, it is still shown in the following tables for informational purposes.

Table D.8-2. Study Scenario 1 (2010 Baseline Conditions) — 2010 Conditions; Includes 2010 Road Network

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class ^a – Exist, 2, and 5	Minimum LOS	Scenario 1 - Existing Conditions (2010)				Impact? (Y/N)
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
44	Green Valley Road ^b	100 ft W of El Dorado Hills Boulevard	2A	E	1,060	1,650	D	F	Y
47	Missouri Flat Road	100 ft S of China Garden Rd	2A	E	1,250	1,580	D	E	N
151	Green Valley Road ^b	200 ft E of County line	2A	E	1,730	2,050	F	F	Y

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2014.

^aRoadway Classification - See Table 3.9-3 for additional detail.

^bTraffic Volumes for this roadway are estimates based on adjacent roadway volumes.

2R, W20, W18 = Minor Two-Lane Highway
 2U = Major Two-Lane Highway
 2A = Two-Lane Arterial
 4AU = Four-Lane Arterial, Undivided
 4AD = Four-Lane Arterial, Divided
 6AD = Six-Lane Arterial, Divided

2F = Two Freeway Lanes (3)
 2FA = Two Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane (3)
 3F = Three Freeway Lanes (3)
 3FA = Three Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane (3)
 4F = Four Freeway Lanes (3)

Under the existing conditions, assuming the project is not implemented, only one segment of Missouri Flat Road is anticipated to operate at LOS E in the PM peak hour. This segment is within a Community Region of the county where LOS E is acceptable. Two segments of Green Valley Road would operate at an unacceptable LOS F and are expected to continue to operate at LOS F in the near future. Because these levels of service reflect existing conditions without the project, no project impacts would occur.

Table D.8-3. Study Scenario 2 (Project 2035 Impact)—2035 Land Use Buildout (with Existing Road Network) + Project (TGPA/ZOU Buildout Assumption) with 2010 CIP/RTP Improvements

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class ^a – Scenario Exist, 2, and 5	Minimum LOS ^b	Scenario 2				Impact? (Y/N)
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
1	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Latrobe Rd	2FA	E	2,490	4,920	B	E	N
2	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Latrobe Rd	2F	E	4,000	2,950	E	D	N
	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Silva Valley Pkwy	2FA	E	2,300	5,010	B	E	N
	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Silva Valley Pkwy	2F	E	3,750	3,040	E	D	N
5	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Bass Lake	2FA	D/E ^c	2,300	5,010	B	E	Y
6	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Bass Lake	2F	D/E ^c	3,750	3,040	E	D	Y
	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Cambridge Rd	2F	D/E ^c	2,100	3,670	C	E	Y
9	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Cameron Park	2F	E	2,140	3,680	C	E	N
13	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Ponderosa	2F	E	2,410	3,660	C	E	N
14	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Ponderosa	2F	E	3,610	3,230	E	D	N
32	Cameron Park Dr	200 ft N of Oxford Rd	2A	E	1,420	1,710	D	F	Y
38	El Dorado Hills Bl	300 ft S of Francisco Dr	2A	E	1,390	1,620	D	E	N
44	Green Valley Rd ^d	100 ft W of El Dorado Hills Boulevard	2A	E	1,370	2,050	D	F	Y
47	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft S of China Garden Rd	2A	E	1,350	1,600	D	E	N
55	South Shingle Rd	100 ft S of Mother Lode Dr	2A	E	1,230	1,590	D	E	N

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class ^a – Scenario Exist, 2, and 5	Minimum LOS ^b	Scenario 2				Impact? (Y/N)
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
56	Cameron Park Dr	100 ft N of Robin Ln	2A	F ^e	1,060	1,610	D	E	N
151	Green Valley Rd ^d	200 ft E of County line	2A	E	2,000	2,230	F	F	Y
226	White Rock Rd	At County Line	2A	E	1,060	1,910	D	F	Y

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2014.

^a Roadway Classification - See Table 3.9-3 for additional detail.

^b These minimum LOS values represent the 20-year concept LOS from the Caltrans TCCR 50 because the model includes the 20-year concept facility improvements shown in Table 3.9-1.

^c The minimum acceptable operations is LOS D on this segment of U.S. Highway 50 according to County standards. The Caltrans Concept LOS is LOS E. Impacts are identified based on the most stringent threshold (LOS D).

^d Traffic Volumes for this roadway are estimates based on adjacent roadway volumes

^e This roadway segment is included in the list of roadway segments allowed to operate at LOS F as shown in Table 3.9-4.

2R, W20, W18 = Minor Two-Lane Highway

2U = Major Two-Lane Highway

2A = Two-Lane Arterial

4AU = Four-Lane Arterial, Undivided

4AD = Four Lane Arterial, Divided

6AD = Six-Lane Arterial, Divided

2F = Two Freeway Lanes (3)

2FA = Two Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane (3)

3F = Three Freeway Lanes (3)

3FA = Three Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane (3)

4F = Four Freeway Lanes (3)

Note: "GP" stands for General Purpose Lanes (includes auxiliary lanes)

Study Scenario 2 examines the potential impact of future development under the General Plan to 2035, with the TGPA/ZOU amendments, absent any additional road improvements. This is a worse-case scenario that would occur in the absence of the road improvements that would otherwise be funded by the TIM and CIP requirements. This is provided solely as a point of comparison; there is no intent on the part of the County to rescind the TIM and CIP requirements. As shown, four County-maintained roadway segments (IDs 32, 44, 151, and 226) would change to an unacceptable LOS F. These roadway segments are not on the list of roadways that are allowed to operate at LOS F pursuant to the General Plan (see Table D.7-2). The decrease in LOS to LOS F on these roadway segments would be a significant impact. Under this scenario, two segments of Green Valley Road would continue to operate at LOS F with the addition of project traffic. Adding additional traffic to roads operating at LOS F would be a significant impact. Three segments of U.S. Highway 50 (west of Bass Lake Rd and west of Cambridge Rd) would operate at LOS E. These segments of U.S. Highway 50 are located in a Rural Region of the County where the minimum LOS is D. The additional traffic from the proposed project would cause these segments of the highway to decrease in LOS to E. The decrease from LOS D to LOS E on these segments of U.S. Highway 50 would be a significant impact.

Table D.8-4. Study Scenario 3 (2025 Baseline Conditions)—2010 Road Network with 2025 CIP/RTP Improvements

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class ^a – Scenario 3, 4, and 6	Minimum LOS	Scenario 3				Impact? (Y/N)
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
14	U.S. Highway 50-WB GP	W of Ponderosa	2F	E ^b	3,440	3,260	D	D	N
32	Cameron Park Dr	200 ft N of Oxford Rd	2A	E	1,310	1,660	D	F	Y
46	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft S of China Garden Rd	2A	E	1,300	1,470	D	D	N
48	Missouri Flat Rd	400 yds N of Forni Rd	4AD	F ^c	2,390	3,120	D	D	N

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2014

^aRoadway Classification - See Table D.7-1 for additional detail

2R, W20, W18 = Minor Two-Lane Highway

2U = Major Two-Lane Highway

2A = Two-Lane Arterial

4AU = Four-Lane Arterial, Undivided

4AD = Four Lane Arterial, Divided

^bThese minimum LOS values represent the 20-year concept LOS from the Caltrans TCR 50 because the model includes the 20-year concept facility improvements shown in Table D.7-3.

^cThis roadway segment is included in the list of roadway segments allowed to operate at LOS F as shown in Table D.7-2.

Note: "GP" stands for General Purpose Lanes (includes auxiliary lanes)

Under this scenario, two County-maintained roadway segments would change to an unacceptable LOS F. One segment of Missouri Flat Road (ID 48) is identified in the General Plan as a roadway segment allowed to operate at LOS F. One County-maintained roadway segment (ID 32) would change to an unacceptable LOS F. The decrease in LOS on this roadway segments would be a significant impact.

Table D.8-5. Study Scenario 4 (Project 2025 Impact)—2010 Road Network + Project (TGPA/ZOU Buildout Assumption) With 2025 CIP/RTP Improvements

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class ^a – Scenario 3, 4, and 6	Minimum LOS	Scenario 4				Impact? (Y/N)
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
14	U.S. Highway 50-WB GP	W of Ponderosa	2F	E ^b	3,440	3,240	D	D	N
32	Cameron Park Dr	200 ft N of Oxford Rd	2A	E	1,300	1,650	D	F	Y
46	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft S of China Garden Rd	2A	E	1,290	1,440	D	D	N
48	Missouri Flat Rd	400 yds N of Forni Rd	4AD	F ^c	2,400	3,120	D	D	N

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2014.

^aRoadway Classification - See Table D.7-1 for additional detail.

2R, W20, W18 = Minor Two-Lane Highway

2U = Major Two-Lane Highway

2A = Two-Lane Arterial

4AU = Four-Lane Arterial, Undivided

4AD = Four Lane Arterial, Divided

^bThese minimum LOS values represent the 20-year concept LOS from the Caltrans TCR 50 because the model includes the 20-year concept facility improvements shown in Table D.7-3.

^cThis roadway segment is included in the list of roadway segments allowed to operate at LOS F as shown in Table D.7-2.

Note: “GP” stands for General Purpose Lanes (includes auxiliary lanes)

This scenario has the same roadway impacts as Study Scenario 3. Two County-maintained roadway segments would change to an unacceptable LOS F. One segment of Missouri Flat Road (ID 48) is identified in the General Plan as a roadway segment allowed to operate at LOS F, One County-maintained roadway segment (ID 32) would change to an unacceptable LOS F. The decrease in LOS on this roadway segments would be a significant impact.

Table D.8-6. Study Scenario 5 (2035 Baseline)—2010 Road Network with 2035 Land Use Buildout Outside of El Dorado County with 2010 CIP/RTP Improvements

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class ^a – Scenario Exist, 2, and 5	Minimum LOS	Scenario 5				Impact? (Y/N)
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
	Green Valley Rd ^b	100 ft W of El Dorado Hills Boulevard	2A	E	1,131	1,790	D	F	Y
47	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft S of China Garden Rd	2A	E	1,260	1,610	D	E	N
	Green Valley Rd ^b	200 ft E of County line	2A	E	1,840	2,080	F	F	Y
226	White Rock Rd	At County Line	2A	E	900	1,810	D	F	Y

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, 2014

^aRoadway Classification - See Table 3.9-3 for additional detail.

^bTraffic Volumes for this roadway are estimates based on adjacent roadway volumes

2R, W20, W18 = Minor Two-Lane Highway

2U = Major Two-Lane Highway

2A = Two-Lane Arterial

4AU = Four-Lane Arterial, Undivided

4AD = Four-Lane Arterial, Divided

6AD = Six-Lane Arterial, Divided

2F = Two Freeway Lanes (3)

2FA = Two Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane (3)

3F = Three Freeway Lanes (3)

3FA = Three Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane (3)

4F = Four Freeway Lanes (3)

Under this scenario, three County-maintained roadway segments (IDs 44, 151, 226) are anticipated to operate at and unacceptable LOS F in the PM peak hour. These segments are not listed in Table D.7-2as one of the roadway segments allowed to operate at LOS F by the General Plan. For this reason, the decrease in level of service on these segments under Study Scenario 5 would be significant.

Table D.8-7. Study Scenario 6 (Cumulative Conditions in 2035)—2035 Road Network + Project (TGPA/ZOU Buildout Assumption) with 2035 CIP/RTP Improvements

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class ^a – Scenario 3, 4, and 6	Minimum LOS	Scenario 6				Impact? (Y/N)
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		
					AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hour	
5	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Bass Lake Rd	2FA	D/E ^b	2,530	4,700	B	E	Y
9	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Cameron Park	2F	E ^c	2,280	3,600	C	E	N
13	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Ponderosa	2F	E ^c	2,660	3,810	C	E	N
14	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Ponderosa	2F	E ^c	3,900	3,500	E	D	N
32	Cameron Park Dr	200 ft N of Oxford Rd	2A	E	1,500	1,840	D	F	Y
38	El Dorado Hills Bl	300 ft S of Francisco Dr	2A	E	1,230	1,540	D	E	N
46	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft S of China Garden Rd	2A	E	1,240	1,450	D	D	N
48	Missouri Flat Rd	400 yds N of Forni Rd	4AD	F ^d	2,510	3,310	D	F	N ^d
55	Cameron Park Dr	100 ft N of Robin Ln	2A	F ^d	1,170	1,730	D	F	N ^d
194	Pleasant Valley Rd	200 yds E of SR 49 (E)	2A	E	1,300	1,560	D	E	N

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2014.

^a Roadway Classification - See Table D.7-1 for additional detail.

2R, W20, W18 = Minor Two-Lane Highway

2U = Major Two-Lane Highway

2A = Two-Lane Arterial

4AU = Four-Lane Arterial, Undivided

4AD = Four Lane Arterial, Divided

6AD = Six-Lane Arterial, Divided

2F = Two Freeway Lanes (3)

2FA = Two Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane (3)

3F= Three Freeway Lanes (3)

3FA= Three Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane (3)

4F= Four Freeway Lanes (3)

^b The minimum acceptable operations is LOS D on this segment of US Highway 50 according to County standards. The Caltrans Concept LOS is LOS E. Impacts are identified based on the most stringent threshold (LOS D).

^c These minimum LOS values represent the concept LOS from the Caltrans US 50 TCR/CSMP because the model includes the 20-year concept facility improvements shown in Table D.7-3.

^d Not considered an impact because this roadway segment is included in the list of roadway segments allowed to operate at LOS F as shown in Table D.7-2.

Note: "GP" stands for General Purpose Lanes (includes auxiliary lanes)

Two roadway segments (IDs 5 and 32) would exceed the minimum LOS. This includes one-segment of U.S. Highway 50 (ID 5) that would operate at LOS E. LOS E would exceed the County's LOS standards for rural regions, although it does not exceed Caltrans' Concept LOS. The decrease to LOS E on this segment of U.S. Highway 50 for the 2035 planning period would be a significant impact. The decrease in service to LOS F on Cameron Park Drive (ID 32) would be a significant impact. Missouri Flat Road (ID 49) and Cameron Park Road (ID 56) however, are allowed to operate at LOS F per General Plan Policy TC-Xa and there would be no significant impact on those segments.

Table D.8-8. LOS Summary Table

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class – Scenario Exist, 2, and 5	Class – Scenario 3, 4, and 6	Existing Conditions (2010)				Scenario 2				Scenario 3				Scenario 4				Scenario 5				Scenario 6			
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
1	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Latrobe	2FA	2FA	1,720	3,560	B	C	2,490	4,920	B	E	1,980	3,430	B	C	1,950	3,450	B	C	1,980	4,300	B	D	2,360	3,830	B	D
2	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Latrobe	2F	2FA	2,955	2,140	D	C	4,000	2,960	E	D	3,130	2,480	C	B	3,090	2,450	C	B	3,580	2,400	D	C	3,450	2,840	C	C
3	U.S. Highway 50–EB HOV	W of Latrobe			620	800	-	-	-	-	-	-	740	850	-	-	750	850	-	-	-	-	-	-	800	970	-	-
4	U.S. Highway 50–WB HOV	W of Latrobe			620	800	-	-	-	-	-	-	690	1,030	-	-	720	1,040	-	-	-	-	-	-	900	1,150	-	-
	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Silva Valley Pkwy	2FA	2FA	1,450	3,630	B	C	2,300	5,010	B	E	2,180	3,920	B	D	2,150	3,930	B	D	1,850	4,000	B	D	2,540	4,320	B	D
	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Silva Valley Pkwy	2F	2FA	2,900	2,110	D	C	3,750	3,040	E	D	3,320	2,670	C	C	3,290	2,660	C	C	2,990	2,290	D	C	3,610	3,070	C	C
	U.S. Highway 50–EB HOV (future)	W of Silva Valley Pkwy			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	330	630	-	-	340	630	-	-	-	-	-	-	380	760	-	-
	U.S. Highway 50–WB HOV (future)	W of Silva Valley Pkwy			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	530	480	-	-	550	490	-	-	-	-	-	-	700	560	-	-
5	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Bass Lake	2FA	2FA	1,450	3,630	B	C	2,300	5,010	B	E	2,200	4,230	B	D	2,180	4,210	B	D	1,850	4,000	B	D	2,530	4,700	B	E
6	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Bass Lake	2F	2FA	2,900	2,110	D	C	3,750	3,040	E	D	3,250	2,590	C	B	3,220	2,570	C	B	2,990	2,290	D	C	3,000	2,360	C	B
7	U.S. Highway 50–EB HOV (future)	W of Bass Lake			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	310	600	-	-	320	610	-	-	-	-	-	-	360	740	-	-
8	U.S. Highway 50–WB HOV (future)	W of Bass Lake			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	370	460	-	-	390	460	-	-	-	-	-	-	490	530	-	-
	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Cambridge Rd	2F	2F	1,540	3,530	B	D	2,100	3,670	C	E	1,700	3,540	B	D	1,680	3,530	B	D	1,800	3,260	B	D	1,980	3,930	B	E
	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Cambridge Rd	2F	2F	3,070	2,120	D	C	3,210	2,890	D	D	2,260	2,240	C	C	2,240	2,220	C	C	2,960	2,310	D	C	2,500	2,560	C	C
	U.S. Highway 50–EB HOV (future)	W of Cambridge Rd			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200	440	-	-	210	450	-	-	-	-	-	-	240	560	-	-
	U.S. Highway 50–WB HOV (future)	W of Cambridge Rd			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	230	340	-	-	240	340	-	-	-	-	-	-	310	390	-	-
9	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Cameron Park	2F	2F	1,610	3,170	B	D	2,140	3,680	C	E	2,060	3,420	B	D	2,040	3,420	B	D	1,800	3,260	B	D	2,280	3,600	C	E
10	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Cameron Park	2F	2F	2,910	2,120	D	C	3,470	2,890	D	D	3,260	2,940	D	D	3,250	2,520	D	C	2,960	2,310	D	C	3,490	2,850	D	C
11	U.S. Highway 50–EB HOV (future)	W of Cameron Park			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	250	490	-	-	260	490	-	-	-	-	-	-	290	610	-	-
12	U.S. Highway 50–WB HOV (future)	W of Cameron Park			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	360	400	-	-	380	400	-	-	-	-	-	-	490	460	-	-
13	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Ponderosa	2F	2F	2,020	2,930	B	D	2,410	3,660	C	E	2,520	3,410	C	D	2,510	3,410	C	D	2,170	3,030	C	D	2,660	3,810	C	E
14	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Ponderosa	2F	2F	2,970	2,700	D	C	3,610	3,230	E	D	3,440	3,260	D	D	3,440	3,240	D	D	3,010	2,830	D	C	3,900	3,500	E	D
17	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Shingle Springs	2F	2F	1,570	2,330	B	C	1,880	3,050	B	D	1,960	2,750	B	C	1,950	2,750	B	C	1,680	2,410	B	C	2,080	3,140	C	D
18	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Shingle Springs	2F	2F	1,870	1,850	B	B	2,610	2,340	C	C	2,310	2,340	C	C	2,300	2,330	C	C	1,910	1,960	B	B	2,760	2,540	C	C
21	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Greenstone	2F	2F	1,440	2,220	B	C	1,700	2,800	B	C	1,760	2,600	B	C	1,750	2,600	B	C	1,540	2,290	B	C	1,870	2,920	B	D
22	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Greenstone	2F	2F	1,850	1,710	B	B	2,550	2,140	C	C	2,260	2,140	C	C	2,260	2,130	C	C	1,880	1,810	B	B	2,680	2,310	C	C
25	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	Greenstone	2F	2F	1,480	2,160	B	C	1,750	2,740	B	C	1,790	2,530	B	C	1,780	2,530	B	C	1,580	2,230	B	C	1,900	2,820	B	C
26	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	Greenstone	2F	2F	1,740	1,700	B	B	2,320	2,040	C	B	2,060	2,040	B	B	2,060	2,030	B	B	1,760	1,800	B	B	2,440	2,180	C	C
27	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	Missouri Flat	2F	2F	1,430	2,040	B	B	1,700	2,600	B	C	1,710	2,350	B	C	1,710	2,350	B	C	1,530	2,110	B	C	1,820	2,630	B	C
28	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	Missouri Flat	2F	2F	1,650	1,650	B	B	2,240	1,990	C	B	1,950	2,000	B	B	1,950	2,000	B	B	1,680	1,730	B	B	2,310	2,110	C	C
29	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Placerville	2F	2F	1,110	1,660	B	B	1,249	2,161	B	C	1,200	1,900	B	B	1,200	1,880	B	B	1,175	1,718	B	B	1,260	2,150	B	C
30	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Placerville	2F	2F	1,510	1,440	B	B	1,895	1,661	B	B	1,410	1,400	B	B	1,400	1,400	B	B	1,510	1,486	B	B	1,660	1,510	B	B
31	Cameron Park Dr	300 yds S of Hacienda Dr	2A	4AD	1,030	1,210	D	D	1,280	1,440	D	D	1,420	1,630	C	C	1,410	1,630	C	C	1,100	1,210	D	D	1,570	1,830	C	C
32	Cameron Park Dr	200 ft N of Oxford Rd	2A	2A	1,080	1,370	D	D	1,420	1,710	D	F	1,310	1,660	D	F	1,300	1,650	D	F	1,150	1,390	D	D	1,500	1,840	D	F
33	El Dorado Hills Bl	200 ft S of Saratoga Wy	6AD	6AD	2,090	2,530	C	C	2,740	3,020	C	D	2,010	2,270	C	C	2,040	2,330	C	C	2,290	2,680	C	C	2,260	2,650	C	C
34	El Dorado Hills Bl	100 ft S of Wilson Bl	4AD	4AD	1,860	1,800	D	C	2,350	2,170	D	D	2,420	2,220	D	D	2,420	2,220	D	D	2,010	1,910	D	D	2,650	2,410	D	D
35	El Dorado Hills Bl	100 ft S of Olson Ln	4AD	4AD	1,830	1,780	C	C	2,270	2,090	D	D	2,180	2,060	D	D	2,180	2,060	D	D	1,970	1,910	D	D	2,340	2,160	D	D
36	El Dorado Hills Bl	10 ft N of Olson Ln	4AD	4AD	1,790	1,590	C	C	2,220	1,900	D	D	2,130	1,870	D	D	2,130	1,870	D	D	1,920	1,720	D	C	2,290	1,970	D	D
37	El Dorado Hills Bl	100 ft N of Harvard Wy	4AD	4AD	1,060	1,480	C	C	1,530	1,850	C	C	1,290	1,720	C	C	1,290	1,720	C	C	1,270	1,660	C	C	1,380	1,800	C	C
38	El Dorado Hills Bl	300 ft S of Francisco Dr	2A	2A	990	1,340	D	D	1,390	1,620	D	E	1,160	1,510	D	D	1,160	1,510	D	D	1,190	1,480	D	D	1,230	1,540	D	E
39	El Dorado Hills Bl	100 ft S of Green Vly Rd	2A	2A	320	440	C	C	460	440	C	C	480	550	C	C	500	560	C	C	290	350	C	C	570	630	C	C
40	Francisco Dr	200 ft S of Green Valley Rd	2A	2A	950	1,130	D	D	1,250	1,440	D	D	930	1,190	D	D	900	1,190	D	D	1,180	1,390	D	D	900	1,150	D	D
41	Green Valley Rd	200 ft W of Mormon Island Dr	4AD	4AD	1,870	2,460	D	D	2,430	3,020	D	D	1,520	2,270	C	D	1,520	2,270	C	D	2,180	2,730	D	D	1,670	2,480	C	D
42	Green Valley Rd	200 ft E of Mormon Island Dr	4AD	4AD	1,860	2,430	D	D	2,420	2,980	D	D	1,510	2,230	C	D	1,510	2,240	C	D	2,170	2,690	D	D	1,660	2,440	C	D
43	Green Valley Rd	200 ft E of Francisco Dr	4AD	4AD	1,060	1,650	C	C	1,370	2,050	C	D	970	1,740	C	C	950	1,730	C	C	1,130	1,790	C	C	1,090	1,850	C	C
44	Green Valley Rd	100 ft W of El Dorado Hills Blvd	2A	4AU	1,060	1,650	D	F	1,370	2,050	D	F	970	1,740	C	C	950	1,730	C	C	1,130	1,790	D	F	1,090	1,850	C	D
45	Latrobe Rd	300 ft N of White Rock Rd	6AD	6AD	2,000	2,120	C	C	3,730	3,870	D	D	2,020	1,860	C	C	2,030	1,860	C	C								

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class – Scenario Exist, 2, and 5	Class – Scenario 3, 4, and 6	Existing Conditions (2010)				Scenario 2				Scenario 3				Scenario 4				Scenario 5				Scenario 6			
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
49	Missouri Flat Rd	400 yds N of Forni Rd	4AD	4AD	2,040	2,650	D	D	2,250	2,910	D	D	2,390	3,120	D	D	2,400	3,120	D	D	2,020	2,640	D	D	2,510	3,310	D	F
50	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft S of Plaza Dr	4AD	4AD	1,340	1,930	C	D	1,520	2,130	C	D	1,490	2,130	C	D	1,480	2,130	C	D	1,350	1,910	C	D	1,560	2,240	C	D
51	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft N of Plaza Dr	4AD	4AD	590	650	C	C	760	850	C	C	730	850	C	C	730	850	C	C	590	650	C	C	800	960	C	C
52	Missouri Flat Rd	300 ft S of El Dorado Rd	2A	2A	640	790	C	C	740	990	C	D	620	740	C	C	620	730	C	C	640	800	C	C	660	860	C	D
53	North Shingle Rd	400 yds E of Ponderosa Rd	2A	2A	510	650	C	C	820	1,060	C	D	750	930	C	D	760	930	C	D	490	630	C	C	920	1,120	D	D
54	North Shingle Rd	100 ft S of Green Valley Rd	W22	W22	380	500	C	C	580	760	C	C	550	690	C	C	550	690	C	C	370	480	B	C	660	810	C	D
55	South Shingle Rd	100 ft S of Mother Lode Dr	2A	2A	720	1,030	C	D	1,230	1,590	D	E	960	1,300	D	D	960	1,290	D	D	770	1,070	C	D	1,110	1,530	D	D
56	Cameron Park Dr	100 ft N of Robin Ln	2A	2A	520	820	C	C	1,060	1,610	D	E	930	1,430	D	D	930	1,420	D	D	540	860	C	D	1,170	1,730	D	F
57	Cameron Park Dr	100 ft N of Coach Ln	4AD	4AD	1,370	2,100	C	D	2,180	2,950	D	D	1,960	2,860	D	D	1,970	2,860	D	D	1,400	2,130	C	D	2,250	3,050	D	D
58	Cameron Park Dr	200 yds N of Mira Loma Dr	2A	2A	920	1,240	D	D	1,150	1,450	D	D	1,090	1,420	D	D	1,080	1,420	D	D	990	1,270	D	D	1,170	1,480	D	D
59	Cameron Park Dr	200 yds S of Green Valley Rd	2A	2A	680	810	C	C	860	960	D	D	800	930	C	D	800	930	C	D	710	830	C	C	860	950	D	D
60	Country Club Dr	0.1 mi E of Merrychase Dr	2A	2A	350	230	C	C	570	460	C	C	520	310	C	C	520	310	C	C	350	230	C	C	650	510	C	C
61	Durock Rd	50 ft S of Robin Ln	2A	2A	380	580	C	C	740	1,030	C	D	640	940	C	D	640	930	C	D	390	600	C	C	810	1,110	C	D
62	Latrobe Rd Connection	South of White Rock Road		4AD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,340	1,460	C	C	1,320	1,440	C	C	-	-	-	-	1,790	1,890	C	D
62	Palmer Dr	100 ft E of Cameron Park Dr	2A	2A	570	820	C	C	800	1,130	C	D	730	1,030	C	D	730	1,030	C	D	570	820	C	C	820	1,150	C	D
63	Saratoga Way	West of El Dorado Hills Blvd		4AD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,240	2,360	D	D	2,220	2,370	D	D	-	-	-	-	2,470	2,580	D	D
63	Serrano Pkwy	450 ft E of Silva Valley Pkwy	4AD	4AD	1,080	930	C	C	1,460	1,170	C	C	1,130	1,020	C	C	1,130	1,020	C	C	1,040	970	C	C	1,290	1,210	C	C
64	Silva Valley Pkwy	100 ft S of Serrano Pkwy	4AD	4AD	850	640	C	C	1,370	1,220	C	C	1,620	1,360	C	C	1,620	1,360	C	C	890	800	C	C	1,760	1,550	C	C
65	Silva Valley Pkwy	100 ft N of Serrano Pkwy	4AD	4AD	1,270	900	C	C	1,640	1,250	C	C	1,600	1,180	C	C	1,590	1,170	C	C	1,340	1,000	C	C	1,720	1,310	C	C
66	Silva Valley Pkwy	100 ft S of Harvard Wy	4AD	4AD	1,050	860	C	C	1,340	1,170	C	C	1,280	1,050	C	C	1,270	1,040	C	C	1,110	970	C	C	1,350	1,140	C	C
67	Silva Valley Pkwy	100 ft N of Harvard Wy	2A	2A	790	630	C	C	940	820	D	C	1,000	720	D	C	990	710	D	C	760	670	C	C	1,070	790	D	C
68	Silva Valley Pkwy	100 ft S of Green Valley Rd	2A	2A	590	530	C	C	770	760	C	C	720	570	C	C	720	560	C	C	610	620	C	C	800	630	C	C
69	Sophia Pkwy	200 ft S of Green Valley Rd	2A	2A	450	590	C	C	710	870	C	D	320	530	C	C	320	530	C	C	640	750	C	C	380	650	C	C
70	White Rock Rd	100 ft E of Latrobe Rd	4AD	6AD	760	1,380	C	C	1,090	1,900	C	D	1,110	1,940	C	C	1,090	1,900	C	C	740	1,600	C	C	1,520	2,300	C	C
71	Barkley Rd	50 ft N of Carson Rd	2A	2A	70	80	C	C	80	90	C	C	80	90	C	C	80	90	C	C	70	80	C	C	80	100	C	C
72	Bedford Av	At City Limits	2A	2A	30	40	C	C	40	50	C	C	40	50	C	C	40	50	C	C	30	40	C	C	40	50	C	C
73	Big Cut Rd	100 ft N of Pleasant Vly Rd	W18	W18	70	90	B	B	210	260	B	B	160	200	B	B	160	200	B	B	80	90	B	B	240	260	B	B
74	Bucks Bar Rd	50 ft S of Pleasant Vly Rd	W20	W20	380	390	C	C	470	510	C	C	450	470	C	C	450	470	C	C	360	360	B	B	500	530	C	C
75	Bucks Bar Rd	300 ft N of Mt Aukum Rd	W18	W18	300	290	B	B	380	400	C	C	360	370	B	C	360	380	B	C	270	270	B	B	410	430	C	C
76	China Garden Rd	150 ft N of SR 49	2A	2A	80	80	C	C	90	80	C	C	90	80	C	C	90	80	C	C	80	80	C	C	90	90	C	C
77	China Garden Rd	200 yds E of Missouri Flat Rd	2A	2A	240	330	C	C	410	610	C	C	90	150	C	C	90	260	C	C	220	300	C	C	170	300	C	C
78	El Dorado Rd	200 yds N of Pleasant Vly Rd	W22	W22	210	250	B	B	390	440	C	C	330	390	B	C	340	390	B	C	220	250	B	B	370	440	B	C
79	Enterprise Dr	100 ft E of Forni Rd	2A	2A	220	320	C	C	240	360	C	C	220	320	C	C	210	320	C	C	220	320	C	C	220	330	C	C
80	Fairplay Rd	100 ft S of Mt Aukum Rd	W20	W20	150	170	B	B	180	200	B	B	170	190	B	B	170	190	B	B	140	160	B	B	190	220	B	B
81	Forebay Rd	100 ft N of Pony Express Tr	2A	2A	120	170	C	C	150	210	C	C	140	190	C	C	140	190	C	C	120	170	C	C	160	210	C	C
82	Forni Rd	200 ft N of SR 49	2A	2A	340	330	C	C	350	350	C	C	350	350	C	C	350	350	C	C	320	320	C	C	350	360	C	C
83	Forni Rd	300 ft W of Missouri Flat Rd	2A	2A	500	820	C	C	520	840	C	C	420	720	C	C	420	710	C	C	510	820	C	C	420	720	C	C
84	Forni Rd	30 ft W of Arroyo Vista Wy	2A	2A	100	150	C	C	110	160	C	C	110	170	C	C	110	170	C	C	100	150	C	C	110	170	C	C
85	Forni Rd	W of Placerville Dr at City Limits	W20	W20	70	120	B	B	240	190	B	B	-	-	B	B	-	-	B	B	70	110	B	B	20	-	B	B
86	French Creek Rd	300 ft S of Mother Lode Dr	2A	2A	200	240	C	C	250	280	C	C	220	230	C	C	220	230	C	C	200	240	C	C	260	260	C	C
87	Garden Valley Rd	300 ft N of SR 193	W20	W20	40	40	B	B	50	60	B	B	50	50	B	B	50	50	B	B	40	40	B	B	50	60	B	B
88	Garden Valley Rd	0.45 mi S of Marshall Rd	W20	W20	140	120	B	B	150	130	B	B	150	120	B	B	150	120	B	B	140	120	B	B	150	130	B	B
89	Greenwood Rd	100 ft W of Marshall Rd	2A	2A	80	110	C	C	170	200	C	C	130	160	C	C	130	160	C	C	70	110	C	C	170	210	C	C
90	Greenwood Rd	0.03 mi S of SR 193	2A	2A	60	90	C	C	60	90	C	C	60	90	C	C	60	90	C	C	60	80	C	C	60	90	C	C
91	Harvard Wy	0.15 mi E of El Dorado Hills Bl	4AU	4AU	930	730	C	C	1,220	890	C	C	1,010	840	C	C	1,010	840	C	C	960	760	C	C	1,120	890	C	C
92	Harvard Wy	200 ft W of Silva Valley Pkwy	4AU	4AU	820	560	C	C	1,080	740	C	C	890	590	C	C	880	590	C	C	870	600	C	C	950	640	C	C
93	Icehouse Rd	300 ft N of US 50	2A	2A	80	130	C	C	70	110	C	C	80	120	C	C	80	120	C	C	60	100	C	C	80	120	C	C
94	Lime Kiln Rd	100 ft E of China Garden Rd	2A	2A	130	230	C	C	290	550	C	C	30	70	C	C	30	150	C	C	110	200	C	C	70	180	C	C
95	Meder Rd	300 ft E of Cameron Park Dr	W22	W22	590	580	C	C	840	950	D	D	670	760	C	C	670	760	C	C	600	590	C	C	860	1,010	D	D
96	Meder Rd	200 yds W of Ponderosa Rd	W22	W22	490	510	C	C	570	660	C	C	520	540	C	C	520	540	C	C	490	510	C	C	550	600	C	C
97	Mosquito Rd	300 ft S of Union Ridge Rd	2A	2A	150	150	C	C	330	350	C	C	270	280	C	C	270	280	C	C	140	140	C	C	350	360	C	C
98	Mosquito Rd	At American River Br	W18	W18	100	100	B	B	160	170	B	B	140	140	B	B	140	140	B	B	80	90	B	B	180	180	B	B
99	Newtown Rd	200 yds N of Pleasant Vly Rd	2A	2A	250	240	C	C	370	360	C	C	310	320	C	C	310	310	C	C	230	240	C	C	380	360	C	C

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class – Scenario Exist, 2, and 5	Class – Scenario 3, 4, and 6	Existing Conditions (2010)				Scenario 2				Scenario 3				Scenario 4				Scenario 5				Scenario 6			
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
100	Oak Hill Rd	300 ft S of Pleasant Vly Rd	2A	2A	130	170	C	C	130	170	C	C	140	170	C	C	140	170	C	C	130	160	C	C	140	170	C	C
101	Patterson Dr	200 ft S of Pleasant Vly Rd	2A	2A	270	370	C	C	350	460	C	C	300	410	C	C	320	430	C	C	270	370	C	C	350	470	C	C
102	Ponderosa Rd	100 ft N of Meder Rd	W20	W20	130	130	B	B	140	130	B	B	140	140	B	B	140	140	B	B	130	130	B	B	150	140	B	B
103	Ponderosa Rd	100 ft S of Green Valley Rd	W20	W20	110	100	B	B	110	110	B	B	110	100	B	B	110	100	B	B	100	100	B	B	110	110	B	B
104	Rock Creek Rd	100 ft E of SR 193	2A	2A	20	20	C	C	20	20	C	C	20	20	C	C	20	20	C	C	20	20	C	C	20	20	C	C
105	Sand Ridge Rd	100 ft W of Bucks Bar Rd	2A	2A	100	100	C	C	120	130	C	C	130	130	C	C	130	130	C	C	100	100	C	C	120	130	C	C
106	Serrano Pkwy	250 ft W of Silva Valley Pkwy	4AD	4AD	770	590	C	C	860	690	C	C	550	370	C	C	550	370	C	C	780	610	C	C	660	470	C	C
107	Sliger Mine Rd	50 ft N of SR 193	2A	2A	50	70	C	C	60	80	C	C	60	80	C	C	60	80	C	C	40	60	C	C	70	90	C	C
108	Snows Rd	400 ft N of Newtown Rd	2A	2A	80	90	C	C	100	120	C	C	90	110	C	C	90	110	C	C	70	90	C	C	100	120	C	C
109	Snows Rd	200 ft S of Carson Rd	2A	2A	280	240	C	C	310	270	C	C	300	260	C	C	300	260	C	C	280	240	C	C	310	270	C	C
110	South Shingle Rd	0.5 mi E of Latrobe Rd	W18	W18	130	70	B	B	340	290	B	B	150	120	B	B	150	120	B	B	140	100	B	B	180	160	B	B
111	South Shingle Rd	100 ft N of Barnett Ranch Rd	W20	W20	190	230	B	B	400	430	C	C	200	260	B	B	200	260	B	B	230	260	B	B	230	290	B	B
112	Starbuck Rd	110 ft N of Green Valley Rd	2A	2A	100	150	C	C	150	200	C	C	150	200	C	C	150	200	C	C	100	150	C	C	160	210	C	C
113	Union Ridge Rd	100 ft W of Hassler Rd	2A	2A	40	50	C	C	70	80	C	C	60	70	C	C	60	70	C	C	40	50	C	C	80	90	C	C
114	Wentworth Springs Rd	100 ft W of Quintette Rd	2A	2A	40	60	C	C	40	70	C	C	40	70	C	C	40	70	C	C	40	60	C	C	50	70	C	C
115	White Rock Rd	100 ft S of Silva Valley Pkwy	2A	6AD	690	900	C	D	1,190	1,460	D	D	1,230	1,490	C	C	1,210	1,450	C	C	670	1,050	C	D	1,710	1,910	C	C
116	Bass Lake Rd	400 yd N of Country Club Dr	2A	2A	930	880	D	D	1,370	1,340	D	D	1,070	1,050	D	D	1,070	1,040	D	D	990	840	D	C	1,260	1,230	D	D
117	Bass Lake Rd	100 yd S of Green Vly Rd	W22	2A	510	450	C	C	790	670	C	C	570	480	C	C	570	480	C	C	520	460	C	C	670	570	C	C
118	Bassi Rd	200 ft W of Lotus Rd	2A	2A	80	100	C	C	100	120	C	C	90	110	C	C	90	110	C	C	80	100	C	C	100	120	C	C
119	Broadway	At City Limits	2A	2A	350	350	C	C	530	550	C	C	440	460	C	C	450	460	C	C	330	330	C	C	540	560	C	C
120	Cambridge Rd	At U.S. Highway 50 OC	2A	2A	620	860	C	D	840	1,060	C	D	770	980	C	D	770	960	C	D	640	840	C	C	910	1,010	D	D
121	Cambridge Rd	300 ft S of Country Club Dr.	2A	2A	580	750	C	C	740	980	C	D	600	880	C	D	590	860	C	D	590	760	C	C	660	910	C	D
122	Cambridge Rd	100 ft N of Country Club Dr	2A	2A	520	740	C	C	800	1,100	C	D	580	870	C	D	570	850	C	D	530	750	C	C	710	990	C	D
123	Cambridge Rd	300 yds N of Oxford Rd	2A	2A	330	480	C	C	520	700	C	C	370	570	C	C	380	560	C	C	360	480	C	C	440	670	C	C
124	Cambridge Rd	300 ft S of Green Valley Rd	2A	2A	350	410	C	C	710	720	C	C	440	570	C	C	440	570	C	C	370	430	C	C	590	730	C	C
125	Carson Rd	0.6 mi E of City Limits	2A	2A	120	170	C	C	130	180	C	C	120	180	C	C	130	180	C	C	120	170	C	C	130	180	C	C
126	Carson Rd	300 yds E of Gatlin Rd	2A	2A	80	140	C	C	110	160	C	C	100	150	C	C	100	150	C	C	70	110	C	C	110	160	C	C
127	Carson Rd	At Carson Ct	2A	2A	110	180	C	C	110	200	C	C	110	190	C	C	110	190	C	C	100	170	C	C	110	200	C	C
128	Carson Rd	100 ft W of Barkley Rd	2A	2A	210	280	C	C	280	360	C	C	260	330	C	C	260	330	C	C	210	280	C	C	290	360	C	C
129	Carson Rd	100 ft E of Ponderosa Wy	2A	2A	170	220	C	C	180	230	C	C	180	230	C	C	180	230	C	C	170	220	C	C	180	240	C	C
130	Cedar Ravine Rd	0.1 mi N of Pleasant Vly Rd	W20	2A	170	170	B	B	330	340	B	B	250	270	C	C	250	270	C	C	160	160	B	B	340	340	C	C
131	Cedar Ravine Rd	0.25 mi S of Country Club Dr	2A	2A	220	220	C	C	340	350	C	C	290	300	C	C	290	300	C	C	210	210	C	C	330	340	C	C
132	Cold Springs Rd	At City Limits	2A	2A	270	300	C	C	430	480	C	C	360	400	C	C	360	400	C	C	260	300	C	C	430	470	C	C
133	Cold Springs Rd	300 yds S of Gold Hill Rd	2A	2A	190	280	C	C	270	370	C	C	230	330	C	C	230	330	C	C	180	270	C	C	270	360	C	C
134	Cold Springs Rd	100 ft S of SR 153	W22	2A	120	180	B	B	190	260	B	B	150	220	C	C	150	210	C	C	120	180	B	B	190	250	C	C
135	Country Club Dr	West of Bass Lake Road	-	2A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	330	110	C	C	330	110	C	C	-	-	-	-	500	230	C	C
136	Country Club Dr	0.4 mi E of Bass Lake Rd	2A	2A	440	350	C	C	820	720	C	C	740	540	C	C	730	540	C	C	470	370	C	C	930	810	D	C
137	Country Club Dr	0.15 mi W of Knollwood Dr	2A	2A	480	310	C	C	760	620	C	C	710	420	C	C	690	410	C	C	480	310	C	C	890	630	D	C
138	Country Club Dr	300 yds E of Cambridge Rd	2A	2A	240	270	C	C	710	870	C	D	520	590	C	C	510	590	C	C	240	300	C	C	750	790	C	C
139	Country Club Dr	0.2 mi W of Cameron Park Dr	2A	2A	230	370	C	C	500	680	C	C	380	550	C	C	370	550	C	C	230	390	C	C	520	620	C	C
140	Durock Rd	50 ft W of S Shingle Rd	2A	2A	360	560	C	C	730	950	C	D	600	790	C	C	600	780	C	C	370	550	C	C	720	940	C	D
141	El Dorado Rd	0.2 mi S of US 50	W22	2A	440	500	C	C	600	710	C	C	570	670	C	C	580	680	C	C	450	500	C	C	630	750	C	C
142	El Dorado Rd	0.11 N of U.S. Highway 50	W22	2A	160	200	B	B	270	390	B	C	280	350	C	C	280	350	C	C	150	210	B	B	340	450	C	C
143	El Dorado Rd	50 ft N of Missouri Flat Rd	W22	2A	150	260	B	B	160	320	B	B	130	220	C	C	130	220	C	C	150	260	B	B	140	260	C	C
144	Francisco Dr	200 ft N of Green Valley Rd	4AD	4AD	900	1,210	C	C	940	1,220	C	C	930	1,240	C	C	930	1,240	C	C	900	1,200	C	C	970	1,270	C	C
145	Francisco Dr	100 ft S of Sheffield Dr	2A	2A	160	200	C	C	180	210	C	C	170	190	C	C	170	190	C	C	170	200	C	C	180	210	C	C
146	Francisco Dr	300 yds N of Sheffield Dr	2A	2A	60	80	C	C	70	90	C	C	70	70	C	C	60	70	C	C	60	80	C	C	70	90	C	C
147	Gold Hill Rd	100 ft E of Lotus Rd	W22	2A	230	140	B	B	290	190	B	B	270	180	C	C	270	180	C	C	230	140	B	B	290	200	C	C
148	Gold Hill Rd	200 ft W of Cold Springs Rd	W22	2A	220	150	B	B	280	200	B	B	260	180	C	C	260	180	C	C	220	150	B	B	280	200	C	C
149	Gold Hill Rd	100 yds E of Cold Springs Rd	W22	2A	50	40	B	B	80	60	B	B	70	50	C	C	70	50	C	C	60	40	B	B	80	60	C	C
150	Green Valley Rd	200 ft W of Sophia Pkwy	4AU	4AU	1,730	2,050	C	D	2,000	2,230	D	D	1,650	2,050	C	D	1,640	2,050	C	D	1,840	2,080	D	D	1,690	2,090	C	D
151	Green Valley Rd	200 ft E of County Line	2A	4AU	1,730	2,050	F	F	2,000	2,230	F	F	1,650	2,050	C	D	1,640	2,050	C	D	1,840	2,080	F	F	1,690	2,090	C	D

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class – Scenario Exist, 2, and 5	Class – Scenario 3, 4, and 6	Existing Conditions (2010)				Scenario 2				Scenario 3				Scenario 4				Scenario 5				Scenario 6			
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
152	Green Valley Rd	300 ft W of Silva Valley Pkwy	2A	4AU	970	1,120	D	D	1,120	1,360	D	D	1,100	1,330	C	C	1,090	1,320	C	C	1,000	1,250	D	D	1,280	1,440	C	C
153	Green Valley Rd	200 ft W of Bass Lake Rd	2A	2A	1,200	980	D	D	1,400	1,240	D	D	1,120	1,020	D	D	1,130	1,010	D	D	1,240	1,040	D	D	1,230	1,090	D	D
154	Green Valley Rd	300 ft W of Cameron Park Dr	2A	2A	930	940	D	D	1,340	1,340	D	D	1,040	1,120	D	D	1,040	1,110	D	D	970	990	D	D	1,230	1,270	D	D
155	Green Valley Rd	300 ft E of La Crescenta Dr	W22	2A	610	630	C	C	930	980	D	D	710	730	C	C	700	730	C	C	630	640	C	C	800	820	C	C
156	Green Valley Rd	500 ft E of Deer Valley Rd (E)	W18	2A	360	420	B	C	580	670	C	C	340	400	C	C	340	400	C	C	370	430	C	C	420	480	C	C
157	Green Valley Rd	300 ft W of Lotus Rd	W18	2A	570	650	C	C	990	1,170	D	D	760	870	C	D	760	870	C	D	560	650	C	C	940	1,070	D	D
158	Green Valley Rd	100 ft W of Greenstone Rd	W20	2A	300	360	B	B	470	590	C	C	390	460	C	C	390	460	C	C	310	360	B	B	430	520	C	C
159	Green Valley Rd	400 ft W of Campus Dr	W20	2A	370	420	B	C	450	540	C	C	420	480	C	C	420	480	C	C	380	430	C	C	430	540	C	C
160	Green Valley Rd	200 ft W of Missouri Flat Rd	W20	2A	710	760	C	C	800	880	D	D	770	820	C	C	760	820	C	C	720	770	C	C	780	880	C	D
161	Green Valley Rd	100 ft W of Weber Creek Br	W18	2A	230	310	B	B	300	410	B	C	290	330	C	C	290	330	C	C	230	320	B	B	310	390	C	C
162	Greenstone Rd	300 ft N of Mother Lode Dr	W18	2A	80	110	B	B	120	160	B	B	110	130	C	C	110	130	C	C	80	110	B	B	120	160	C	C
163	Greenstone Rd	0.25 mi N of US 50	2A	2A	210	220	C	C	350	400	C	C	320	340	C	C	320	340	C	C	210	220	C	C	360	360	C	C
164	Grizzly Flat Rd	200 yds E of Mt Aukum Rd	2A	2A	160	190	C	C	230	260	C	C	210	240	C	C	210	240	C	C	150	170	C	C	240	270	C	C
165	Lake Hills Dr	100 ft N of Salmon Falls Rd	2A	2A	250	260	C	C	260	270	C	C	260	280	C	C	260	280	C	C	240	260	C	C	260	270	C	C
166	Latrobe Rd	250 ft N of County Line	2A	2A	240	300	C	C	540	650	C	C	260	300	C	C	260	300	C	C	450	480	C	C	380	400	C	C
167	Latrobe Rd	1.5 mi N of S Shingle Rd	2A	2A	250	310	C	C	620	710	C	C	300	340	C	C	290	340	C	C	490	550	C	C	430	440	C	C
168	Latrobe Rd	At Deer Creek Bridge	2A	2A	330	390	C	C	640	730	C	C	360	390	C	C	350	390	C	C	540	570	C	C	480	490	C	C
169	Latrobe Rd	100 ft S of Investment Bl	2A	2A	380	420	C	C	780	870	C	D	470	490	C	C	460	490	C	C	620	660	C	C	620	620	C	C
170	Latrobe Rd	100 ft N of Investment Bl	2A	2A	650	710	C	C	970	1,080	D	D	730	770	C	C	720	770	C	C	890	960	D	D	870	880	D	D
171	Latrobe Rd	100 ft N of Golden Foothill Pw	4AD	4AD	1,750	1,740	C	C	2,570	2,610	D	D	1,320	1,280	C	C	1,320	1,280	C	C	1,970	1,950	D	D	1,490	1,440	C	C
172	Lotus Rd	300 ft N of Green Valley Rd	2A	2A	470	570	C	C	1,010	1,220	D	D	770	930	C	D	770	930	C	D	450	560	C	C	1,010	1,190	D	D
173	Lotus Rd	300 ft S of Thompson Hill Rd	2A	2A	310	430	C	C	530	680	C	C	390	540	C	C	390	540	C	C	290	410	C	C	530	670	C	C
174	Lotus Rd	0.25 mi S of SR 49	2A	2A	260	460	C	C	480	710	C	C	350	570	C	C	350	570	C	C	250	440	C	C	490	700	C	C
175	Luneman Rd	100 ft W of Lotus Rd	2A	2A	270	180	C	C	330	260	C	C	310	230	C	C	310	230	C	C	270	180	C	C	330	260	C	C
176	Marshall Rd	200 yds E of SR 49	2A	2A	260	300	C	C	370	410	C	C	310	350	C	C	310	350	C	C	250	290	C	C	380	410	C	C
177	Marshall Rd	300 ft E of Garden Valley Rd	2A	2A	430	370	C	C	560	500	C	C	490	440	C	C	490	440	C	C	410	360	C	C	580	510	C	C
178	Marshall Rd	300 yds S of Lower Main St	2A	2A	40	50	C	C	90	100	C	C	60	70	C	C	60	70	C	C	40	50	C	C	110	110	C	C
179	Missouri Flat Rd	300 ft N of El Dorado Rd	2A	2A	650	620	C	C	730	740	C	C	690	680	C	C	690	680	C	C	650	630	C	C	720	750	C	C
180	Mormon Emigrant Tr	100 ft E of Sly Park Rd	2A	2A	60	90	C	C	110	150	C	C	100	140	C	C	100	140	C	C	60	90	C	C	140	180	C	C
181	Mosquito Rd	At City Limits	2A	2A	270	310	C	C	490	550	C	C	410	460	C	C	410	460	C	C	260	300	C	C	510	570	C	C
182	Mother Lode Dr	200 ft W of Sunset Ln	2A	2A	910	1,100	D	D	1,140	1,330	D	D	1,050	1,260	D	D	1,060	1,260	D	D	940	1,130	D	D	1,130	1,320	D	D
183	Mother Lode Dr	400 yds W of Pleasant Valley Rd	2A	2A	570	740	C	C	910	1,120	D	D	730	910	C	D	750	920	C	D	590	750	C	C	870	1,060	D	D
184	Mother Lode Dr	0.43 mi E of Pleasant Valley Rd	2A	2A	240	320	C	C	280	360	C	C	260	350	C	C	260	350	C	C	240	330	C	C	280	370	C	C
185	Mt Aukum Rd	0.25 mi N of County Line	2A	2A	120	160	C	C	130	160	C	C	150	190	C	C	150	190	C	C	120	150	C	C	150	190	C	C
186	Mt Aukum Rd	300 ft S of Bucks Bar Rd	2A	2A	300	290	C	C	370	380	C	C	350	360	C	C	350	360	C	C	280	280	C	C	400	410	C	C
187	Mt Aukum Rd	300 ft S of Pleasant Vly Rd	2A	2A	200	270	C	C	290	340	C	C	260	330	C	C	260	330	C	C	190	270	C	C	300	370	C	C
188	Mt Murphy Rd	50 ft S of Marshall Rd	2A	2A	90	100	C	C	140	160	C	C	110	130	C	C	110	130	C	C	80	90	C	C	140	160	C	C
189	Mt Murphy Rd	200 yds N of SR 49	2A	2A	20	30	C	C	110	130	C	C	60	80	C	C	60	80	C	C	20	30	C	C	110	130	C	C
190	Newtown Rd	200 yds N of Pioneer Hill Rd	2A	2A	200	220	C	C	330	350	C	C	260	280	C	C	260	280	C	C	180	210	C	C	340	350	C	C
191	Newtown Rd	100 ft E of Broadway	2A	2A	280	320	C	C	410	450	C	C	340	380	C	C	340	380	C	C	260	310	C	C	420	450	C	C
192	Old Frenchtown Rd	400 yds S of Mother Lode Dr	2A	2A	90	100	C	C	130	150	C	C	110	130	C	C	110	130	C	C	90	110	C	C	130	150	C	C
193	Omo Ranch Rd	100 ft E of Mt Aukum Rd	2A	2A	60	80	C	C	70	80	C	C	70	90	C	C	70	90	C	C	60	70	C	C	70	90	C	C
194	Oxford Rd	50 ft E of Salida Wy	2A	2A	290	420	C	C	710	850	C	D	390	640	C	C	390	630	C	C	290	440	C	C	620	850	C	D
195	Pleasant Valley Rd	200 yds E of Mother Lode Dr	2A	2A	440	560	C	C	740	900	C	D	580	710	C	C	600	720	C	C	450	570	C	C	700	830	C	C
196	Pleasant Valley Rd	200 yds E of SR 49 (E)	2A	2A	1,030	1,230	D	D	1,240	1,500	D	D	1,200	1,440	D	D	1,200	1,430	D	D	1,010	1,210	D	D	1,300	1,560	D	E
197	Pleasant Valley Rd	300 ft W of Oak Hill Rd	2A	2A	860	980	D	D	940	1,090	D	D	930	1,060	D	D	930	1,060	D	D	830	950	C	D	970	1,130	D	D
198	Pleasant Valley Rd	100 ft E of Cedar Ravine Rd	2A	2A	800	830	C	C	1,020	1,080	D	D	950	990	D	D	940	990	D	D	780	800	C	C	1,060	1,120	D	D
199	Pleasant Valley Rd	0.10 mi E of Bucks Bar Rd	2A	2A	530	450	C	C	670	580	C	C	600	530	C	C	610	530	C	C	540	450	C	C	670	600	C	C
200	Pleasant Valley Rd	0.40 mi E of Newtown Rd	2A	2A	410	450	C	C	550	580	C	C	500	530	C	C	500	530	C	C	400	440	C	C	570	600	C	C
201	Ponderosa Rd	300 ft N of Wild Chaparral Dr	2A	2A	680	600	C	C	860	760	D	C	810	660	C	C	810	660	C	C	690	600	C	C	860	720	D	C
202	Pony Express Tr	200 yds E of Carson Rd	2A	2A	180	240	C	C	200	270	C	C	200	260	C	C	200	260	C	C	170	240	C	C	200	270	C	C
203	Pony Express Tr	300 ft E of Gilmore Rd	2A	2A	280	420	C	C	350	500	C	C	330	480	C	C	330	480	C	C	270	420	C	C	360	510	C	C
204	Pony Express Tr	300 ft W of Forebay Rd	2A	2A	350	510	C	C	370	530	C	C	370	530	C	C	370	530	C	C	350	520	C	C	370	540	C	C

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class – Scenario Exist, 2, and 5	Class – Scenario 3, 4, and 6	Existing Conditions (2010)				Scenario 2				Scenario 3				Scenario 4				Scenario 5				Scenario 6			
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
205	Salmon Falls Rd	50 ft S of Malcolm-Dixon Rd	2A	2A	560	620	C	C	860	790	D	C	770	810	C	C	770	810	C	C	650	620	C	C	920	940	D	D
206	Salmon Falls Rd	At New York Creek Bridge	2A	2A	200	220	C	C	430	410	C	C	280	300	C	C	280	300	C	C	190	210	C	C	440	420	C	C
207	Salmon Falls Rd	400 yds S of Pedro Hill Rd	2A	2A	120	170	C	C	290	310	C	C	180	230	C	C	180	230	C	C	110	160	C	C	300	320	C	C
208	Salmon Falls Rd	200 yds S of Rattlesnake Bar Rd	2A	2A	30	50	C	C	210	190	C	C	100	100	C	C	100	100	C	C	30	40	C	C	210	200	C	C
209	Sand Ridge Rd	300 ft E of SR 49	2A	2A	50	50	C	C	130	120	C	C	90	90	C	C	90	90	C	C	50	50	C	C	140	130	C	C
210	Serrano Pkwy	300 ft W of Bass Lake Rd	4AD	4AD	370	380	C	C	870	760	C	C	410	470	C	C	410	480	C	C	400	430	C	C	580	690	C	C
211	Shingle Springs Dr	0.20 mi S of U.S. Highway 50	2A	2A	420	400	C	C	650	780	C	C	560	570	C	C	560	570	C	C	400	390	C	C	670	760	C	C
212	Sly Park Rd	0.35 mi E of Mt Aukum Rd	2A	2A	240	290	C	C	310	360	C	C	280	330	C	C	280	330	C	C	240	280	C	C	310	360	C	C
213	Sly Park Rd	1.62 mi W of Mormon Emigrant Tr	W18	W18	150	190	B	B	190	240	B	B	170	220	B	B	170	220	B	B	150	190	B	B	200	250	B	B
214	Sly Park Rd	0.35 mi E of Mormon Emigrant Tr	2A	2A	260	330	C	C	350	430	C	C	320	400	C	C	320	400	C	C	250	320	C	C	380	460	C	C
215	Sly Park Rd	100 ft S of Gold Ridge Tr (N)	2A	2A	310	310	C	C	430	450	C	C	370	380	C	C	370	380	C	C	300	310	C	C	470	480	C	C
216	Sly Park Rd	100 ft S of Pony Express Tr	2A	2A	590	710	C	C	640	770	C	C	630	750	C	C	630	750	C	C	590	710	C	C	650	770	C	C
217	South Shingle Rd	100 ft S of Sunset Ln	W20	W20	420	530	C	C	720	870	C	D	450	610	C	C	450	610	C	C	460	570	C	C	580	760	C	C
218	SR49	North of China Hill	2A	2A	480	510	C	C	590	650	C	C	540	570	C	C	540	570	C	C	450	480	C	C	580	630	C	C
219	SR49	West of Missouri Flat Rd	2A	2A	980	950	D	D	1,240	1,280	D	D	1,090	1,080	D	D	1,110	1,100	D	D	960	940	D	D	1,160	1,150	D	D
220	SR49	West of Hastings Creed Rd	2A	2A	260	310	C	C	410	500	C	C	360	440	C	C	360	430	C	C	250	290	C	C	410	510	C	C
221	SR49	At the Placer County Line	2A	2A	640	750	C	C	810	940	C	D	750	870	C	D	750	870	C	D	620	730	C	C	820	950	C	D
222	SR 193	West of American River Road	2A	2A	470	580	C	C	590	710	C	C	540	650	C	C	540	650	C	C	460	560	C	C	600	710	C	C
223	SR 193	North of SR 49 in Placerville	2A	2A	180	190	C	C	210	230	C	C	200	210	C	C	200	210	C	C	170	180	C	C	210	230	C	C
224	Union Mine Rd	200 yds S of SR 49	2A	2A	290	140	C	C	300	160	C	C	290	150	C	C	290	150	C	C	280	140	C	C	300	160	C	C
225	Wentworth Springs Rd	0.7 mi E of Main St	2A	2A	170	220	C	C	190	250	C	C	180	240	C	C	180	240	C	C	160	210	C	C	200	260	C	C
226	White Rock Rd	At County Line	2A	4AD	530	1,070	C	D	1,060	1,910	D	F	660	1,330	C	C	660	1,280	C	C	900	1,810	D	F	1,020	1,740	C	C
227	White Rock Rd	100 ft W of Latrobe Rd	4AD	4AD	710	1,150	C	C	1,340	2,220	C	D	740	1,330	C	C	740	1,270	C	C	1,180	2,070	C	D	1,050	1,650	C	C

D.8.2 References Cited

- California Department of Transportation. 1992. *Travel Forecasting Guidelines*.
- . 2000. State Route 49 Transportation Concept Report. September. District 3. Available: <<http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist3/departments/planning/tcr/tcr49.pdf>>. Accessed: February 6, 2014.
- . 2014. *Transportation Concept Report and Corridor System Management Plan United States Highway 50*. June. District 3.
- California Transportation Commission. 2010. *2010 California Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines*.
- Federal Highway Administration. 1990. Calibration and Adjustment of System Planning Models.
- Kimley-Horn and Associates. 2014. *Draft Transportation and Traffic Analysis for the El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendments/Zoning Ordinance Update Draft Program Environmental Impact Report*. February. Prepared for County of El Dorado.
- Sacramento Area Council of Governments. 2012. *Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) 2035*. Available: <http://www.sacog.org/2035/mtpscs/>. Accessed: January 31, 2014.
- Transportation Research Board. 2010. *Highway Capacity Manual*.