

From:
Susan DeCarli, City Planner
Subject: Continued Public Hearing from O ctober 11, 2016
Consideration of a recommendation to the City Council for the Destino Paso Resort Amendment (3350 Airport Road, APNs 025-436-029 \& 025-346-030 - Karen Stier applicant) - 291 room, 4-phase hotel development, which includes: Planned D evelopment Amendment (PD 08-002); Conditional Use Permit Amendment (CUP 08-002); Vesting Tentative Tract Map 2962 (TR 2962); O ak Tree Removal (OTR 16-009); Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND).

D ate: $\quad$ D ecember 13, 2016

## Facts

1. The project site is located at 3350 Airport Road, APNs 025-436-029 \& 025-346-030. See Attachment 1 - Site Location Map.
2. A resort complex was previously approved on the project site in 2009, under a prior ownership, which included a main hotel, individual casitas units, and ancillary improvements for up 291 rooms.
3. The applicant, Karen Stier, proposes to re-subdivide the project site into six (6) lots, construct four (4) hotels (with a maximum of up to 291 rooms, consistent with the previously approved entitlement), demolish an existing single-family home, and maintain the existing farmhouse (on a separate parcel).
4. The property is designated in the General Plan, Land Use Element and is zoned as Parks and Open Space with a Resort Lodging Overlay, and an Airport Overlay. The proposed project is consistent with the applicable land use designation and zoning. The site is located partially in three different Airport Safety Zones, including zones 2, 3, and 4. An analysis of airport consistency indicates that the proposed project is consistent with all applicable development standards within the Airport Land Use Plan.
5. The Planning Commission considered this project at the Planning Commission meeting on $O$ ctober 11, 2016. The Commission had concerns regarding traffic impacts and associated traffic mitigation measures, and also a proposed oak tree removal on proposed Parcel 6, near hotel \#4. The Commission continued consideration of this project to a future meeting to allow staff time to work with the applicant, project arborist, architect, and traffic engineer to address concerns identified. The previous Planning Commission staff report is included by reference in this amended report (Attachment 10).
6. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an environmental analysis/ Initial Study and a draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was prepared. The Initial Study/ MND was included in the Commission's agenda on October 11, 2016, and has been available continuously on the City's website for public review since it was circulated in September 2016.
7. The D evelopment Review Committee (DRC) reviewed changes proposed to the Site Plan for hotel \#4, to preserve oak tree \#155, and also considered revisions to the Traffic Impact Analysis on November 28, 2016. The DRC supported moving the project forward to Planning Commission
for reconsideration with the proposed Site Plan changes relative to preserving oak tree \#155, and an updated Traffic Impact Analysis.

## Options

1. Recommend the City Council approve proposed amendments to Planned D evelopment 08-002, Conditional Use Permit 08-002, Vesting Tentative Tract Map 2962, O ak Tree Removal 16-009 and associated Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
2. Continue consideration of this project, and direct staff analyze modifications suggested by the Planning Commission.
3. Recommend the City Council deny proposed amendments to the project entitlements based on findings to be made by the Planning Commission.

## Analysis and Conclusions

## 1. Project Summary

The applicant intends to subdivide the property into six parcels, and construct four hotels in four phases. Two of the lots are not proposed for development. Lot 1 is proposed to remain vacant, and lot 5 is would be maintained with an existing farm house.

The previous project entitlement of lodging with 291 guest rooms is not proposed to change with the new the development. However, the site plan and type of accommodations is proposed to be modified from the prior project approval. An expanded discussion of design details is provided in the Planning Commission staff report from O ctober 11, 2016, which is provided in Attachment 10.

## New Traffic Analysis

The Planning Commission continued this project because the Commission had concerns that the project would exacerbate an existing traffic congestion at the intersection of Airport Road and SR 46E. The Commission was also concerned the proposed mitigation measures would not adequately address traffic issues in a timely manner. Therefore, the Commission requested staff and the applicant modify the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) to ensure it covered the full range of near-term approved development projects, and that it considers other possible mitigations. See Attachment 4, Updated TIA. The Commission also requested staff analyze consistency of the project with the future cumulative development potential in the vicinity, and the potential traffic implications.

Staff met with Caltrans and the project transportation engineer to discuss potential options for project mitigation. Caltrans did not offer suggestions that would reduce traffic impacts, and rejected the proposal to close the southbound left turn movement at Airport Road and SR 46E, since Caltrans will not permit it. It was suggested to investigate an interim mitigation for phase 1 of the project to redirect eastbound exiting traffic towards Dry Creek/ Jardine Roads to reduce congestion at Airport Road and SR 46E. This "Transportation Demand Management" (TDM) method appears to help reduce traffic at Airport Road and SR 46E. Therefore, a condition of approval has been incorporated to require it be implemented, and that a study be done prior to construction of phase 2, to determine if redirecting traffic is effective and based on the results if other options should be considered.

The TIA evaluated Airport Road and SR 46E under existing conditions, existing conditions plus the project, existing conditions plus near-term (approved) development, and existing plus near-term development and the project. The existing operations at Airport Road and SR 46E during the weekday
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AM peak hours (6:00 to 8:00 AM) already operates at a level of service (LOS) C. During the weekday PM peak hours (4:00 to 6:00 pm), it operates at LO S D. On Saturday it operates at LO S E. The Saturday peak hours with and without the project degrades to LOS F (when the water park is in operation during the three summer months). The weekday AM and PM peak hours also continue to degrade, so that under the existing plus near-term and the project, the LOS degrades to LOS F.

The overall traffic situation in the vicinity is compounded by the fact that City is planning for increased development (e.g. cumulative development scenario), and that the transportation improvements necessary to improve the traffic situation are beyond the near-term capacity of the City to fund and construct. However, it is also acknowledged that without development, the City cannot collect the funds necessary to incrementally make the necessary improvements. Therefore, the City would continue to experience a decline in transportation capacity in the near-term with and without the proposed project.

To help address this issue, the City Council recently directed staff to process amendments to the General Plan Circulation Element to modify the list of planned improvements in the parallel route network, and focus improvements on the highest priority projects that would result in the most benefit. One of the highest priority projects that would provide the greatest benefit is the Wisteria Parkway extension. This improvement would relieve existing and projected traffic congestion, (including traffic from the Destino Paso project), at the Airport Road and SR 46E intersection. However, construction of this improvement is still several years out into the future.

Future cumulative development, including the existing approved project and near-term development are evaluated in the Caltrans Corridor Study, Parallel Route Study, and the City's General Plan Circulation Element. The implementation of the parallel route system would redirect traffic from needing to enter the highway, thereby reducing the impact of new development on all SR 46E intersections, most notably Airport Road. These policy documents acknowledge that the level of service in the project area will continue to decline until the long-range improvements are constructed. The collection of traffic impact fees, which can be used towards the improvements needed is the planned traffic mitigation for this area. The proposed and previously approved hotel project is consistent with these plans and policies. The proposed revised site plan would not change the existing or near-term conditions, or be in conflict with the City's circulation plans. Therefore, the updated TIA recommends applying traffic impact fees for this project.

## New O ak Tree Impact Analysis

The Planning Commission had concerns regarding the proposed removal of a healthy oak tree (\#155) near hotel \#4 on lot 6. The Commission directed the applicant to modifying the site plan to save the tree. The applicant was able to modify the proposed access driveway and change the design of the hotel footprint to save the tree. The site plan has been changed to reflect the redesign, as shown in Attachment 5, Draft Resolution B2, Exhibit A Site Plan. The O ak Tree Protection Plan was also updated to reflect preserving the tree, and is provided in Attachment 8, O ak Tree Protection Plan, updated November 2016.

## 2. Option 1

Approval of this project meets the objectives of the applicant and would provide a better land use development project than the previously approved (active) entitlement. Additionally, the project would be required to contribute traffic impact fees that could be used for the Wisteria Parkway transportation improvement project, which would provide a significant benefit to the northeast circulation parallel route network.

## 3. Option 2

If this amendment is not approved, the previous entitlement is still active and a less quality development could be constructed at this location. Alternatively, the applicant may not pursue development at this
location, and the City would not benefit from collecting transportation impact fees that could be used from parallel route improvements.

## Fiscal Impact

Expansion of hotel and lodging accommodations is identified in the City's Economic Strategy. Hotels have been determined to have a net positive fiscal impact on the City's revenues due to receipt of transient occupancy taxes.

## Recommendation

The Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the amendments to PD 08-002, CUP-08-002, VTTM 2962, OTR 16-009, and the associated D raft Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

## Attachments

1. Location Map
2. Comment Letter from North Coast Engineering
3. Updated 12/ 1/ 16 City Engineer Memo
4. Draft Resolution A2

Exhibit C and D: Traffic Impact Analysis, updated November 2016
5. Draft Resolution B2
6. Draft Resolution C2
7. Draft Resolution D2

Exhibit A - O ak Tree Protection Plan, updated November 2016
8. Notices
9. Planning Commission Staff Report, dated O ctober 11, 2016
10. Public Comments
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## Attachment 1

Location Map


## Destino Paso DRC and Traffic Comments

## Traffic Impacts History and Progress

1. The Destino Paso Project is an approved project. It was approved in 2006.
2. The amended project has the same number of rooms as the existing project.
3. When the original project was approved the focus for the traffic improvements was on the intersection of Airport Road and HWY 46E with an eventual overpass. Now the focus is on the intersection of Union Road and Hwy 46E.
4. Since the Destino Paso Project was approved the following progress in transportation improvements has occurred:
o The City has developed a Parallel Route Plan in 2008 that is designed to take traffic off of HWY 46E.
o In 2009 CalTrans prepared a Comprehensive Study concluding that there should be a grade separated interchange at Union and HWY 46E and that there should be focus on parallel local streets
o The City updated the Circulation Element in 2011 and included the approved Destino Paso project in the analysis.
o In 2011 the City began a Project Study Report on the Union/46E intersection options. There are 3 proposed options, including an overpass and an underpass. The study is still in progress.
o HWY 46E has been widened.
o Two left turn onramps have been constructed at the intersection of Hwy 46E and HWY 101.
o The City has approved the Wisteria Project which provides a key connection in the Parallel Routes Plan. The owner is working on recording the map which includes an Offer of Dedication for the ROW necessary to connect to Airport Road.
0 The Owner of the Wisteria project and the City are studying the costs for both a bridge crossing and an Arizona type of crossing for the connection of Wisteria to Airport Road.
0 In September of 2016 the City Council had a Study Session in cooperation with SLOCOG on the Circulation Issues and Options for the HWY 45E/Airport Road area. The City Council directed Staff to prepare a Circulation Element Update for the NE Quadrant of town for a "focused" parallel route plan. These studies are now in progress. The Circulation Element Update is tentatively scheduled to go to City Council on Dec $20^{\text {th }}$.
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Revised Traffic Study and Comments:

1. The first Traffic Study proposed a traffic mitigation of prohibiting left turns at Airport and 46E. After meeting with CalTans, it was determined that this approach would potentially cause traffic concerns with people making U-turns at Union Road. This mitigation has been eliminated
2. The revised Traffic study proposes a mitigation of signage and information provided to guests at hotel to turn right on Airport Road, go to Dry Creek Road and turn right and enter 46E at Jardine Road. This is part of the Parallel Routes identified by the City. The effectiveness of this mitigation shall be evaluated prior to construction of Hotel 2 and adjusted if deemed necessary by the Community Development Director.
3. The revised Traffic Study proposes mitigation by way of the payment of Development Impact Fees to contribute to the construction of the improvements identified in the Parallel Route Study, the Union/46E intersection study and the Wisteria connection which are the solutions for traffic in the NE Quadrant.
4. The Traffic Study was updated to include additional Near Term projects, some of which may never be built and certainly will not be built in the short term.
5. The Traffic Study included traffic counts on Saturday, in June when the Ravine Water Park was in operation. The water park has significant traffic generation that impacts the peak hours on the weekends. The important point is that although the traffic generation is significant, it is only open for approximately 3 months of the year from Memorial Day weekend to Labor Day weekend.

## Development Impact Fees

1. The development of the project of 291 rooms based on current Development Impact Fees would total $\$ 965,247$.
a. The Transportation portion at $\$ 2,699$ a room would be $\$ 785,409$.
2. The development of the first hotel of 136 rooms would generate $\$ 451,112$ in Development Impact Fees.
3. The Transportation portion at $\$ 2,699$ a room would be $\$ 367,064$

Transient Occupancy Tax
The Transient Occupancy Tax estimated for the first hotel of 136 rooms is estimated to be approximately $\$ 750,000$ for the first year and increasing in subsequent years.

Sales Tax
The generation of Sales Tax on the first hotel for the first year is estimated to be $\$ 120,000$ and increasing in subsequent years.
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## MEMORANDUM

| TO: | Susan DeCarli |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM: | John Falkenstien |
| SUBJECT: | Amended PD 08-002, VTM 2962 <br> Destino Paso Resort |
| DATE: | December 1, 2016 |

## Tentative Tract Map

In accordance with the recommendations of the Transportation Impact Analysis, access easements should be provided from the dedicated new road to the properties to the north to reduce the number of driveways needed on Airport Road and preclude the need for the driveway in close proximity to the intersection of the new road.

## Stormwater Quality

In accordance with Water Board mandates, the City has adopted a Storm Water Ordinance requiring all projects to implement low impact development best management practices to mitigate impacts to the quality of storm water run-off and to limit the increase in the rate and volume of storm water run-off to the maximum extent practical.

The applicant has prepared a Stormwater Control Plan offering a site assessment of constraints and opportunities and corresponding storm water management strategies. The Stormwater Control Plan submitted includes reference to bio-retention swales and centralized bio-retention basins.

## Streets and Traffic

The project fronts on Airport Road. Tentative Airport Road improvement plans have been submitted showing through lane channelization, left turn and right turn pockets. The plan should be modified in accordance with the recommendations of the Transportation Impact Analysis to optimize features for bikes and pedestrians as well.

As indicated in the Traffic Impact Analysis, Airport Road serves the region and provides a connection to Highway 46E. The project will aggravate queues with increased peak hour traffic at Highway 46E. Mitigation options are provided in the Analysis including travel demand management (TDM) strategies to direct east bound traffic leaving the site to the Jardine Road Highway 46E intersection.

It is imperative that the operator/owner of the project is motivated to take every opportunity to implement these strategies. Therefore, a condition of approval limiting the development to Phase I until additional traffic analysis is conducted to determine the effectiveness of the TDM during the operation of Phase I is appropriate.

## Sewer and Water

There is currently no public sewer available to serve the project. The applicant proposes to construct a sewer main in Airport Road to a new lift station at a point northerly in Airport Road and then pump to west Dry Creek Road. Once the project is developed there is potential that the sewer may be available in the Connection Road in the Erskine General Plan Amendment property.

There is a 16 -inch water main in Airport Road available to serve the property.

## Conditions

The Final Tract Map shall include an easement between the newly dedicated road and the property to the north precluding the need for the driveway on Airport Road directly to the north.

Prior to recordation of the Final Map, and in conjunction with construction of the newly dedicated road, rough grade the easement to the north. The applicant shall work with the property owner to the north to complete the connection to eliminate, or at least provide an alternative to their existing driveway.

Stormwater Control Measures shall be constructed in accordance with the Stormwater Control Plan.

Airport Road shall be improved in accordance with plans designed in accordance with the recommendations of the Traffic Impact Analysis and as approved by the City Engineer. A crosswalk shall be established at the entrance road in accordance with plans approved by a Traffic Engineer. The walking path on the west side of Airport Road shall be extended south to the Ravine Water Park parking lot.

No development shall occur after Phase I without additional traffic analysis demonstrating the effectiveness of travel demand management (TDM) strategies implemented during operations of Phase I to direct east bound traffic to the Jardine Road - Highway 46E intersection.

Prior to occupancy of any development, a gravity sewer main must be constructed in Airport Road consistent with the Master Plan of the area, along with a lift station and force main to an appropriate connection point as determined by the Wastewater Division Manager. All of the regional sewer infrastructure will be subject to a reimbursement agreement for collection from future development interests.
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Draft Resolution A2

## DRAFT RESOLUTION 16-xxx

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES<br>RECOMMENDING THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION<br>AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE DESTINO PASO RESORT<br>PLANNED DEVELOMENT AMENDMENT 08-002, CONDITIONAL USE PERMINT AMENDMENT 08-002,<br>VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 2962, AND OAK TREE REMOVAL 16-009 3350 AIRPORT ROAD, APN: 025-436-029 \& 025-346-030

WHEREAS, an application for Planned Development Amendment (PD 08-002), Conditional Use Permit Amendment (CUP 08-002), Vesting Tentative Tract Map (VTTM 2962), and Oak Tree Removal (OTR 16-009) have been filed by Karen Stier for Destino Paso Resort, with four (4) hotels that include 291 rooms and ancillary site improvements; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq., and the City's Procedures for Implementing CEQA, an Initial Study and a Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was prepared and circulated for a 30-day public review period beginning on September 10, 2016 and extended through December 13, 2016. Public comments were received from Caltrans on the MND prior to the Planning Commission meeting on October 11, 2016, and modifications to the mitigation measures, as suggested by Caltrans to not close the southbound left turn movement on Airport Road at SR 46E has been incorporated consistent the updated 11/ 30/ 16 Traffic Impact Analysis (Exhibit C and D ); and

WHEREAS, a copy of the Draft MND/ Initial Study is included in Exhibit A (Attachment 12 of the project staff report) of this Resolution, and it is on file at the Paso Robles Community Development D epartment; and

WHEREAS, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the MND and will be imposed on the project through the City's adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) in compliance with CEQA Guideline 15074(d). These mitigation measures are imposed on the project to address potential environmental effects from: aesthetics; air quality; traffic; biological resources, greenhouse gas emissions; and traffic; and

WHEREAS, with the implementation of these mitigation measures, all potential environmental effects will be reduced to a less than significant level. These mitigation measures are provided in Exhibit B, "Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program" attached to this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, mitigation measures set forth in the MMRP are specific and enforceable. The MMRP adequately describes implementation procedures, monitoring responsibility, reporting actions, compliance
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schedule, and verification of compliance in order to ensure that the Project complies with the adopted mitigation measures; and

WHEREAS, the mitigation measures contained in the MMRP will also be imposed as enforceable conditions of approval; and

WHEREAS, the applicant has executed a Mitigation Agreement whereby the applicant has agreed to incorporate all of the mitigation measures listed in Exhibit B into the project. A copy of the executed Mitigation Agreement is on file in the Community D evelopment D epartment; and

WHEREAS, public notice of the proposed Draft MND was posted as required by Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code; and

WHEREAS, two public hearings were conducted by the Planning Commission on October 11, 2016 and December 13, 2016 to consider the Initial Study and the draft MND prepared for the proposed project, and to accept public testimony on the Planned Development, Conditional Use Permit, Vesting Tentative Tract Map, Oak Tree Removal, and environmental determination. At the close of the public hearing on December 13, 2016, the Planning Commission recommended adoption of the MND and approval of the proposed project to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to CEQA the Planning Commission has independently reviewed the Initial Study, the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and all comments received regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and based on the whole record before it finds that the Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, that there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment with the incorporation of mitigation, and the Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Planning Commission.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles, based on its independent judgment and analysis, hereby recommends the City Council adopt (i) the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Destino Paso Resort project, attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference, and (ii) the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the project, attached hereto as Exhibit B and incorporated herein by reference, and hereby imposes each mitigation measure as a condition of approval of the project, in accordance with the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the City's Procedures for Implementing CEQA.

PASSED AND AD OPTED this 13th day of December, 2016, by the following roll call vote:
AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

## BOB ROLLINS, CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST:

WARREN FRACE, SECRETARY OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
Exhibits:
A. Exhibit A - Mitigated Negative Declaration / Initial Study (refer to Attachment 12 of the October 11, 2016 Planning Commission staff report)
B. Exhibit B-12/6/16 updated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
C. Exhibit C - 11/ 30/ 16 revised Transportation Impact Analysis
D. Exhibit D - 11/ 30/ 16 revised Appendix A: Traffic Count Sheets

## Agenda Item 1

## Exhibit B

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan
Project File No./Name: PD Amendment 08-002, CUP 08-002, VTTM Amendment 2962, OTR 16-002 - Destino Paso Resort Hotel, 3350 Airport Road
Approving Resolution No.: $\qquad$ by:

Planning Commission Date: December 13, 2016
The following environmental mitigation measures were either incorporated into the approved plans or were incorporated into the conditions of approval. Each and every mitigation measure listed below has been found by the approving body indicated above to lessen the level of environmental impact of the project to a level of non-significance. A completed and signed checklist for each mitigation measure indicates that it has been completed.

## Explanation of Headings:

Type: $\qquad$ Project, ongoing, cumulative
Monitoring Department or Agency: ..Department or Agency responsible for monitoring a particular mitigation measure
Shown on Plans: $\qquad$ When a mitigation measure is shown on the plans, this column will be initialed and dated.
Verified Implementation: When a mitigation measure has been implemented, this column will be initialed and dated
Remarks: $\qquad$ Area for describing status of ongoing mitigation measure, or for other information.

| Mitigation Measure | Type | Monitoring Department or Agency | Shown on Plans | Verified Implementation | Timing/Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AES-1 <br> The project shall be designed in accordance with the attached specific architectural features to ensure visual impacts are mitigated. | Project | CDD |  |  | Priorto issuance of building permits. |
| BIO-1 <br> To the maximum extent possible, site preparation, ground-disturbing, and construction activities should be conducted outside of the migratory bird breeding season. If such activities are required during this period, the applicant should retain a qualified biologist to conduct a nesting bird survey and verify that migratory birds are not oc cupying the site. If nesting activity is detected the following measures should be implemented: <br> a. The project should be modified ordelayed as necessary to avoid direct take of identified nests, eggs, and/or young protected under the MBTA; <br> b. The qualified biologist should determine an a ppropriate biologic al bufferzone a round active nest sites. Construction activities within the established buffer | Project | Qualified <br> Biologist <br> CDD |  |  | Prior to issuance of grading permit |
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| Mitigation Measure | Type | Monitoring Department or Agency | Shown on Plans | Verified Implementation | Timing/Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| zone will be prohibited until the young have fledged the nest and achieved independence; and, <br> c. The qualified biologist should document all active nests and submit a letter report to the City documenting project compliance with the MBTA. |  |  |  |  |  |
| BIO-2 <br> Prior to construction, a qualified biologist should conduct a pre-activity survey to identify known or potential dens orsign of San Joaquin kit fox no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days prior to the beginning of the site preparation, ground-disturbing, or construction activities, or any other activity that has the potential to adversely affect the species. If a known or potential den or any other sign of the species is identified or detected within the project area, the biologist will contact USFWS a nd CDFW immediately. No work will commence or continue until such time that USFWS a nd CDFW determine that it is appropriate to proceed. Under no circumstances will a known or potential den be disturbed or destroyed without prior authorization from USFWS and CDFW. Within 7 days of survey completion, a report will be submitted to USFWS, CDFW, and the City. The report will include, at a minimum, survey dates, field personnel, field conditions, survey methodology, a nd survey results. | Project | Qualified Biologist CDD |  |  | Prior to issuance of grading pemit |
| BIO-3 <br> During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, to prevent entrapment of the San Joaquin kit fox, all excavation, steep-walled holes, or trenches in excess of 2 feet in depth should be covered at the close of each working day by plywood or similar materials, or provided with one or more escape rampsconstructed of earth fill or wooden planks. Trenches should also be inspected for entrapped kit foxeach moming prior to onset of field a ctivities and immediately prior to covering with plywood at the end of each working day. Before such holes or trenches are filled or covered, they should be thoroughly inspected forentrapped kit fox. If any kit fox is found, work will stop and USFWS and CDFW will be contacted immediately to determine how to proceed. | On-going | CDD |  |  | Priorto issuance of grading pemit |
| BIO-4 | On-going | CDD |  |  | Prior to issuance of grading permit |
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| Mitigation Measure | Type | Monitoring Department or Agency | Shown on Plans | Verified Implementation | Timing/Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| During the site disturbance and/or construction phase, a ny pipes, culverts, or similar struc tures with a dia meter of 4 inches orgreaterstored ovemight at the project site should be thoroughly inspected for trapped San J oaquin kit foxes before the subject pipe is subsequently buried, capped, or otherwise used ormoved in any way. If any kit fox is found, work will stop and USFWS and CDFW will be contacted immediately to determine how to proceed. |  |  |  |  |  |
| BIO-5 <br> Prior to, during, and after the site disturbance and/or construction phase, use of pesticides or herbicides should be in compliance with all federal, state, and local regulations. This is nec essa ry to minimize the probability of primary or secondary poisoning of endangered species utilizing adjacent habitats, and the depletion of prey upon which San J oaquin kit foxes depend. | On-going | CDD |  |  | Priorto issuance of grading permit |
| BIO-6 <br> During the site disturbance and/or construction phase, a ny contrac tor or employee that inadvertently kills or injures a San J oaquin kit fox or who finds any such animal either dead, injured, or entrapped should be required to report the incident immediately to the applic ant and City. In the event that any observations are made of injured ordead kit fox, the applic ant should immediately notify USFWS and CDFW by telephone. In addition, formal notific ation should be provided in writing within 3 working days of the finding of any such a nimal(s). Notification should include the date, time, loc ation, and c irc umstances of the incident. Any threatened or endangered speciesfound dead or injured should be tumed over immediately to CDFW for care, a nalysis, or disposition. | On-going | CDD |  |  | Priorto issuance of grading permit |
| BIO-7 <br> Prior to final inspection, should a ny long intemal or perimeterfencing be proposed orinstalled, the City should do the following to provide for kit foxpassage: <br> a. If a wire strand/pole design is used, the lowest strand should be no closer to the ground than 12 inches. <br> b. If a more solid wire mesh fence is used, $8 \times 12$ inch openings nearthe ground should be provided every 100 yards. | Project | CDD |  |  | Prior to issuing Certificate of Occupancy permit |
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| Mitigation Measure | Type | Monitoring Department or Agency | Shown on Plans | Verified Implementation | Timing/Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Upon fence installation, the applicant should notify the City to verify proper installation. Any fencing constructed after issuance of a final pemit should follow the above guidelines. |  |  |  |  |  |
| BIO-8 <br> Prior to site disturbance, the CRZ of all oak trees with a DBH of 6 inches or greater must be fenced to protect from construction activities. The proposed fencing shall be shown in orange ink on the grading plan. It must be a minimum of 4 ' high chain link, snow or safety fence staked (with t posts 8 feet on center) at the edge of the critical root zone or line of encroachment for each tree orgroup of trees. The fence shall be up before any construction orearth moving begins. The ownershall be responsible for maintaining an erect fence throughout the construction period. The arborist(s), upon notification, will inspect the fence placement once it is erected. After this time, fencing shall not be moved without arborist inspection/approval. If the orange plastic fencing is used, a minimum of four zip ties shall be used on each stake to secure the fence. All efforts shall be made to maximize the distance from each saved tree. Weather proof signs shall be perma nently posted on the fences every 50 feet (See Arborist Report for specific language required for signage). All areas within the critical root zone of the trees that can be fenced shall receive a 4-6" layer of chip mulch to retain moisture, soil struc ture and reduce the effects of soil compaction. | Project | Certified Arborist CDD |  |  | Prior to issuing grading permit |
| BIO-9 <br> All trenc hing within the critical root zone of native trees shall be hand dug. All major roots shall be avoided whenever possible. All exposed roots larger than 1" in dia metershall be clean cut with sharp pruning tools and not left ragged. A Mandatory meeting between the a rborists and grading contractor(s) must ta ke place prior to work start. During the site disturbance and/or construction phase, grading, cutting, or filling within 5 feet of a CRZ of all oak trees with a DBH of 6 inches or greater must be supervised by a certified a rborist a pproved by the City. Such activities beyond 5 feet of a CRZ must be monitored to ensure that activities are in accordance with approved plans. Root pruning outside of the CRZmust be done by hand. Grading should not encroach within the critical root zone unless authorized. | On-going | Certified Arborist CDD |  | Notes shown on construction documents. | Prior to issuing grading permit. |
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| Mitigation Measure | Type | Monitoring Department or Agency | Shown on Plans | Verified Implementation | Timing/Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grading should not dissupt the normal drainage pattem around the trees. Fills should not create a ponding condition and excavations should not leave the tree on a rapidly draining mound. |  |  |  |  |  |
| BIO-10 <br> Oil, gasoline, chemicals, or other construction materials potentially harmful to oak trees may not be stored in the CRZof a ny oak tree with a DBH of 6 inches or greater. No liquid or solid construction waste shall be dumped on the ground within the critic al root zone of a ny native tree. The critical root zone areas are not for storage of materials either. | On-going | CDD |  | Notes shown on construction documents. | Prior to issuing grading permit. |
| BIO-11 <br> Drains shall be installed ac cording to City specific ation so asto avoid ham by excessive watering to oak trees with a DBH of 6 inches or greater. | Project | CDD |  | Notes shown on construction documents. | Prior to issuing Certificate of Occupancy permit |
| BIO-12 <br> Landscaping within the CRZof any oak tree with a DBH of 6 inches or greater is limited to indigenous plant species or non-plant material, such as cobbles or wood chips. All landscape within the critical root zone shall consist of drought tolerant or native varieties. Lawns shall be avoided. All imigation trenching shall be routed a round critic al root zones, otherwise above ground dripimigation shall be used. | Project | CDD |  | Notes shown on construction documents. | Prior to issuing Build ing Permit. |
| BIO-13 <br> Wires, signs, or other similaritems shall not be attached to oak trees with a DBH of 6 inc hes or greater. | On-going | CDD |  | Notes shown on construction documents. | Prior to issuing Build ing Permit. |
| BIO-14 For each oak tree removed (DBH of 6 inches or greater), a tree ortrees of the same species must be planted with a combined DBH of $25 \%$ of the removed tree's DBH within the property's boundary. | Project | CDD |  |  | Priorto issuing Certificate of Occupancy permit |
| BIO-15 <br> It is the responsibility of the owner or project manager to provide a copy of the tree protection plan to any and all contractors and subcontractors that work within the critic al root zone of any native tree and confim they are trained in maintaining fencing, protecting root zones and conforming to all tree protection goals. Each contractor must sign and acknowledge this tree protection plan. | Project | CDD |  |  | Prior to site disturbance, grading permit issued |
| BIO-16 <br> Any exposed roots shall be re-covered the same day they were exposed. If they cannot, they must be covered with burlap or a nother suitable material and | On-going | Certified Arborist CDD |  | Shown on construction documents | Priorto issuance of grading pemit |
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## Agenda Item 1

| Mitigation Measure | Type | Monitoring Department or Agency | Shown on Plans | Verified Implementation | Timing/Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| wetted down $2 x$ per day until re-buried. All heavy equipment shall not be driven under the trees, as this will contribute to soil compaction. Also there is to be no parking of equip ment or personal vehicles in these areas. All areas behind fencing are off limits unless prea pproved by the arborist. |  |  |  |  |  |
| BIO-17 <br> As the project movestoward completion, the a rborist(s) may suggest either fertiliza tion and/or myc orrhiza a pplications that will benefit tree health. Mycorhiza offers several benefits to the host plant, including faster growth, improved nutrition, greater drought resistance, and protection from pathogens. | On-going | Certified <br> Arborist <br> CDD |  | Shown on construction documents | Priorto issuance of Certificate of Occupancy |
| BIO-18 <br> Class 4 pruning includescrown reduction pruning shall consist of reduction of tops, sides or individual limbs. A tra ined a rborist shall perform all pruning. No pruning shall take more than $25 \%$ of the live crown of any native tree. Any trees that may need pruning for road/home clearance shall be pruned priorto any grading activities to avoid any branch tea ring. | On-going | Certified <br> Arborist <br> CDD |  | Shown on construction documents | Priorto issuance of building permit |
| BIO-19 <br> An arborist shall be present for selected activities (trees identified in Arborist Report and items bulleted below). The monitoring does not necessarily have to be c ontinuous but observational at times during these activities. It is the responsibility of the owner(s) or their designee to inform usprior to these events so we can make a rrangements to be present. All monitoring will be documented on the field report form which will be forwarded to the project manager and the City of Paso Robles Planning Department. <br> - pre-construction fence placement inspection <br> - all grading a nd trenc hing identified on the spreadsheet <br> - a ny other encroa chment the arborist feels necessary | On-going | Certified Arborist CDD |  | Shown on construction documents | Priorto issuance of building permit |
| BIO-20 <br> Pre-C onstruction Meeting: An on-site pre-construction meeting with the Arborist(s), Owner(s), Planning Staff, and the earth moving team shall be required for this project. Priorto final occupancy, a letter from the | Project | Certified Arborist CDD |  |  | Prior to issuance of Final Occupancy |

Agenda Item 1

| Mitigation Measure | Type | Monitoring Department or Agency | Shown on Plans | Verified Implementation | Timing/Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| arborist(s) shall be required verifying the health/condition of all impacted trees a nd providing a ny recommendations for a ny additional mitigation. The letter shall verify that the arborist(s) were on site for all grading and/or trenching activity that encroached into the critical root zone of the selected native trees, and that all work done in these areas wascompleted to the standards set forth above. |  |  |  |  |  |
| GHG-1 <br> The proposed project shall implement, at a minimum, the following GHG-reduction measures: <br> a. Install high effic iency lights in parking lots, streets, and other public areas. <br> b. Comply with mandatory Califomia Green Building Standards Code bicycle parking sta ndards. <br> c. Install bic yc le facilities a nd/or a menities beyond those required in building standards. <br> d. Incorporate a pedestrian access network that intemally links a ll uses a nd connects all existing or pla nned extemal streets and pedestria n facilities contiguous with the project site. <br> e. The project site shall be designed to minimize ba miers to pedestrian access a nd interconnectivity. <br> f. Implement traffic calming improvements as <br> a ppropriate (e.g., marked crosswalks, count-down signal timers, curb extensions, speed tables, raised c rosswalks, median isla nds, mini-circles, tight c omer radii, etc.). <br> g. Comply with CALGreen Tier 1 or Tier 2 standards for water efficiency and conservation. <br> h. Divert 65 percent of non-hazardous construction or demolition debris. <br> i. Include the planting of native and drought tolerant trees beyond those required as mitigation for tree removal. <br> j. Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-2. <br> k. Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-3,e-k. | Project | CDD |  |  | Prior to occupancy permit of hotel 1 |
| AQ-1 | Project | CDD |  |  | Prior to occupancy permit of hotel 1 |

Agenda Item 1

| Mitigation Measure | Type | Monitoring Department or Agency | Shown on Plans | Verified Implementation | Timing/Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The following measures shall be implemented to minimize construction-generated emissions. These mea sures shall be shown on grading a nd build ing plans: <br> a. Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible. <br> b. Use of water trucks or sprinkler systems in suffic ient qua ntities to prevent a irbome dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speedsexceed 15 mph . Reclaimed (non-potable) water should be used whenever possible. <br> c. All dirt stock pile a reas should be sprayed daily as needed. <br> d. Perma nent dust control mea sures identified in the approved project revegetation a nd landscape plans should be implemented as soon as possible following completion of a ny soil disturbing a c tivities; <br> e. Exposed ground areasthat are planned to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading should be sown with a fast germinating, non-inva sive grass seed a nd watered until vegetation is established. <br> f. All disturbed soil a reas not subject to revegetation should be stabilized using a pproved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the SLOAPCD. <br> g. All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc . to be paved should be completed as soon aspossible. In addition, building pads should be laid assoon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used. <br> h. Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on a ny unpaved surface at the construction site. <br> i. All trucks hauling dirt, sa nd, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should mainta in at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical |  |  |  |  |  |

Agenda Item 1

| Mitigation Measure | Type | Monitoring Department or Agency | Shown on Plans | Verified Implementation | Timing/Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| distance between top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with CVC Section 23114. <br> j. Install wheel washers at the construction site entrance, wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site, or implement other SLOAPCD-approved methods suffic ient to minimize the track-out of soil onto paved roadways. <br> k. Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water should be used where feasible. <br> l. The buming of vegetative material shall be prohibited. <br> m . The contractor or builder shall designate a person orpersons to monitor the fugitive dust emissions and enhance the implementation of the measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints, reduce visible emissions below $20 \%$ opacity, a nd to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SLOAPCD Compliance Division prior to the start of a ny grading, earthwork or demolition. <br> n. Construction of the proposed project shall use low-VOC content paints not exceeding 50 grams per liter. |  |  |  |  |  |
| AQ-2 <br> To reduce operational emissions, the proposed project shall implement the following measures. The project proponent shall submit proof to the Paso Robles Community Development Department Staff that implementation of all measures ha ve been met in accordance with a time schedule deemed appropriate by Community Development Department staff. | Project | CDD |  |  | Prior to occupancy permit of hotel 1 |

Agenda Item 1

| Mitigation Measure | Type | Monitoring Department or Agency | Shown on Plans | Verified Implementation | Timing/Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Utilize green building materials (materials which are resource efficient, recycled, a nd susta inable) a va ilable loc ally if possible. <br> b. Provide shade tree planting in parking lots to reduce evaporative emissions from parked vehic les. Design should provide 50\%tree coverage within 10 years of construction using low ROG emitting, low maintenance native drought resistant trees. <br> c. Pave and maintain roads in parking areas. <br> d. Plant drought tolera nt native shade trees a long southem exposures of buildings to reduce energy used to cool buildings in summer. <br> e. Provide native and drought tolerant trees beyond those required as mitigation for tree removal. <br> f. Incorporate outdoor electrical outlets to encourage the use of electric appliances and tools. <br> g. Insta ll high-effic iency heating and cooling systems. <br> h. Utilize high-effic iency gas or solar water heaters. i. Utilize built-in energy effic ient appliances (i.e., Energy Star rated). <br> j. Utilize double- or triple-pa ned windows. <br> k. Utilize low energy street lights (i.e., sodium, lightemitting diode [LED]). <br> I. Utilize energy-effic ient interior lighting. <br> m . Install door sweeps a nd weather stripping (if more effic ient doors and windows are not a va ilable). <br> n. Install energy-reducing programmable themostats. <br> o. Install low water consumption landsc a pe. Use native plants that do not require watering after they are well established or minimal watering during the summer months and are low ROG emitting. <br> p. Provide a designated parking space for altematively fueled vehicles. |  |  |  |  |  |

## Agenda Item 1

| Mitigation Measure | Type | Monitoring Department or Agency | Shown on Plans | Verified Implementation | Timing/Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| q. Provide a shuttle service for gueststo local destinations, including Pa so Robles Transit/ Amtrak Station <br> r. Install energy-sa ving systems in guest rooms that reduce energy usage when rooms are not occupied. <br> s. Provide a pedestrian access network that intemally links all uses a nd connects all existing or planned extemal streets and pedestrian facilities contiguous with the project site <br> t. Provide on-site bicycle parking beyond those required by Califomia Green Building Standards Code and related facilities to support long-tem use (lockers, or a locked room with standard racks and access limited to bicyclists only). <br> u. Implement traffic calming improvements as a ppropriate (e.g., marked crosswalks, count-down signal timers, c urb extensions, speed tables, raised c rosswalks, median isla nds, mini-circles, tight comer radii, etc.) |  |  |  |  |  |
| AQ-3 <br> The following measures shall be implemented to reduce expose of sensitive receptorsto substantial pollutant concentrations. These measures shall be shown on grading and building plans: <br> a. Implement Mitigation Mea sure AQ-1, as identified in "Impact AQ-C", above. <br> b. Demolition of onsite structures shall comply with the National Emission Standards for Haza rdous Air Emissions (NESHAP) requirements (NESHAP, 40 CFR, Part 61, Subpart M) for the demolition of existing struc tures. The SLOAPCD is delegated authority by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to implement the Federal Asbestos NESHAP. Prior to demolition of onsite struc tures, the SLOAPCD shall be notified, per NESHAP requirements. SLOAPCD notification form and reporting requirements a re included in Appendix A. Additional information may be obtained at website url: http://slocleanair.org/business/a asbestos.php. | Project | CDD |  |  | Prior to occupancy permit of hotel 1 |
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Agenda Item 1

| Mitigation Measure | Type | Monitoring Department or Agency | Shown on Plans | Verified Implementation | Timing/Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| c. If during demolition of existing structures, pa int is separated from the construction materials (e.g. chemic ally or physic ally), the paint waste will be evaluated independently from the building material by a qualified hazardous materials inspector to determine its proper management. All hazardous materials shall be handled a nd disposed in accordance with local, state and federal regulations. According to the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), if paint is not removed from the building material during demolition (and is not chipping or peeling), the material can be disposed of asconstruction debris (a non-hazardous waste). The landfill operator will be contacted prior to disposal of building material debris to detemine a ny specific requirements the la ndfill may have regarding the disp osal of leadbased paint materials. The disposal of demolition debris shall comply with a ny such requirements. Contact the SLOAPCD Enforcement Division at (805) 781-5912 for more information. Approval of a lead work plan and permit may be required. Lead work plans, if required, will need to be submitted to SLOAPCD ten days prior to the start of demolition d. On-road diesel vehic les shall comply with Section 2485 of Title 13 of the Califomia Code of Regulations. This regulation limits id ling from dieselfueled commercial motor vehicles with gross vehic ular weight ratings of more than 10,000 pounds and licensed for operation on highways. It appliesto Califomia and non-Califomia based vehic les. In general, the regulation specifies that drivers of said vehic les: <br> 1) Shall not idle the vehicle's primary diesel engine for greater than 5 minutes at any location, except as noted in Subsection (d) of the regulation; and, <br> 2) Shall not operate a diesel-fueled a uxiliary power system to power a heater, air conditioner, or any ancillary equipment on that vehicle during sleeping or resting in a sleeper berth for greater |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Agenda Item 1

| Mitigation Measure | Type | Monitoring Department or Agency | Shown on Plans | Verified Implementation | Timing/Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| than 5.0 minutes at any location when within 1,000 feet of a restricted area, except as noted in Subsection (d) of the regulation. <br> e. Mainta in all construction equipment in proper tune according to ma nufa cturer's spec ific a tions; f. Fuel all off-road and portable diesel powered equipment with ARB certified motor vehic le diesel fuel (non-taxed version suitable for use off-road); <br> g . Use diesel c onstruction equipment meeting ARB's Tier 2 certified engines or cleaner off-road heavy duty diesel engines, a nd comply with the State off-Road Regulation; <br> h. Idling of all on a nd off-road diesel-fueled vehic les shall not be permitted when not in use. Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areasand or job site to remind drivers a nd operators of the no id ling limitation. <br> i. Elec trify equipment when possible; <br> j. Substitute gasoline-powered in place of dieselpowered equipment, when a vailable; and, <br> k. Use a ltematively fueled construction equipment on-site when available, such as compressed natural gas(CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), propane orbiodiesel. |  |  |  |  |  |
| TR-1 <br> A sidewalk is proposed along Aiport Road between Hotels 3 and 4. A four foot orgreater aggregate base walking path is shown on the west side of Airport Road from Destino Paso Way to the northemmost Ravine Water Park parking a rea. <br> Detailed construction documents should be reviewed once they are ready to ensure that adequate sight distance is provided at the driveways serving Hotels 1 and 3 , which are located on the inside of horizontal curves. Landsc aping and other features should be restricted near these driveways to provide clearsight linesto approaching traffic. | On-going | CDD |  |  | Prior to certific ate of occupancy of hotels 3 and 4 |
| TR-2 | Project | CDD |  |  | Prior to certific ate of occupancy of hotel 1 |

Agenda Item 1

| Mitigation Measure | Type | Monitoring Department or Agency | Shown on Plans | Verified Implementation | Timing/Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The applicant will be required to pay traffic mitigation fees to offset to offset its impacts to the citywide transportation network. |  |  |  |  |  |
| TR-3 <br> The a pplic ant will implement employee tra nsportation demand measuresto reduce traffic congestion, such as: <br> (1) The applic ant shall implement a program to direct east bound guest traffic to the J a rdine Road/SR 46E intersection, and not be permitted to develop Phase II without additional traffic a nalysis demonstrating effectiveness of this TDM, a nd to pursue altemative TDM measures if it should not be determined to be effective; <br> (2) Provide information on regional rideshare programs, bike racks, well as provide shuttle service to the multi-modal transportation center and downtown for residents and guests. | Project | CDD |  |  | Prior to certificate of occupancy of hotel 1 |
| TR-4 <br> The project will be required to participate in the SLO Car Free program with SLO County APCD | Project | CDD |  |  | Prior to certific ate of occupancy of hotel 1 |

(add additional measures as necessary)

## Explanation of Headings:

Type: $\qquad$ .Project, ongoing, cumulative
Monitoring Department or Agency: ...Department or Agency responsible for monitoring a particular mitigation measure Shown on Plans: $\qquad$ .When a mitigation measure is shown on the plans, this column will be initialed and dated.
Verified Implementation: $\qquad$ When a mitigation measure has been implemented, this column will be initialed and dated
Remarks: $\qquad$ Area for describing status of ongoing mitigation measure, or for other information.
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## Executive Summary

This study evaluates the potential transportation impacts of the D estino Paso Resort Hotel proposed on Airport Road in Paso Robles. Four hotels are proposed as a part of the project, with a combined total of 291 rooms and supporting resort amenities. This revised study incorporates comments on the September 2016 version from the City Planning Commission, City staff, and Caltrans.
The following study intersections are evaluated during the weekday morning (7-9 AM), weekday evening ( $4-6$ PM) and Saturday mid-day (11 AM-1 PM) time periods under Existing and Near-Term conditions with and without the project:

1. Dry Creek Road/ Airport Road
2. State Route 46 E/ G olden Hill Road
3. State Route 46 E/ Union Road
4. State Route 46 E/ Airport Road

The project is expected to generate 1,657 daily trips, 90 AM peak hour trips, and 122 PM peak hour trips on a typical weekday and 146 peak hour trips on a Saturday. The City's Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines and Caltrans criteria are applied to identify the transportation deficiencies below.
Traffic Operations: The following recommendations are noted:

- Prohibit northbound left turns at SR 46E/ Union Road to improve operations by reducing turning conflicts. The westbound left turn lane should remain, as it provides substantial relief to the SR 46E/ G olden Hill Road intersection. This improvement is a condition of approval from an approved development project.
- The southbound approach to SR 46E/Airport Road would operate at LOS E during the Saturday peak hour under Existing conditions, worsening to LOS F with the project. We recommend directing project traffic heading east on SR 46E to Dry Creek Road, then to the SR 46E/Jardine Road intersection where they would turn left on to SR 46E. The SR 46E/ Jardine Road intersection has adequate capacity to accommodate the shifted left turn volumes under Existing Plus Project conditions. The effectiveness of this measure should be evaluated prior to Hotel 2 permitting and the measure should be adjusted if needed to meet the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. Under Near Term conditions, a parallel route would be needed to reduce the reliance on SR 46E for local trips.
- An access easement is recommended along Destino Paso Way to serve the property to the north, which would reduce the number of driveways on Airport Road.
- Detailed construction documents should be reviewed once they are ready to ensure that adequate sight distance is provided at the driveways serving Hotels 1 and 3 , which are located on the inside of horizontal curves. Landscaping and other features should be restricted near these driveways to provide clear sight lines to approaching traffic.


## Bicycle and Pedestrian Recommendations:

- Modify the proposed Airport Road/ D estino Paso Way roadway striping to place the bike lane between the northbound right turn lane and through lane per Figure 9C-4 of the CA MUTCD .
- Eliminate the short merge/ acceleration lane proposed on the north side of the Hotel 4 Driveway/ Airport Road intersection. This merge would be difficult for cyclists to navigate and would provide little benefit to vehicles.

Analysis supporting these recommendations are provided in the body of this report.
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## Introduction

This study evaluates the potential transportation impacts of the proposed Destino Paso Resort Hotel in the City of Paso Robles. The project site is located at 3340 Airport Road, north of State Route 46E (SR 46E) and on the east side of Airport Road.

This study revises the prior version from September 2016 to address comments received from the City's Planning Commission, City staff, and Caltrans. The following changes have been made to the September 2016 study:

- Eliminated the recommendation to prohibit southbound left turns at SR 46E/Airport Road due to Caltrans and Planning Commission concerns.
- Evaluated the impact of channelizing the southbound approach to SR 46E/ Airport Road per Caltrans' request.
- Added approved projects to the Near Term scenario.
- Evaluated operations at SR 46E/Jardine Road as an alternative route for eastbound project traffic.
- Described project trip generation for each of the individual hotels and documented impacts by phase.

The project's location and study intersections are shown on Figure 1, and Figure 2 shows the project's site plan. The study locations and analysis scenarios were developed in consultation with City staff.
The following intersections are evaluated during the weekday morning (7-9 AM) and evening (4-6 PM) and Saturday mid-day time periods:

1. Dry Creek Road/ Airport Road
2. State Route 46 E/ G olden Hill Road
3. State Route 46 E/ Union Road
4. State Route 46 E/ Airport Road

The study intersections are evaluated under these scenarios:

1. Existing Conditions reflect traffic counts collected in May 2014, June 2015, March 2016, and June 2016 and the existing transportation network.
2. Existing Plus Project Conditions add project generated traffic to Existing Conditions volumes.
3. Near Term Conditions add approved and pending projects in the study area to Existing Conditions volumes.
4. N ear Term Plus Project Conditions add project traffic to Near Term Conditions volumes.

A description of the analysis approach follows Figures 1 and 2.

## Agenda Item 1

Figure 1: Project and Study Locations
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Legend:
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## ANALYSIS METHODS

The analysis approach was developed based on the City of Paso Robles' Transportation Impact A nalysis G uidelines and Caltrans standards for intersections on State Route 46.

## City Facilities

The City's TIA Guidelines provide criteria for identifying mobility deficiencies reflecting the City's Circulation Element Goals. While vehicular level of service (LOS) is not identified as a mobility deficiency criteria for City controlled intersections, vehicular queues that exceed existing or planned lengths of turn pockets are a deficiency criteria. LOS calculations are also a component of the evaluation criteria for stop-controlled intersections.

To evaluate queuing and stop-controlled intersection LO S the study intersections have been analyzed with the Synchro 9 software package applying the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methods. The 95th percentile queues are reported, which reflect the queue length that will not be exceeded $95 \%$ of the time.

The City's TIA Guidelines provide mobility deficiency criteria for a variety of study elements. Table 1 summarizes these criteria, which are used to identify deficiencies.

| Table 1: City of Paso Robles Mobility Deficiency Criteria ${ }^{1}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Study Element | Deficiency D etemination |
| On-site Circulation and Parking | Project designs fail to meet City or industry standard guidelines, fail to provide adequate truck access, will result in unsafe condition, or will create parking demand or supply above code requirement. |
| Pedestrian, Bicycle, Transit Facilities | Project fails to provide safe and accessible connections, conflicts with adopted plans, or adds trips to facility that doesn't meet current design standards. |
| Traffic O perations | Project causes vehicle queues that exceed turn pocket lengths, increases safety hazards, or causes stopcontrolled intersection to operate below LOS D and meet signal warrant. |
| 1. Summary based on Table 5 of City's Transportation Impat G uidelines. |  |

The City's TIA Guidelines also specify the analysis time periods, noting that typically traffic operations should be studied during the peak one hour of traffic on weekday mornings (between 7-9 AM) and afternoons (between 4-6 PM). The weekend mid-day peak was also included in this study to describe conditions when high regional traffic is present on SR 46E and when the Ravine Water Park is active. Note that these conditions only occur during a limited time period in the summer.

## Caltrans Facilities

Caltrans controls the intersections along State Route 46 and relies on LOS to determine deficiencies. Accordingly, Caltrans intersections have been evaluated using LOS criteria as contained in the 2010 HCM. Vehicular level of service is based on control delay, which is the total of time spent decelerating when approaching an intersection, time spent stopped or moving in a queue at an intersection, and time spent accelerating after an intersection.

The level of service thresholds relevant to the Caltrans controlled intersection in this study are presented in Table 2. Unsignalized intersections have lower delay thresholds because users experience more uncertainty than at signals, where drivers typically expect higher levels of congestion and more predictable levels of delay.

Caltrans strives to maintain operations at the LOS C/ D threshold on state-operated facilities. If an existing State Highway facility is operating at LOS D, E, or F the existing LOS should be maintained.

| Table 2: Intersection Level of Service Thresholds |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signalized Intersections ${ }^{1}$ |  | Stop Sign Controlled Intersections ${ }^{2}$ |  |
| Delay ${ }^{3}$ | Level of Service | Delay ${ }^{3}$ | Level of Service |
| $\leq 10$ | A | $\leq 10$ | A |
| > 10-20 | B | $>10-15$ | B |
| > 20-35 | C | $>15-25$ | C |
| > 35-55 | D | $>25-35$ | D |
| > 55-80 | E | > $35-50$ | E |
| > 80 | F | $>50$ | F |
| 1. Soume: Exhil <br> 2. Souræ: Exhib <br> 3. HCM 2010 a | 18 -4 of the 2010 High s 19-1 and 20-2 of the age control delay in se | Capacity Ma 10 Highway Ids per vehid | al. paity Manual. |

Note that side-street stop-controlled intersection operations are described both in terms of the overall intersection average delay per vehicle in addition to the delay experienced by the worst approach. While not required by the 2010 HCM, reporting both the average and worst approach delays per vehicle gives a more complete picture of intersection operations. This is particularly relevant to intersections with very low side street volumes where worst approach delay can be very high but affects a very small portion of the total entering vehicles.

## Existing Conditions

This section describes the existing transportation system and current operating conditions in the study area.

## EXISTING ROADWAY NETWORK

StateRoute 46 is an east-west facility connecting the Central Valley with the Central Coast. In the vicinity of the project it consists of four lanes with at-grade intersections at side streets.

G olden H ill Road is a north-south arterial with two travel lanes north of Union Road that expand into four travel lanes between Mesa Road and D allons D rive.

U nion Road is a northeast-southwest arterial with two travel lanes between State Route 46 E and Creston Road. Union Road also splits into a second arterial in the northwest-southeast direction just before connecting to State Route 46 E.

A irport Road is a north-south arterial with two travel lanes north of State Route 46 E.
D ry Creek Road is an east-west arterial with two travel lanes. Dry Creek Road meets with Airport Road at the El Paso De Robles School driveway.

## EXISTING PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE FACILITIES

Pedestrian facilities include sidewalks, crosswalks, multi-use paths, and pedestrian signals at signalized intersections. Sidewalks are provided along Golden Hill Road and along discontinuous portions of Union Road. Marked crosswalks are provided across three legs of the State Route 46/ Golden Hill Road intersection. No crosswalks are provided at the intersection of State Route 46/ Union Road. No pedestrian facilities are provided on Airport Road.

Bicycle facilities consist of permitted bicycle use on the shoulder of State Route 46. The City's Bike Master Plan proposes Class II bicycle facilities along G olden Hill Road, Union Road, Airport Road, and Dry Creek Road.

## EXISTING TRANSIT SERVICE

The Paso Express provides fixed route and dial-a-ride transit service throughout the City of Paso Robles. The nearest stop to the site is served by Route C at Cuesta College Campus on Buena Vista Drive, with hourly service from 7:15 AM to 7:15 PM on weekdays. Route C was created in 2011 and connects Cuesta College with Templeton via the North County Transit Center. The dial-a-ride service provides curb-to-curb service on weekdays from 7:00 AM to 1:00 PM.

The San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority (RTA) provides regional fixed-route and dial-a-ride services to San Luis Obispo County. Route 9 serves the North County, with a stop in Paso Robles at Pine Street/ 8th Street. RTA also operates a summer beach shuttle connecting the North County to Cayucos.

## EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Traffic counts for weekday AM and PM peak hour and Saturday mid-day conditions were collected at the study intersections in May 2014, June 2015, March 2016, and June 2016. The traffic count sheets are included in Appendix A. The specific count days are listed below.

- Airport Road/ Dry Creek Road: Thursday, April 7, 2016, Saturday June 4, 2016, and Sunday June 5, 2016.
- State Route 46/ G olden Hill Road: Thursday May 1, 2014, Saturday June 4, 2016, and Sunday June 5, 2016.
- State Route 46/ Union Road: Thursday May 1, 2014, Saturday June 4, 2016, and Sunday June 5, 2016.
- State Route 46/ Airport Road: Thursday, April 7, 2016, Saturday June 4, 2016, and Sunday June 5, 2016.

Figure 3 shows the existing weekday peak hour traffic volumes and lane configurations. Table 3 presents the LOS for the study intersections, and the detailed calculation sheets are included in Appendix B.

| Table 3: Existing Intersection Levels of Service |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Peak Hour | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay }{ }^{1} \\ \text { (sec/ veh) } \end{gathered}$ | LOS ${ }^{2}$ | Queues Exceed Storage ${ }^{3}$ |
| 1. Airport Road/ Dry Creek Road | AM | 0.9 (11.6) | - (B) | No |
|  | PM | 3.7 (15.3) | - (C) | No |
|  | Sat | 5.4 (12.9) | - (C) | No |
| 2. State Route 46/ Golden Hill Road | AM | 22.7 | C | No |
|  | PM | 23.0 | C | No |
|  | Sat | 34.0 | C | No |
| 3. State Route 46/ Union Road | AM | 4.2 (25.2) | - (D) | No |
|  | PM | 5.3 (38.8) | - (E) | No |
|  | Sat | 8.9 (>200) | - (F) | No |
| 4. State Route 46/ Airport Road | AM | 5.2 (19.5) | - (C) | Yes ${ }^{4}$ |
|  | PM | 4.4 (26.7) | - (D) | Yes ${ }^{4}$ |
|  | Sat | 8.8 (46.3) | - (E) | Yes ${ }^{4}$ |
| 1. HCM 2010 average control delay in seconds per vehicle. <br> 2. For side-street-stop controlled intersections the worst approach's delay is reported in parenthesis. <br> 3. See Table 7 for detailed queues. <br> 4. 95th percentile queues exceed storage length or signal capacity. |  |  |  |  |

Field observations at the SR 46E/G olden Hill Road intersection showed occasional queue spillback for the north- and southbound left turn lanes. These queues cleared within a single cycle.
At the SR 46E/ Union Road intersection left turns from the Union Road approach experiences high levels of delay due to the high volumes of SR 46E. This results in occasional aggressive maneuvers as drivers are unable to find an acceptable gap in traffic. Many drivers familiar with the intersection detour to avoid these turning movements. The northbound approach at this intersection currently operates at LOS D/E during the weekday AM/ PM peak hours and at LOS F on Saturday at mid-day.

The 95th percentile queues on the southbound approach to the SR 46E/Airport Road intersection reach five vehicles and this approach operates at LOS D during the PM peak hour and at LOS E on Saturday at mid-day. Note that the Saturday conditions include traffic from the Ravine Water Park, which operates in the summer and is busiest on weekends.
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Figure 3: Existing Weekday Peak Hour Volumes and Lane Configurations


## Existing Peak Hour

|  | 2. | 3. | 4. <br>  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Highway 46 } \\ 332(163) \_\uparrow \\ 621(1019) \rightarrow \end{array}$ |

## Existing Lane Configuration
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## Existing Plus Project Conditions

This section evaluates the impacts of the proposed project on the surrounding transportation network, including traffic operations, bicycle, pedestrian, transit, and site access deficiencies. Existing Plus Project conditions reflect existing traffic levels plus the estimated traffic generated by the proposed project.

## PROJECT TRAFFIC ESTIMATES

The amount of project traffic affecting the study intersections is estimated in three steps: trip generation, trip distribution, and trip assignment. Trip generation refers to the total number of new trips generated by the site. Trip distribution identifies the general origins and destinations of these trips, and trip assignment identifies the specific routes taken to reach these origins and destinations.

## Tnip Generation

The project's trip generation estimate, shown in Table 4, was developed using data provided in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation Manual. The Resort Hotel land use most closely matches the proposed land uses, and includes trips generated by supporting amenities such as hotel meeting facilities and restaurants. Trips during the AM and PM peak hours are reported during the peak commute time periods and the Saturday peak hour of the Hotel is assumed to coincide with a summer Saturday peak hour on Airport Road, when the water park is operational.

| Table 4: Project Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Phase | Size | Daily Trips | AM Peak Hour Trips |  | Weekday | PM Peak Hour Trips |  |  | Saturday Peak Hour Trips |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
|  | Hotel 1 | 136 rooms | 772 | 30 | 12 | 42 | 25 | 32 | 57 | 38 | 30 | 68 |
| Resort | Hotel 2 | 80 rooms | 464 | 18 | 7 | 25 | 14 | 20 | 34 | 23 | 18 | 41 |
| Hotel ${ }^{1}$ | Hotel 3 | 28 rooms | 156 | 7 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 8 | 6 | 14 |
|  | Hotel 4 | 47 rooms | 265 | 10 | 4 | 14 | 8 | 12 | 20 | 13 | 10 | 23 |
|  | tal | 291 rooms | 1,657 | 65 | 25 | 90 | 52 | 70 | 122 | 82 | 64 | 146 |

1. ITE Trip Generation Manual, Land Use Code 330, Resort Hotel. Average rate used for AM and PM trips. D aily and Saturday trips are not provided in ITE Trip Generation Manual for Resort Hotel, so they were estimated using the PM to Daily and Saturday trip ratios from Land Use Code 310, Hotel.
Source: ITE Trip G eneration M anual, 9th Edition, 2012; CCTC, 2016.
The project, in total, is expected to generate 1,657 daily trips, 90 weekday AM peak hour trips, 122 weekday PM peak hour trips, and 146 Saturday peak hour trips.

## Trip Distribution and Assignment

The directions of approach and departure for project trips were estimated using existing trip patterns and the locations of complementary land uses. Project trips were assigned to individual intersections based on the trip distribution percentages, and were then added to the existing traffic volumes to establish Existing Plus Project Conditions. Figure 4 shows the trip distribution percentages, project trip assignment, and Existing Plus Project volumes.

## Project Proposed Improvements

The project proposes frontage improvements along Airport Road to provide a southbound left turn lane, northbound right turn lane, a raised median, and bike lanes. An aggregate base path is proposed on the west side of the road.
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Figure 4: Project Trip Distribution, Assignment, and Existing Plus Project Weekday Vobumes


## Project Trip Assignment

1. 

|  | 40 (0) |
| :---: | :---: |
| O | $\leftarrow 0(0)$ |
| $\checkmark \downarrow$ | $\checkmark^{1(1)}$ |
| Dr Creeer Ro <br> $0(0)$ | $7 \uparrow \stackrel{ }{4}$ |
| O(0) $\rightarrow$ | 응춛 |
| $0(0) \downarrow$ |  |

2. 


3.
4.


## Existing Plus Project

|  | 2. | 3. <br>  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Central Coast Iransportation Consulting Irdific Engineting \& Tangoortaion Plaming

Agenda Item 1
Figure 5: Saturday Peak Hour Volumes

## Existing Peak Hour

| 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Highway } 46 \\ 308 \wedge \\ 795 \rightarrow \end{array} \end{gathered}$ |

## Existing Plus Project



## Near Term

| 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Dr CreekRd $12 \_$ $120 \rightarrow$ 1 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Highway } 46 \\ 319 \_ \\ 950 \rightarrow \end{gathered}$ |

## Near Term Plus Project
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## DEFICIENCY ANALYSIS

The deficiency analysis for individual travel modes are discussed below.

## Traffic Operations

Traffic operations deficiency criteria are described in the Analysis Methods section of this report. Table 5 summarizes the operating conditions under Existing and Existing Plus Project conditions.

| Intersection | Peak Hour | Existing Delay ${ }^{1}$ |  | Existing Plus Project |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay }^{1} \\ \text { (sec/ veh) } \end{gathered}$ | $\mathrm{LOS}^{2}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh})}{\text { Delay }^{1}}$ | $\mathrm{LOS}^{2}$ | Queues Exceed Storage ${ }^{3}$ |
| 1. Airport Road/ Dry Creek Road | AM | 0.9 (11.6) | - (B) | 0.9 (11.6) | - (B) | No |
|  | PM | 3.7 (15.3) | - (C) | 3.7 (15.5) | - (C) | No |
|  | Sat | 5.4 (12.9) | - (C) | 5.4 (13.0) | - (B) | No |
| 2. State Route 46/ G olden Hill Road | AM | 22.7 | C | 23.0 | C | No |
|  | PM | 23.0 | C | 23.6 | C | No |
|  | Sat | 34.0 | C | 34.7 | C | No |
| 3. State Route 46/ Union Road | AM | 4.2 (25.2) | - (D) | 4.4 (27.7) | - (D) | No |
|  | PM | 5.3 (38.8) | - (E) | 6.1 (48.3) | - (E) | No |
|  | Sat | 8.9 (>200) | - (F) | 10.2 (>200) | - (F) | No |
| 4. State Route 46/ Airport Road | AM | 5.2 (19.5) | - (C) | 7.5 (27.2) | - (D) | Yes ${ }^{4}$ |
|  | PM | 4.4 (26.7) | - (D) | 6.3 (34.8) | - (D) | Yes ${ }^{4}$ |
|  | Sat | 8.8 (46.3) | - (E) | 43.4 (>200) | - (F) | Yes ${ }^{4}$ |

1. HCM 2010 average control delay in seconds per vehicle.
2. For side-street-stop controlled intersections the worst approach's delay is reported in parenthesis.
3. See Table 7 for detailed queues.
4. 95th percentile queues exceed storage length or signal capacity.

The Airport Road/ Dry Creek Road and SR 46E/ G olden Hill Road intersections operate at LOS C or better during all time periods both with and without the project.
The northbound approach to the SR 46E/ Union Road intersection operates at LOS E both with and without the project during weekday PM peak hour and at LOS F on Saturday at mid-day due to high volumes on SR 46E.

The southbound approach to the SR 46E/Airport Road intersection operates at LOS D during weekday conditions with the project and at LO SF on Saturday with the project. Note that this includes traffic from the Ravine Water Park.

Queuing is reported in Table 8. Queuing on the southbound approach to SR 46E/Airport Road increases from five vehicles in the Existing PM peak hour to seven vehicles with the addition of project traffic under Existing Plus Project PM conditions. Queuing at the same intersection increase from six vehicles in Existing Saturday at mid-day to nine vehicles with the addition of project traffic under Existing Plus Project Saturday mid-day conditions.

## Traffic Operations Recommendations

The side-street-stop controlled approaches to Union Road and Airport Road at SR 46E experience moderate to long delay as drivers wait for an acceptable gap in traffic on SR 46E. Caltrans' Comprehensive Corridor Study for SR 46E acknowledges these existing deficiencies and provides recommendations to address them. These recommendations include improving local parallel routes,
improving the SR 46E/ Union Road intersection, and implementation of travel demand management strategies.

SR 46E/ Union Road: The City recently approved a project on Union Road with the condition that it prohibit northbound left turns at the SR 46E/ Union Road intersection. This will improve operations at this intersection in the near term; no further improvements are recommended. With the side street left and through movements prohibited at this intersection, the worst approach is expected to operate at LOS C during the Saturday mid-day peak hour under Existing Plus Project conditions. Longer term improvements are under study as a part of the on-going SR 46E/ Union Road Project Report and Environmental D ocument.

SR 46E/Airport Road: The southbound approach to the SR 46E/Airport Road intersection experiences moderate delay during the weekday peak hours, worsening during Saturday mid-day conditions when the water park is active and high regional traffic volumes are present on the highway. The 95th percentile queues on the southbound approach are forecast to reach 228 feet (under 10 vehicles) under Existing Plus Project conditions on Saturday, when the southbound approach would operate at LOS F.

We recommend that the project direct exiting project traffic destined to the east on SR 46E to turn right on Airport Road, right on Dry Creek Road, then left at SR 46 E/Jardine Road. This would shift southbound left turns from the SR 46E/Airport Road intersection to the SR 46 E/Jardine Road intersection. Table 6 shows the effect of adding these shifted southbound left turns to the SR 46 $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Jardine}$ Road intersection by phase of the project.

| Scenario | State Route 46/ Aipport Road$\begin{gathered} \text { Delay }^{1} \\ (\mathrm{sec} / \text { veh) } \end{gathered} \quad \text { LO S }^{2}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { State Route 46/ } \\ & \text { Jardine Road } \\ & \text { Delay }{ }^{1} \\ & \text { (sec/ veh) } \quad \text { LO S }^{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Saturday | 8.8 (46.3) | (E) | 1.9 (15.5) | - (C) |
| Existing Saturday Plus Hotel 1 | 12.3 (63.0) | - (F) | 1.9 (15.6) | - (C) |
| Mitigated Existing Saturday Plus Hotel 1 | 11.6 (55.8) | - (F) | 2.0 (16.3) | - (C) |
| Existing Saturday Plus Hotels 1 and 2 | 17.1 (96.9) | - (F) | 1.9 (15.6) | - (C) |
| Mitigated Existing Saturday Plus Hotels 1 and 2 | 13.8 (64.1) | - (F) | 2.1 (16.6) | - (C) |
| Existing Saturday Plus Hotels 1, 2, and 3 | 20.1 (121.7) | - (F) | 1.9 (15.7) | - (C) |
| Mitigated Existing Saturday Plus Hotels 1, 2, and 3 | 15.5 (76.6) | - (F) | 2.1 (16.8) | - (C) |
| Existing Saturday Plus Hotels 1, 2, 3, and 4 | 43.4 (>200) | - (F) | 1.9 (15.7) | - (C) |
| Mitigated Existing Saturday Plus Hotels 1, 2, 3, and 4 | 16.9 (80.8) | - (F) | 2.2 (17.2) | - (C) |
| 1. HCM 2010 average oontrol delay in seconds per vehide. 2. For sidestreet-stop controlled intersections the worst appia | h's delay is | orted in | renthesis. |  |

Table 6 shows that the southbound approach to SR 46 E/ Jardine Road would operate at LOS C with the addition of left turning traffic from all Hotels. Shifting the left turning traffic away from SR 46E/ Airport Road would also substantially reduce the delay at this intersection, but the southbound approach would continue to operate at LOS F under all phases of the project. The effectiveness of this measure should be evaluated prior to Hotel 2 permitting and the measure should be adjusted if needed to meet the satisfaction of the Community D evelopment D irector.

Two additional improvements were considered but discarded for this location. O ne would channelize the southbound approach to SR 46E/ Airport Road to provide designated right and left turn lanes. This improvement would not reduce delay but would provide additional queue storage. However, the forecast queues to not block any nearby intersections so this improvement is not recommended. The second recommendation would prohibit southbound left turns at this intersection. Caltrans has indicated they would not support this turn prohibition due to potential secondary impacts of u-turns causing conflicts at the SR 46E/ Union Road intersection, so it is not recommended.
The development of parallel routes is consistent with the Caltrans Corridor Study for this area and would allow project traffic to access other areas of the City without driving on SR 46E. This improvement is discussed in more detail in the Near Term chapter.

## Bicycles

Bicycle deficiencies would occur if the project disrupts existing or planned bicycle facilities or is otherwise incongruent with the City's Bike Master Plan. The Bike Master Plan proposes the following new bicycle facilities in the vicinity of the project:

- Class II bike lanes are proposed along Golden Hill Road from SR 46E to south of Niblick D rive.
- Class II bike lanes are proposed along the extent of Union Road.
- Class II bike lanes are proposed along Dry Creek Road from Airport Road to Jardine Road.
- Class II bike lanes are proposed along the extent of Airport Road, including along the project frontage.
- A Class I bike path along the east bank of the Huer Huero Creek is proposed connecting Union Road near Barney Schwartz Park to the Ravine Water Park on Airport Road.
The project site plan shows frontage improvements on Airport Road that include a 12 foot median, 12 foot travel lanes, a two foot buffer, and five foot Class II bike lanes.
The following changes are recommended to better serve cyclists and conform to the Bike Master Plan:
- Modify the bike lane and right turn striping for the northbound right turn lane proposed at Airport Road/ Destino Paso Way per Figure 9C-4 of the California MUTCD. The site plan shows the bike lane to the right of the right turn lane instead of between the right turn lane and through lane as recommended by the MUTCD.
- Install the bicycle rider stencil pavement marker only when the bike lanes are continuous to the north and south of the project frontage.


## Pedestrians

Pedestrian deficiencies would occur if the project fails to provide safe and accessible pedestrian connections between project buildings and adjacent streets, trails, and transit facilities.
The project site plan shows a concrete sidewalk along the east side of the project driveway (D estino Paso Way) connecting to Hotels 1 and 2 to Hotel 3. A sidewalk is proposed along Airport Road between Hotels 3 and 4. A four foot or greater aggregate base walking path is shown on the west side of Airport Road from D estino Paso Way to the northernmost Ravine Water Park parking area.

## Pedestrian Evaluation and Recommendations

The Ravine Water Park is located approximately $1 / 2$ mile from the proposed project, and some Hotel guests may walk to the Water Park if pedestrian accommodations are provided. As proposed, guests
walking to the Water Park would cross Airport Road at Destino Paso Way then walk along the aggregate walking path to the Water Park. An alternative would be to cross Airport Road near the RV Park. The table below summarizes these alternatives.

| Airport Road Pedestrian Crossing Evaluation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | Pros | Cons | Recommendation |
| Cross Airport at Destino Paso, path on West Side | - Serves D estino Paso pedestrians | - Long uncontrolled crossing (60-80 feet) | - Construct as proposed on site plan. |
| Path on East Side, Cross on North side of RV Resort Driveway | - Shorter Crossing D istance <br> - Serves RV Resort and Destino Paso pedestrians | - May require modification of Airport Road at RV Resort entrance merge <br> - May require additional grading <br> - Potential sight distance issue due to horizontal and vertical curves | - Not recommended. |

The table above suggests that a shared crossing with the RV Resort would benefit the most pedestrians, but has constructability and sight distance concerns. This crossing would require modification to the short northbound acceleration/ merge lane located north of the RV Resort driveway on Airport Road, potential grading and retaining walls, and would require site plan revisions to provide a walking path along the east side of Airport Road along the project frontage. The walking path as proposed by the project along the west side of Airport Road is recommended given these constraints.

## On-Site Pedestrian Circulation

Recommendations on the preliminary site plans have been incorporated into the current plan. No further changes are recommended.

## Transit

Transit deficiencies would occur if the project disrupts existing or planned transit facilities or services; conflicts with City plans, guidelines, policies, or standards; or if the project adds trips to a line already operating at peak hour crush load capacity.
The project is not expected to alter or disrupt any of the transit facilities or services, so no transit deficiencies are noted. Shuttle service, if feasible, serving local attractions such as wineries and the Water Park would reduce the demand for travel by personal automobile.

## Site Access and On-Site Circulation

On-site circulation deficiencies would occur if project designs fail to meet appropriate standards, fail to provide adequate truck access, or would result in hazardous or unsafe conditions.
The proposed site plan is shown on Figure 2. Project access will be provided via Destino Paso Way, which would be improved from its current condition as a dirt road.
Detailed construction documents should be reviewed once they are ready to ensure that adequate sight distance is provided at the driveways serving Hotels 1 and 3 , which are located on the inside of
horizontal curves. Landscaping and other features should be restricted near these driveways to provide clear sight lines to approaching traffic.

## Circulation Element Consistency

Airport Road is classified as an arterial in the City's Circulation Element. Page CE-15 of the Circulation Element lists development policies, and item 12 notes that developers should be responsible for "Limited access on all arterials." Three of the project's hotels would gain access directly from D estino Paso Way, not Airport Road, which is consistent with this Circulation Element policy. The fourth hotel would be accessed directly from Airport Road.

There is an existing driveway less than 100 feet north of Destino Paso Way. It currently serves lowintensity single family and ranching uses. If this property intensifies, the existing driveway could create driver confusion and conflicts due to the closely spaced intersections. We recommend providing an access easement to consolidate this parcel via Destino Paso Way if the property intensifies and generates more traffic. This would limit the conflicting closely spaced driveways on an arterial roadway consistent with the Circulation Element policy.

Destino Paso Way is proposed as a City street, so it would serve the parcel to the east should it redevelop. The City's Circulation Element and Parallel Routes Study plan the development of a network of City streets parallel to State Route 46 from Jardine Road to River Road. The Circulation Element plans a new connection from Wisteria Lane to Airport Road which would allow project traffic to reach G olden Hill Road on local streets and reduce the reliance on State Route 46 for local trips. Providing the eastern property access to Airport Road via D estino Paso Way as proposed by the project would support the development of parallel routes.

## Near Term Traffic Conditions

Near Term conditions reflect the addition of approved and pending projects in the study area to Existing Conditions volumes. The following near-term projects are included in this scenario:

- Buena Vista A partments- 142 apartment units located at 802 Experimental Station Road.
- River Oaks- The Next Generation- 144 active adult homes, 127 single family homes, community center, and fitness/ wellness center located north of River O aks D rive and east of River Road.
- RV Park- 332 spaces located at the north end of G olden Hill Road
- Wine Storage Building- 66,000 s.f. located at 2261 Wisteria Lane
- Hilton G arden Inn Hotel- 166 hotel rooms and related amenities on the southeast corner of SR 46E/ G olden Hill Road.
- Paso Robles Marriott- 119 hotel rooms on Union Road.
- San Antonio Winery Development- Tasting room, restaurant, four residences, and retail in addition to existing facilities at 2610 Buena Vista D rive
- San Antonio Winery Processing- 126,000 s.f. processing facility at 2261 Wisteria Lane.
- Discovery G ardens also known as La Entrada - East of Airport Road on SR 46E. Phases 1 and 1a were assumed to be in place.
- Gran Cielo Cluster Development - 42 single family homes located in the County south of Union Road and State Route 46 E.
- Vina Robles Hotel - 98 room hotel south of Vina Robles Amphitheatre on Mill Road.

Traffic volumes for the Buena Vista A partments, Hilton G arden Inn, River O aks, Discovery G ardens, and Paso Robles Marriott projects were obtained from the traffic studies prepared for those projects. Traffic volumes for the remaining near term projects were estimated using standard ITE rates. The roadway network was assumed to remain the same as under Existing conditions.

## DEFICIENCY ANALYSIS

Project volumes were added to Near Term conditions to yield Near Term Plus Project conditions as shown on Figure 6. Table 7 summarizes the traffic conditions under Near Term and Near Term Plus Project conditions, with queues detailed in Table 8.

| Intersection | Peak <br> Hour | Near Term |  |  | N ear Term Plus Project |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay }^{1} \\ \text { (sec/ veh) } \end{gathered}$ | $\mathrm{LOS}^{2}$ | Queues Exceed Storage ${ }^{3}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay }^{1} \\ \text { (sec/ veh) } \end{gathered}$ | $\mathrm{LOS}^{2}$ | Queues Exceed Storage ${ }^{3}$ |
| 1. Airport Road/ Dry Creek Road | AM | 0.9 (11.8) | - (B) | No | 0.9 (11.9) | - (B) | No |
|  | PM | 3.9 (16.1) | - (C) | No | 3.9 (16.3) | - (C) | No |
|  | Sat | 5.4 (13.6) | - (B) | No | 5.5 (13.8) | - (B) | No |
| 2. State Route 46/ G olden Hill Road | AM | 28.4 | C | No | 28.8 | C | No |
|  | PM | 31.0 | C | Yes ${ }^{4}$ | 32.1 | C | Yes ${ }^{4}$ |
|  | Sat | 46.0 | D | Yes ${ }^{4}$ | 47.4 | D | Yes ${ }^{4}$ |
| 3. State Route 46/ Union Road | AM | 5.0 (34.8) | - (D) | No | 5.7 (40.7) | - (E) | No |
|  | PM | 8.7 (78.2) | - (F) | No | 11.4 (110.5) | - (F) | No |
|  | Sat | 13.8 (184.6) | - (F) | No | 18.9 (>200) | - (F) | No |
| 4. State Route 46/ Airport Road | AM | 8.2 (26.2) | - (D) | Yes ${ }^{4}$ | 19.4 (128.6) | - (F) | Yes ${ }^{4}$ |
|  | PM | 6.8 (45.7) | - (E) | Yes ${ }^{4}$ | 11.0 (67.5) | - (F) | Yes ${ }^{4}$ |
|  | Sat | 8.6 (96.1 ${ }^{5}$ ) | - (F) | Yes ${ }^{4}$ | 16.1 (149.3 ${ }^{5}$ ) | - (F) | Yes ${ }^{4}$ |
| 1. HCM 2010 average control delay in seconds per vehicle. <br> 2. For side-street-stop controlled intersections the worst approach's delay is reported in parenthesis. <br> 3. See Table 7 for detailed queues. <br> 4. 95 th percentile queues exceed storage length or signal capacity. <br> 5. Software does not report value for southbound approach, delay reported for southbound right turn lane. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 7 shows the following:

- The Airport Road/ Dry Creek Road intersection operates at LO S C or better during all Near Term scenarios.
- The SR 46E/Golden Hill Road intersection is forecast to operate at LOS C during the weekday peak hour with the project in place. During the Saturday peak hour, the intersection operates at LOS D both with and without the project.
- The northbound approach to the SR 46E/ Union Road intersection operates at LOS F both with and without the project during weekday PM and Saturday mid-day peak hours.
- The southbound approach to the SR 46E/ Airport Road intersection operates at LO SD during weekday conditions with the project and at LOS F on Saturday with the project.

Queuing is summarized in Table 8. Queuing on the southbound approach to SR 46E/Airport Road increases from nine vehicles in the NearTerm PM peak hour to 12 vehicles with the addition of project traffic under Near Term Plus Project PM conditions. Queuing at the same intersection increase from 11 vehicles under Near Term Saturday conditions to 15 vehicles with the addition of project traffic. These queues would not block nearby driveways.

## Traffic Operations Recommendations

The recommendations summarized in the Existing Plus Project conditions section (shifting exiting project traffic heading east on SR 46E to use the SR 46E/ Jardine Road intersection) also apply to the Near Term Plus Project scenario. However, the SR 46E/Jardine Road intersection is forecast to operate at LO S E under Near Term conditions without the project.

We recommend completion of the local road connection from Wisteria Lane to Airport Road to address the deficiency at SR 46E/ Airport Road. When the connection is complete, provide signage to direct hotel visitors and other drivers to the new local road connection instead of SR 46E. The City has made substantial progress towards completing this connection, and the project would contribute towards this connection by paying development impact fees.

| Table 8: 95th Percentile Queues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Direction | Storage Length | Peak Hour | 95th Percentile Q ueues (feet) ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Existing | Existing+ Project | NearTem | $\begin{gathered} \text { NearTerm+ } \\ \text { Project } \end{gathered}$ |
| 1. Airport Road/ Dry Creek Road | EBL | N/A | AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  | PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  | Sat | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
|  | WBL | N/A | ${ }_{\text {PM }}^{\text {AM }}$ | 5 3 | 5 3 | 5 38 | 5 38 |
|  |  |  | Sat | 10 | 10 | 13 | 13 |
|  | NBL | N/A | AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  | PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  | Sat | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | SBL | N/A | AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  | PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  | Sat | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. State Route 46/ GoldenHill Road Hill Road | EBL | 550 ft . | AM | 79 | 80 | 118 | 118 |
|  |  |  | PM | 86 | 88 | 121 | 121 |
|  |  |  | Sat | 115 | 116 | 149 | 151 |
|  | WBL | 460 ft . | AM | ${ }^{23}$ | 23 | 41 | 41 |
|  |  |  | PM | 35 | 38 | 57 | 62 |
|  |  |  | Sat | 31 | 34 | 58 | 61 |
|  | NBL | 160 ft . | AM | 119 | 120 | 136 | 136 |
|  |  |  | PM | 115 | 119 | 148 | 148 |
|  |  |  | Sat | 90 | 90 | 130 | 132 |
|  | SBL | 130 ft . | AM | 59 | 61 | 75 | 77 |
|  |  |  | PM | 104 | 109 | 146 | 147 |
|  |  |  | Sat | 91 | 94 | 123 | 142 |
| 3. State Route 46/ Union Road | EBL | 500 ft . | AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  | PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  | Sat | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
|  | WBL | 670 ft . | $\stackrel{\text { AM }}{ }$ | 35 | 38 | 43 | 45 |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PM } \\ & \text { Sat } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 68 \\ & 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75 \\ & 28 \end{aligned}$ | 98 33 | 108 |
|  | NBL | N/A | AM | 63 | 70 | 80 | 90 |
|  |  |  | PM | 65 | 70 | 93 | 103 |
|  |  |  | Sat | 45 | 90 | 95 | 100 |
| 4. State Route 46/ AirportRoad | EBL | 950 | AM | 135 | 188 | 223 | 308 |
|  |  |  | PM | 28 | 35 | 38 | 50 |
|  |  |  | Sat | 193 | 295 | 285 | 420 |
|  | SBL | N/A | AM | 8 | 30 | 18 | 68 |
|  |  |  | PM | 3 | 18 | 5 | 25 |
|  |  |  | Sat | 5 | 98 | $265{ }^{2}$ | $373{ }^{2}$ |
|  | SBR | 25 ft . | AM | 38 | 45 | 50 | 60 |
|  |  |  | PM | 130 | 185 | 218 | 305 |
|  |  |  | Sat | 155 | 228 | 265 | 373 |
| 1. Queue length that would not be exceeded 95 percent of the time. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Agenda Item 1
Figure 6: Near Term Volumes and Near Term Plus Project Weekday Volumes


| Near Term |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. <br>  |  | 3. <br>  |  |

Near Term Plus Project

|  | 2. | 3. | 4. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Highway 46 } \\ 405(215) \_ \\ 709(1180) \rightarrow \end{array}$ |
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## Appendix A: Traffic Count Sheets

##  Metro Traticic Datalanc,

Metro Traffic Data Inc.
310 N. Irwin Street - Suite 20
Hanford, CA 93230
800-975-6938 Phone/Fax
www.metrotrafficdata.com

Turning Movement Report

Prepared For:
Central Coast Transportation Consulting 895 Napa Avenue, Suite A-6 Morro Bay, CA 93442

| LOCATION | Airport Road @ Dry Creek Road |
| ---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | San Luis Obispo |
|  | Thursday, April 7, 2016 |


| LATITUDE | $35.662886{ }^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| LONGITUDE | $-120.640968^{\circ}$ |
| WEATHER | Clear |


|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks |
| 7:00 AM - 7:15 AM | 0 | 27 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 7:15 AM - 7:30 AM | 0 | 40 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 7:30 AM - 7:45 AM | 1 | 45 | 20 | 2 | 3 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 7:45 AM - 8:00 AM | 0 | 65 | 29 | 4 | 3 | 32 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 8:00 AM - 8:15 AM | 0 | 54 | 20 | 3 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM - 8:30 AM | 0 | 51 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 26 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| 8:30 AM - 8:45 AM | 1 | 33 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 27 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM - 9:00 AM | 0 | 21 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 29 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 2 | 336 | 133 | 22 | 11 | 206 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 8 | 9 |


|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks |
| 4:00 PM - 4:15 PM | 0 | 23 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 37 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM - 4:30 PM | 0 | 35 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 41 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM - 4:45 PM | 0 | 29 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 73 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| 4:45 PM - 5:00 PM | 0 | 43 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 49 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM - 5:15 PM | 0 | 32 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5:15 PM - 5:30 PM | 0 | 24 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 52 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM - 5:45 PM | 0 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM - 6:00 PM | 0 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 226 | 46 | 24 | 7 | 377 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 166 | 0 | 13 | 3 |


|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PEAK HOUR | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks |
| 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM | 1 | 215 | 87 | 14 | 9 | 97 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 7 | 5 |
| 4:15 PM - 5:15 PM | 0 | 139 | 21 | 16 | 4 | 228 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 117 | 0 | 6 | 2 |


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PHF | Trucks |
| AM |  |  |
|  | 0.803 | $5.7 \%$ |
| PM |  |  |

##  Metro Traticic Datalanc,

Metro Traffic Data Inc.
310 N. Irwin Street - Suite 20
Hanford, CA 93230
800-975-6938 Phone/Fax
www.metrotrafficdata.com

Prepared For:
Central Coast Transportation Consulting

LOCATION __ Airport Road @ Dry Creek Road (East)
COUNTY $\qquad$

COLLECTION DATE $\quad$ Saturday 6/4/16 \& Sunday 6/5/16

| LATITUDE | $35.662849^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $-120.640936^{\circ}$ |
| ${ } \quad$ Clear $}$ |  |

$\qquad$

|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time (Saturday) | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks |
| 11:00 AM - 11:15 AM | 0 | 17 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 36 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 11:15 AM - 11:30 AM | 0 | 27 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 11:30 AM - 11:45 AM | 0 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 11:45 AM - 12:00 PM | 0 | 37 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 28 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 12:00 PM - 12:15 PM | 0 | 31 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 34 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 12:15 PM - 12:30 PM | 0 | 31 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 12:30 PM - 12:45 PM | 0 | 26 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 34 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 12:45 PM - 1:00 PM | 0 | 32 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 226 | 36 | 14 | 20 | 209 | 2 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 1 | 16 | 3 |


|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time (Sunday) | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks |
| 4:00 PM - 4:15 PM | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM - 4:30 PM | 0 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM - 4:45 PM | 0 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM - 5:00 PM | 0 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM - 5:15 PM | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM - 5:30 PM | 0 | 15 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM - 5:45 PM | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM - 6:00 PM | 0 | 21 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 119 | 22 | 4 | 11 | 134 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 22 | 1 | 6 | 0 |


|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PEAK HOUR | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks |
| 11:45 AM - 12:45 PM | 0 | 125 | 16 | 8 | 12 | 120 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| 4:00 PM - 5:00 PM | 0 | 60 | 10 | 1 | 7 | 69 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 0 |


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PHF | Trucks |
| Saturday |  |  |
|  | 0.891 | $4.3 \%$ |
| Sunday | 0.805 | $1.2 \%$ |




##  Metro Traficic Datalnc.

Metro Traffic Data Inc.
310 N. Irwin Street - Suite 20
Hanford, CA 93230
800-975-6938 Phone/Fax
www.metrotrafficdata.com

Prepared For:
Central Coast Transportation Consulting
LOCATION $\quad$ SR 46 @ Golden Hill Road

COUNTY $\qquad$

COLLECTION DATE $\quad$ Saturday 6/4/16 \& Sunday 6/5/16

| LATITUDE | $35.644557^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| LONGITUDE | $-120.658075^{\circ}$ |
| WEATHER | Clear |


|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time (Saturday) | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks |
| 11:00 AM - 11:15 AM | 37 | 38 | 6 | 1 | 23 | 55 | 72 | 4 | 34 | 183 | 33 | 22 | 21 | 301 | 62 | 23 |
| 11:15 AM - 11:30 AM | 31 | 56 | 10 | 1 | 33 | 54 | 75 | 0 | 44 | 175 | 35 | 33 | 12 | 367 | 62 | 7 |
| 11:30 AM - 11:45 AM | 38 | 46 | 9 | 1 | 31 | 48 | 76 | 2 | 48 | 221 | 36 | 14 | 11 | 307 | 55 | 11 |
| 11:45 AM - 12:00 PM | 36 | 48 | 12 | 0 | 37 | 58 | 69 | 1 | 38 | 177 | 41 | 21 | 8 | 315 | 63 | 21 |
| 12:00 PM - 12:15 PM | 24 | 49 | 8 | 0 | 28 | 45 | 66 | 0 | 45 | 218 | 32 | 18 | 11 | 323 | 38 | 13 |
| 12:15 PM - 12:30 PM | 38 | 41 | 7 | 2 | 31 | 39 | 58 | 0 | 32 | 191 | 39 | 25 | 8 | 285 | 41 | 6 |
| 12:30 PM - 12:45 PM | 29 | 36 | 10 | 0 | 34 | 39 | 50 | 1 | 34 | 198 | 29 | 10 | 19 | 303 | 62 | 21 |
| 12:45 PM - 1:00 PM | 28 | 40 | 1 | 0 | 33 | 35 | 56 | 1 | 34 | 187 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 255 | 23 | 12 |
| TOTAL | 261 | 354 | 63 | 5 | 250 | 373 | 522 | 9 | 309 | 1550 | 265 | 158 | 105 | 2456 | 406 | 114 |


|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time (Sunday) | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks |
| 4:00 PM - 4:15 PM | 13 | 21 | 6 | 1 | 40 | 23 | 27 | 0 | 42 | 278 | 25 | 3 | 7 | 213 | 36 | 8 |
| 4:15 PM - 4:30 PM | 15 | 27 | 7 | 0 | 41 | 33 | 25 | 0 | 34 | 296 | 24 | 7 | 15 | 222 | 20 | 5 |
| 4:30 PM - 4:45 PM | 17 | 20 | 11 | 0 | 48 | 30 | 31 | 2 | 47 | 317 | 27 | 14 | 14 | 197 | 33 | 13 |
| 4:45 PM - 5:00 PM | 13 | 18 | 12 | 0 | 44 | 28 | 40 | 4 | 34 | 303 | 25 | 11 | 9 | 231 | 31 | 11 |
| 5:00 PM - 5:15 PM | 19 | 20 | 7 | 0 | 42 | 28 | 50 | 0 | 30 | 319 | 19 | 8 | 10 | 202 | 21 | 11 |
| 5:15 PM - 5:30 PM | 16 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 28 | 18 | 31 | 1 | 31 | 316 | 17 | 5 | 15 | 223 | 39 | 8 |
| 5:30 PM - 5:45 PM | 26 | 30 | 10 | 1 | 39 | 24 | 41 | 1 | 17 | 322 | 23 | 7 | 12 | 198 | 31 | 7 |
| 5:45 PM - 6:00 PM | 16 | 25 | 9 | 0 | 37 | 22 | 23 | 0 | 31 | 304 | 24 | 0 | 17 | 211 | 25 | 13 |
| TOTAL | 135 | 180 | 64 | 2 | 319 | 206 | 268 | 8 | 266 | 2455 | 184 | 55 | 99 | 1697 | 236 | 76 |


|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PEAK HOUR | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks |
| 11:15 AM - 12:15 PM | 129 | 199 | 39 | 2 | 129 | 205 | 286 | 3 | 175 | 791 | 144 | 86 | 42 | 1312 | 218 | 52 |
| 4:15 PM - 5:15 PM | 64 | 85 | 37 | 0 | 175 | 119 | 146 | 6 | 145 | 1235 | 95 | 40 | 48 | 852 | 105 | 40 |



SR 46

## PHF

|  |  | SAT | 286 | 205 | 129 | 0.945 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.943 | 0.91 |  |  |  |  |  | SUN |
| 145 | 175 |  |  |  |  |  | 105 |
| 1235 | 791 |  |  |  |  |  | 852 |
| 95 | 144 |  |  |  |  |  | 48 |
| SUN SAT |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.927 |
|  |  | 0.946 | 129 | 199 | 39 | SAT |  |
|  |  | 0.949 | 64 | 85 | 37 | SUN |  |

## Project \#: 15-1175-001

TMC SUMMARY OF Union Rd, \& Hwy, 46E


##  Metro Traticic Datalanc,

Metro Traffic Data Inc.
310 N. Irwin Street - Suite 20
Hanford, CA 93230
800-975-6938 Phone/Fax
www.metrotrafficdata.com

Prepared For:
Central Coast Transportation Consulting
LOCATION _ SR 46 @ Union Road

COUNTY $\qquad$

COLLECTION DATE $\qquad$

LATITUDE $\qquad$
LONGITUDE $\qquad$ $-120.649432^{\circ}$

WEATHER $\qquad$

|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time (Saturday) | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks |
| 11:00 AM - 11:15 AM | 1 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 224 | 8 | 23 | 42 | 377 | 0 | 16 |
| 11:15 AM - 11:30 AM | 3 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 188 | 9 | 16 | 47 | 453 | 0 | 12 |
| 11:30 AM - 11:45 AM | 4 | 2 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 242 | 16 | 20 | 46 | 350 | 0 | 8 |
| 11:45 AM - 12:00 PM | 6 | 3 | 60 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 221 | 5 | 20 | 34 | 384 | 0 | 25 |
| 12:00 PM - 12:15 PM | 1 | 1 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 246 | 9 | 17 | 41 | 369 | 0 | 22 |
| 12:15 PM - 12:30 PM | 2 | 0 | 46 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 224 | 9 | 20 | 45 | 327 | 0 | 14 |
| 12:30 PM - 12:45 PM | 2 | 0 | 50 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 239 | 7 | 16 | 48 | 392 | 0 | 18 |
| 12:45 PM - 1:00 PM | 3 | 1 | 53 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 214 | 7 | 18 | 44 | 304 | 0 | 16 |
| TOTAL | 22 | 7 | 381 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 18 | 1798 | 70 | 150 | 347 | 2956 | 0 | 131 |


|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time (Sunday) | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks |
| 4:00 PM - 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 321 | 7 | 3 | 27 | 249 | 0 | 7 |
| 4:15 PM - 4:30 PM | 2 | 0 | 48 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 360 | 3 | 10 | 56 | 260 | 0 | 5 |
| 4:30 PM - 4:45 PM | 1 | 0 | 34 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 346 | 8 | 13 | 35 | 231 | 0 | 16 |
| 4:45 PM - 5:00 PM | 3 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 369 | 6 | 11 | 36 | 264 | 0 | 9 |
| 5:00 PM - 5:15 PM | 2 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 358 | 4 | 14 | 26 | 216 | 0 | 14 |
| 5:15 PM - 5:30 PM | 4 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 339 | 6 | 5 | 42 | 277 | 0 | 8 |
| 5:30 PM - 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 358 | 5 | 10 | 45 | 232 | 0 | 12 |
| 5:45 PM - 6:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 50 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 346 | 7 | 4 | 43 | 238 | 0 | 15 |
| TOTAL | 13 | 0 | 310 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 39 | 1 | 2 | 2797 | 46 | 70 | 310 | 1967 | 0 | 86 |


|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PEAK HOUR | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks |
| 11:15 AM - 12:15 PM | 14 | 6 | 192 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 897 | 39 | 73 | 168 | 1556 | 0 | 67 |
| 4:00 PM - 5:00 PM | 6 | 0 | 160 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 22 | 1 | 2 | 1396 | 24 | 37 | 154 | 1004 | 0 | 37 |



##  Mato Traftic Data Inc,

Metro Traffic Data Inc.
310 N. Irwin Street - Suite 20
Hanford, CA 93230
800-975-6938 Phone/Fax
www.metrotrafficdata.com

Prepared For:
Central Coast Transportation Consulting

| LOCATION | SR 46 @ Airport Road |
| ---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | San Luis Obispo |
|  | Thursday, April 7, 2016 |


| LATITUDE | $35.644513^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $-120.643315^{\circ}$ |
| WONGITUDE | Clear |


|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks |
| 7:00 AM - 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 39 | 91 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 168 | 3 | 35 |
| 7:15 AM - 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 3 | 47 | 124 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 227 | 3 | 19 |
| 7:30 AM - 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 4 | 44 | 102 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 265 | 5 | 29 |
| 7:45 AM - 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 2 | 101 | 138 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 285 | 2 | 28 |
| 8:00 AM - 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 30 | 5 | 82 | 149 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 193 | 0 | 19 |
| 8:15 AM - 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 4 | 61 | 157 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 176 | 1 | 39 |
| 8:30 AM - 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 51 | 150 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 150 | 2 | 19 |
| 8:45 AM - 9:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 31 | 5 | 51 | 140 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 149 | 1 | 31 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 224 | 25 | 476 | 1051 | 0 | 178 | 0 | 1613 | 17 | 219 |


|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks |
| 4:00 PM - 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 81 | 2 | 42 | 230 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 215 | 2 | 18 |
| 4:15 PM - 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 62 | 4 | 40 | 218 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 199 | 2 | 17 |
| 4:30 PM - 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 84 | 1 | 46 | 234 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 198 | 1 | 17 |
| 4:45 PM - 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 76 | 4 | 42 | 277 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 244 | 2 | 23 |
| 5:00 PM - 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 78 | 5 | 39 | 240 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 259 | 2 | 22 |
| 5:15 PM - 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 68 | 1 | 36 | 268 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 193 | 2 | 14 |
| 5:30 PM - 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 55 | 2 | 34 | 240 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 204 | 2 | 24 |
| 5:45 PM - 6:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 26 | 2 | 28 | 212 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 157 | 2 | 16 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 530 | 21 | 307 | 1919 | 0 | 162 | 0 | 1669 | 15 | 151 |


|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PEAK HOUR | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks |
| 7:15 AM - 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 127 | 14 | 274 | 513 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 970 | 10 | 95 |
| 4:30 PM - 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 306 | 11 | 163 | 1019 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 894 | 7 | 76 |


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PHF | Trucks |
| AM |  |  |
| PM | 0.852 | $9.5 \%$ |
|  | 0.933 | $7.1 \%$ |

SR 46

## PHF



## SR 46

##  Metro Traticic Datalanc:

Metro Traffic Data Inc.
310 N. Irwin Street - Suite 20
Hanford, CA 93230
800-975-6938 Phone/Fax
www.metrotrafficdata.com

Prepared For:
Central Coast Transportation Consulting 895 Napa Avenue, Suite A-6 Morro Bay, CA 93442
LOCATION $\quad$ SR 46 @ Airport Road

COUNTY $\qquad$ $\longrightarrow$

COLLECTION DATE $\qquad$

LATITUDE $\qquad$
LONGITUDE $\qquad$ $-120.643296^{\circ}$

WEATHER $\qquad$

|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time (Saturday) | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks |
| 11:00 AM - 11:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 1 | 81 | 196 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 348 | 12 | 17 |
| 11:15 AM - 11:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 73 | 6 | 58 | 176 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 407 | 8 | 10 |
| 11:30 AM - 11:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 70 | 181 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 350 | 4 | 11 |
| 11:45 AM - 12:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 73 | 177 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 338 | 10 | 24 |
| 12:00 PM - 12:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 73 | 3 | 72 | 196 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 323 | 7 | 21 |
| 12:15 PM - 12:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 66 | 199 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 319 | 7 | 18 |
| 12:30 PM - 12:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 1 | 82 | 186 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 331 | 11 | 14 |
| 12:45 PM - 1:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 72 | 4 | 67 | 190 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 292 | 6 | 19 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 508 | 15 | 569 | 1501 | 0 | 161 | 0 | 2708 | 65 | 134 |


|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time (Sunday) | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks |
| 4:00 PM - 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 67 | 6 | 27 | 365 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 217 | 3 | 10 |
| 4:15 PM - 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 85 | 7 | 31 | 395 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 265 | 3 | 16 |
| 4:30 PM - 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 59 | 9 | 30 | 385 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 190 | 1 | 14 |
| 4:45 PM - 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 80 | 10 | 30 | 450 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 218 | 1 | 11 |
| 5:00 PM - 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 44 | 4 | 20 | 269 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 174 | 0 | 10 |
| 5:15 PM - 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 81 | 0 | 32 | 332 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 231 | 0 | 7 |
| 5:30 PM - 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 75 | 8 | 29 | 344 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 186 | 5 | 16 |
| 5:45 PM - 6:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 86 | 9 | 24 | 369 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 181 | 1 | 11 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 577 | 53 | 223 | 2909 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 1662 | 14 | 95 |


|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PEAK HOUR | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks | Left | Thru | Right | Trucks |
| 11:00 AM - 12:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 229 | 7 | 282 | 730 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 1443 | 34 | 62 |
| 4:00 PM - 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 291 | 32 | 118 | 1595 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 890 | 8 | 51 |



## Agenda Item 1

Exhibit D

## INTERSECTION TURNING MOVEMENT COUNTS



| U-TURNS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NB | SB | EB | WB | TTL |
| $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |  |


| 5:30 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5:45 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 6:00 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 6:15 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 6:30 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 6:45 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 59 | 14 | 119 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 6 | 318 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 84 | 19 | 98 | 2 | 1 | 166 | 15 | 391 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 99 | 22 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 162 | 7 | 394 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 85 | 32 | 112 | 1 | 0 | 164 | 11 | 410 |
| 8:00 AM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 50 | 49 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 11 | 368 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 47 | 26 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 121 | 7 | 320 |
| 8:30 AM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 33 | 19 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 10 | 266 |
| 8:45 AM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 45 | 20 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 146 | 8 | 328 |
| 9:00 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 9:15 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 9:30 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 9:45 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 10:00 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 10:15 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| VOLUMES | 3 | 1 | 3 | 40 | 0 | 502 | 201 | 875 | 3 | 1 | 1,091 | 75 | 2,795 |
| APPROACH \% | 43\% | 14\% | 43\% | 7\% | 0\% | 93\% | 19\% | 81\% | 0\% | 0\% | 93\% | 6\% |  |
| APP/DEPART | 7 | / | 277 | 542 | 1 | 4 | 1,079 | 1 | 918 | 1,167 | 1 | 1,596 | 0 |
| BEGIN PEAK HR |  | 7:15 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VOLUMES | 1 | 0 | 2 | 19 | 0 | 318 | 122 | 432 | 3 | 1 | 621 | 44 | 1,563 |
| APPROACH \% | 33\% | 0\% | 67\% | 6\% | 0\% | 94\% | 22\% | 78\% | 1\% | 0\% | 93\% | 7\% |  |
| PEAK HR FACTOR |  | 0.375 |  |  | 0.810 |  |  | 0.810 |  |  | 0.915 |  | 0.953 |
| APP/DEPART | 3 | I | 166 | 337 | 1 | 4 | 557 | / | 453 | 666 | / | 940 | 0 |


| $X$ | $X$ | $x$ |  | $X$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |




| PEDESTRIAN + BIKE CROSSINGS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N SIDE | S SIDE | E SIDE | W SIDE | TOTAL |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N SIDE | S SIDE | E SIDE | W SIDE | TOTAL |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| BICYCLE CROSSINGS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NS | SS | ES | WS | TOTAL |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Agenda Item 1

Exhibit D

## INTERSECTION TURNING MOVEMENT COUNTS

| PASO ROBLES | PROJECT \#: | 1701 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| JARDINE | LOCATION \#: | 1 |
| SR 46 | CONTROL: | TWSC |




| U-TURNS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NB | SB | EB | WB | TTL |
| $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |  |


| 2:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2:45 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 3:00 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 3:15 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 3:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 3:45 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 4:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 36 | 52 | 161 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 6 | 410 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 46 | 55 | 176 | 1 | 0 | 137 | 10 | 429 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 43 | 44 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 8 | 410 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 32 | 43 | 190 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 3 | 431 |
| 5:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 50 | 68 | 165 | 0 | 2 | 142 | 2 | 448 |
| 5:15 PM | 2 | 0 |  | 5 | 0 | 26 | 59 | 163 | 0 | 0 | 157 | 6 | 419 |
| 5:30 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 29 | 50 | 169 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 1 | 398 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 29 | 45 | 167 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 5 | 398 |
| 6:00 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 6:15 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 6:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 6:45 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 7:00 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 7:15 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| VOLUMES | 6 | 0 | 2 | 42 | 3 | 291 | 416 | 1,351 | 1 | 2 | 1,188 | 41 | 3,343 |
| APPROACH \% | 75\% | 0\% | 25\% | 13\% | 1\% | 87\% | 24\% | 76\% | 0\% | 0\% | 97\% | 3\% |  |
| APP/DEPART | 8 | 1 | 457 | 336 | 1 | 6 | 1,768 | 1 | 1,395 | 1,231 | I | 1,485 | 0 |
| BEGIN PEAK HR |  | 4:15 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VOLUMES | 2 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 3 | 171 | 210 | 691 | 1 | 2 | 589 | 23 | 1,718 |
| APPROACH \% | 67\% | 0\% | 33\% | 13\% | 2\% | 86\% | 23\% | 77\% | 0\% | 0\% | 96\% | 4\% |  |
| PEAK HR FACTOR |  | 0.375 |  |  | 0.743 |  |  | 0.968 |  |  | 0.942 |  | 0.959 |
| APP/DEPART | 3 | 1 | 233 | 199 | 1 | 6 | 902 | 1 | 717 | 614 | 1 | 762 | 0 |


| $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $x$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |




| PEDESTRIAN + BIKE CROSSINGS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N SIDE | S SIDE | E SIDE | W SIDE | TOTAL |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N SIDE | S SIDE | E SIDE | W SIDE | TOTAL |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| BICYCLE CROSSINGS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NS | SS | ES | WS | TOTAL |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Agenda Item 1

Exhibit D

## INTERSECTION TURNING MOVEMENT COUNTS

| DATE: |
| :---: |
| 10/22/16 |
| SATURDAY |

LOCATION:
JARDINE
PROJECT \#: 1701
SATURDAY
EAST \& WEST:
SR 46

| U-TURNS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NB | SB | $E B$ | WB | TTL |
| $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |  |


|  |  |  |  | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

VOLUMES
APPROACH \%
APP/DEPART VOLUMES APPROACH \% PEAK HR FACTOR APP/DEPART


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $9: 30 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| $9: 45 \mathrm{AM}$ |  |
| $10: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |  |
| $10: 15 \mathrm{AM}$ |  |
| $10: 30 \mathrm{AM}$ |  |
| $10: 45 \mathrm{AM}$ |  |
| $11: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |  |
| $11: 15 \mathrm{AM}$ |  |
| $11: 30 \mathrm{AM}$ |  |
| $11: 45 \mathrm{AM}$ |  |
| $12: 00 \mathrm{PM}$ |  |
| $12: 15 \mathrm{PM}$ |  |
| $12: 30 \mathrm{PM}$ |  |
| $12: 45 \mathrm{PM}$ |  |
| $1: 00 \mathrm{PM}$ |  |
| $1: 15 \mathrm{PM}$ |  |
| $1: 30 \mathrm{PM}$ |  |
| $1: 45 \mathrm{PM}$ |  |
| $2: 00 \mathrm{PM}$ |  |
| $2: 15 \mathrm{PM}$ |  |
| TOTAL |  |


| PEDESTRIAN + BIKE CROSSINGS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N SIDE | S SIDE | E SIDE | W SIDE | TOTAL |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N SIDE | S SIDE | E SIDE | W SIDE | TOTAL |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |


| BICYCLE CROSSINGS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NS | SS | ES | WS | TOTAL |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Appendix B: LOS Calculations Sheets



Destino Paso

| 2: Golden Hill Rd | 46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\dagger$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | - | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Fow (yph) | 178 | 98 | 359 | 36 | 890 | 62 | 295 | 310 | 122 | 122 | 144 |
| V/c Ratio | 0.50 | 0.60 | 0.41 | 0.10 | 0.77 | 0.24 | 0.61 | 0.43 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.40 |
| Control Delay | 41.5 | 20.8 | 3.6 | 35.8 | 26.4 | 3.7 | 40.1 | 29.0 | 43.9 | 38.5 | 7.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 41.5 | 20.8 | 3.6 | 35.8 | 26.4 | 3.7 | 40.1 | 29.0 | 43.9 | 38.5 | 7.5 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 42 | 170 | 0 | 8 | 193 | 0 | 70 | 66 | 29 | 55 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (t) | 79 | 221 | 32 | 23 | 245 | 26 | 119 | 106 | 59 | 107 | 25 |
| Intemal Link Dist (ti) |  | 3280 |  |  | 2376 |  |  | 566 |  | 648 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (t) | 550 |  | 490 | 460 |  | 390 | 160 |  | 130 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 354 | 2173 | 1199 | 531 | 2330 | 1213 | 487 | 2064 | 265 | 986 | 898 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced V/c Ratio | 0.50 | 0.37 | 0.30 | 0.07 | 0.38 | 0.13 | 0.61 | 0.15 | 0.46 | 0.12 | 0.16 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | \％ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％${ }^{1 / 4}$ | ¢ $\uparrow$ | $\stackrel{7}{ }$ | \％ | 个个 | $\stackrel{7}{7}$ | \％${ }^{1 / 1}$ | 个t |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ | 7 |
| Traffic Volume（ver／h） | 144 | 646 | 291 | 29 | 721 | 131 | 239 | 220 | 31 | 99 | 99 | 117 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 144 | 646 | 291 | 29 | 721 | 131 | 239 | 220 | 31 | 99 | 99 | 117 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | O | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 99 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 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 |
| Adj Sat How，vel／hln | 1863 | 1610 | 1863 | 1863 | 1610 | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 |
| Adj Fow Rate，veh／h | 178 | 798 | 359 | 36 | 890 | 162 | 295 | 272 | 38 | 122 | 122 | 144 |
| Adj No．of Lanes | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | － | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 |
| Percent Heay Veh，\％ | ， | 18 | 2 | 2 | 18 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，verhh | 266 | 1096 | 562 | 52 | 1167 | 599 | 394 | 731 | 10 | 198 | 331 | 276 |
| Arive On Green | 0.08 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.07 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.11 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.06 | 0.18 | 0.18 |
| Sat How，veh／h | 3442 | 3059 | 1570 | 3442 | 3059 | 1571 | 3442 | 3119 | 431 | 3442 | 1863 | 1557 |
| Grp Volume（v），velh | 178 | 798 | 359 | 36 | 890 | 162 | 295 | 153 | 157 | 122 | 122 | 144 |
| Gp Sat Fows（s），veh／V／lin | 1721 | 1530 | 1570 | 1721 | 1530 | 1571 | 1721 | 1770 | 1780 | 1721 | 1863 | 1557 |
| Q Serve（a＿s），$s$ | 3.6 | 16.4 | 8.3 | 0.7 | 18.3 | 5.1 | 6.0 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 2.5 | 4.2 | 6.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear（q＿c），s | 3.6 | 16.4 | 8.3 | 0.7 | 18.3 | 5.1 | 6.0 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 2.5 | 4.2 | 6.1 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.24 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），ver／h | 266 | 1096 | 562 | 252 | 1167 | 599 | 394 | 415 | 41 | 198 | 331 | 276 |
| V／CRatio（ $($ ） | 0.67 | 0.73 | 0.64 | 0.14 | 0.76 | 0.27 | 0.75 | 0.37 | 0.38 | 0.62 | 0.37 | 0.52 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 381 | 2329 | 1195 | 572 | 2498 | 1283 | 524 | 1127 | 1133 | 286 | 1057 | 88 |
| 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 Fiter（1） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），slveh | 32.4 | 20.1 | 7.1 | 31.4 | 19.5 | 15.4 | 31.0 | 23.2 | 23.2 | 33.3 | 26.2 | 26.9 |
| Incr Delay（d2），slveh | 2.9 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 4.1 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 3.1 | 0.7 | 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\％），vehlın | 1.8 | 7.0 | 4.7 | 0.3 | 7.8 | 2.3 | 3.1 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 2.2 | 2.7 |
| LnGrp Delay（d），sveh | 35.3 | 21.1 | 8.3 | 31.6 | 20.5 | 15.6 | 35.1 | 23.7 | 23.8 | 36.4 | 26.8 | 28.5 |
| LnGplos | D | c | A | c | c | B | D | c | c | D | c | C |
| Approach vol，ver／h |  | 1335 |  |  | 1088 |  |  | 605 |  |  | 388 |  |
| Approach Delay，slveh |  | 19.5 |  |  | 20.2 |  |  | 29.3 |  |  | 30.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | c |  |  | c |  |  | c |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ）， s | 8.2 | 20.9 | 11.3 | 31.9 | 12.3 | 16.8 | 9.6 | 33.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $Y+R \mathrm{R}$ ），$s$ | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 | ＊ 6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 6.0 | 46.0 | 12.0 | ＊55 | 11.0 | 41.0 | 8.0 | 59.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（a c $\mathrm{c}+1)^{\text {a }}$ ， s | 4.5 | 7.4 | 27 | 18.4 | 8.0 | 8.1 | 5.6 | 20.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 3.0 | 4.1 | 7.0 | 0.3 | 3.0 | 0.1 | 7.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 CrI Delay |  |  | 22.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




|  | $\stackrel{ }{ }$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Fow (Vph) | 152 | 832 | 293 | 47 | 828 | 134 | 211 | 244 | 185 | 220 | 241 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.40 | 0.63 | 0.35 | 0.15 | 0.75 | 0.21 | 0.50 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.60 | 0.50 |
| Control Delay | 43.1 | 23.8 | 3.7 | 42.7 | 30.1 | 4.7 | 44.1 | 29.2 | 44.9 | 41.4 | 10.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 43.1 | 23.8 | 3.7 | 42.7 | 30.1 | 4.7 | 44.1 | 29.2 | 44.9 | 41.4 | 10.2 |
| Queue Length 50th (ti) | 40 | 201 | 0 | 12 | 205 | 0 | 55 | 53 | 49 | 110 | 9 |
| Queue Length 95th (t) | 86 | 315 | 51 | 35 | 324 | 38 | 115 | 104 | 104 | 216 | 77 |
| Intermal Link Dist (ft) |  | 3280 |  |  | 2376 |  |  | 566 |  | 648 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (t) | 550 |  | 490 | 460 |  | 390 | 160 |  | 130 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 485 | 2427 | 1281 | 352 | 2308 | 1194 | 445 | 1860 | 404 | 988 | 925 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced V/c Ratio | 0.31 | 0.34 | 0.23 | 0.13 | 0.36 | 0.11 | 0.47 | 0.13 | 0.46 | 0.22 | 0.26 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $y$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | $t$ |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 个 $\uparrow$ | 7 | \% ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | ¢ $\uparrow$ | 7 | \% ${ }^{1}$ | 个t |  | \% ${ }^{1 / 1}$ | $\uparrow$ | 7 |
| Traffic Volume (verVh) | 146 | 799 | 281 | 45 | 795 | 129 | 203 | 184 | 50 | 178 | 211 | 231 |
| Future Volume (vel/h) | 146 | 799 | 281 | 45 | 795 | 129 | 203 | 184 | 50 | 178 | 211 | 231 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| 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 |
| Adj Sat How, velVhlı | 1863 | 1610 | 1863 | 1863 | 1610 | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 |
| Adj Fow Rate, vel/h | 152 | 832 | 293 | 47 | 828 | 134 | 211 | 192 | 52 | 185 | 220 | 241 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heay Veh, \% | 2 | 18 | 2 | 2 | 18 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Cap, ver/h | 242 | 1125 | 57 | 157 | 1135 | 582 | 308 | 634 | 167 | 278 | 411 | 34 |
| Arive On Green | 0.07 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.05 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.09 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.08 | 0.22 | 0.22 |
| Sat Fow, veh/h | 3442 | 3059 | 1570 | 3442 | 3059 | 1571 | 3442 | 2764 | 728 | 3442 | 1863 | 1562 |
| Grp Volume(v), vel/h | 152 | 832 | 293 | 47 | 828 | 134 | 211 | 121 | 123 | 185 | 220 | 241 |
| Grp Sat Fow(s), veh/h/lin | 1721 | 1530 | 1570 | 1721 | 1530 | 1571 | 1721 | 1770 | 1723 | 1721 | 1863 | 1562 |
| QServe(g.s), s | 3.1 | 17.1 | 6.7 | 1.0 | 16.9 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 4.3 | 3.8 | 7.6 | 10.3 |
| Cycle Q Clear(q_c), s | 3.1 | 17.1 | 6.7 | 1.0 | 16.9 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 4.3 | 3.8 | 7.6 | 10.3 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.42 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Gp Cap(c), veh/h | 242 | 1125 | 57 | 157 | 1135 | 582 | 308 | 406 | 395 | 278 | 411 | 344 |
| V/CRatio( ${ }^{\text {( }}$ ) | 0.63 | 0.74 | 0.51 | 0.30 | 0.73 | 0.23 | 0.68 | 0.30 | 0.31 | 0.67 | 0.54 | 0.70 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), verlh | 571 | 2876 | 1476 | 381 | 2707 | 1390 | 523 | 1125 | 1096 | 476 | 1159 | 972 |
| 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 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.0 |
| Uniform Delay ( ${ }^{\text {d }}$, siveh | 32.7 | 19.9 | 7.3 | 33.4 | 19.6 | 15.6 | 31.9 | 23.1 | 23.1 | 32.3 | 24.9 | 26. |
| Incr Delay (d2), siveh | 2.7 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 2.7 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 2.6 |
| 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 Backof( $50 \%$ ), vehlı | 1.6 | 7.3 | 3.7 | 0.5 | 7.3 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 4.0 | 4.7 |
| Lngrp Delay (d), Sveh | 35.4 | 20.8 | 8.0 | 34.4 | 20.5 | 15.8 | 34.6 | 23.5 | 23.6 | 35.0 | 26.0 | 28.6 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | c | A | c | c | B | c | c | c | D | c |  |
| Approach Vol, vel/h |  | 1271 |  |  | 1009 |  |  | 455 |  |  | 646 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 19.6 |  |  | 20.6 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 29.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | c |  |  | c |  |  | c |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | , | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 9.8 | 20.6 | 9.3 | 32.6 | 10.5 | 20.0 | 9.1 | 32.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y$ +RC), s | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 | * 6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 10.0 | 46.0 | 8.0 | *68 | 11.0 | 45.0 | 12.0 | 64.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Cear Time ( $\mathrm{c} \mathrm{c}+11$ ), s | 5.8 | 6.3 | 3.0 | 19.1 | 6.3 | 12.3 | 5.1 | 18.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.2 | 3.6 | 2.5 | 7.2 | 0.3 | 3.6 | 0.2 | 6.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 CrI D Delay |  |  | 23.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Los |  |  | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Destino Paso
4: SR 46 E \& Airport Road
5/17/2016



| Destino Paso <br> 2: Golden Hill Rd | R 46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Existing Saturday MD |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Fow (yph) | 182 | 824 | 150 | 44 | 1367 | 227 | 134 | 248 | 134 | 214 | 298 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.57 | 0.54 | 0.20 | 0.08 | 0.83 | 0.27 | 0.47 | 0.40 | 0.50 | 0.67 | 0.72 |
| Control Delay | 58.0 | 29.3 | 5.2 | 37.6 | 30.5 | 3.3 | 57.2 | 39.8 | 59.1 | 54.7 | 28.6 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 58.0 | 29.3 | 5.2 | 37.6 | 30.5 | 3.3 | 57.2 | 39.8 | 59.1 | 54.7 | 28.6 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 66 | 284 | 0 | 12 | 428 | 1 | 48 | 78 | 48 | 148 | 81 |
| Queue Length 95th (t) | 115 | 374 | 45 | 31 | 600 | 44 | 90 | 124 | 91 | 242 | 190 |
| Intemal Link Dist (ti) |  | 3280 |  |  | 2376 |  |  | 566 |  | 648 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) | 550 |  | 490 | 460 |  | 390 | 160 |  | 130 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 346 | 2174 | 1002 | 576 | 1979 | 958 | 314 | 1459 | 283 | 768 | 743 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | - | - | - | 0 | o | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | o | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | o | - | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | o | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.53 | 0.38 | 0.15 | 0.08 | 0.69 | 0.24 | 0.43 | 0.17 | 0.47 | 0.28 | 0.40 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection Summary

|  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个 $\uparrow$ | 7 | \％ | 个个 | 7 | ＊） | 个t |  | ＊＊ | $\uparrow$ | 7 |
| Trafic Volume（verh ） | 175 | 791 | 144 | 42 | 1312 | 218 | 129 | 199 | 39 | 129 | 205 | 286 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 175 | 791 | 144 | 42 | 1312 | 218 | 129 | 199 | 39 | 129 | 205 | 286 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $Q(Q)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| 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 |
| Adj Sat How，vel／hlin | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 | 1900 | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 |
| Adj How Rate，veh／h | 182 | 824 | 150 | 44 | 1367 | 227 | 134 | 207 | 41 | 134 | 214 | 298 |
| Adj No．of Lanes | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heay Veh，\％ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Cap，verh | 246 | 1028 | 455 | 747 | 1609 | 715 | 195 | 686 | 133 | 194 | 433 | 363 |
| Arive On Green | 0.07 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.22 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.06 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.06 | 0.24 | 0.24 |
| Sat How，veh／h | 3375 | 3471 | 1537 | 3375 | 3471 | 1543 | 3375 | 2893 | 562 | 3375 | 1827 | 1533 |
| Grp Volume（v），ver／h | 182 | 824 | 150 | 4 | 1367 | 227 | 134 | 123 | 125 | 134 | 214 | 298 |
| Grp Sat Fows（s），veh／h／lin | 1688 | 1736 | 1537 | 1688 | 1736 | 1543 | 1688 | 1736 | 1719 | 1688 | 1827 | 1533 |
| QServe（g． s ， s | 5.6 | 23.3 | 6.4 | 1.1 | 37.1 | 9.9 | 4.1 | 6.2 | 6.4 | 4.1 | 10.8 | 19.6 |
| Cycle Q Clear（q． c ）， s | 5.6 | 23.3 | 6.4 | 1.1 | 37.1 | 9.9 | 4.1 | 6.2 | 6.4 | 4.1 | 10.8 | 19.6 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.33 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），vel／h | 246 | 1028 | 455 | 747 | 1609 | 715 | 195 | 412 | 408 | 194 | 433 | 363 |
| V／CRatio（ $\times$ ） | 0.74 | 0.80 | 0.33 | 0.06 | 0.85 | 0.32 | 0.69 | 0.30 | 0.31 | 0.69 | 0.49 | 0.82 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），ver／h | 349 | 2184 | 967 | 747 | 1989 | 884 | 317 | 750 | 743 | 285 | 772 | 648 |
| HCMPlatoon 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 Fiter（1） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），siveh | 48.4 | 34.6 | 18.0 | 32.7 | 25.3 | 18.0 | 49.2 | 33.3 | 33.4 | 49.2 | 35.1 | 38.5 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 5.0 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.3 | 4.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 4.3 | 0.9 | 4.6 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），siveh | 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 BackOf（ $50 \%$ ），vehlın | 2.8 | 11.4 | 3.1 | 0.5 | 18.3 | 4.2 | 2.1 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 2.1 | 5.5 | 8.8 |
| LnGrp Delay（d），siveh | 53.4 | 36.1 | 18.4 | 32.7 | 28.4 | 18.2 | 53.5 | 33.7 | 33.8 | 53.6 | 36.0 | 43.1 |
| LnGplos | D | D | B | c | C | B | D | C | c | D | D | D |
| Approach Vol，ver／h |  | 1156 |  |  | 1638 |  |  | 382 |  |  | 646 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 36.5 |  |  | 27.1 |  |  | 40.7 |  |  | 429 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | c |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ）， s | 10.1 | 29.2 | 29.6 | 37.5 | 10.1 | 29.2 | 11.8 | 55.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $Y+R \mathrm{R}$ ），$s$ | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 | ＊ 6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 9.0 | 46.0 | 5.0 | ＊67 | 10.0 | 45.0 | 11.0 | 61.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（ C c c ＋11）， s | 6.1 | 8.4 | 3.1 | 25.3 | 6.1 | 21.6 | 7.6 | 39.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.1 | 3.8 | 1.5 | 6.2 | 0.1 | 3.6 | 0.2 | 10.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Crrl Delay |  |  | 34.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Los |  |  | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Destino Paso | Existing Saturday MD |
| :--- | ---: |
| 4: SR 46 E \& Airport Road | 6/21/2016 |



Destino Paso
Existing Plus Project AM
1: Airport Road \& Dry Creek Road
5/17/2016

2：Golden Hill Rd \＆SR 46 E

|  | $\stackrel{ }{ }$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\dagger$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Fow（yph） | 178 | 838 | 359 | 37 | 906 | 163 | 295 | 314 | 126 | 122 | 144 |
| v／c Ratio | 0.51 | 0.61 | 0.40 | 0.11 | 0.77 | 0.24 | 0.61 | 0.43 | 0.48 | 0.46 | 0.40 |
| Control Delay | 42.0 | 20.7 | 3.5 | 36.9 | 26.5 | 3.7 | 40.7 | 29.2 | 44.8 | 38.9 | 7.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 42.0 | 20.7 | 3.5 | 36.9 | 26.5 | 3.7 | 40.7 | 29.2 | 44.8 | 38.9 | 7.5 |
| Queue Length 50th（tt） | 43 | 182 | 0 | 8 | 198 | 0 | 71 | 67 | 30 | 56 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th（t） | 80 | 231 | 31 | 23 | 250 | 26 | 120 | 108 | 61 | 107 | 25 |
| Intemal Link Dist（ti） |  | 3280 |  |  | 2376 |  |  | 566 |  | 648 |  |
| Turn Bay Length（t） | 550 |  | 490 | 460 |  | 390 | 160 |  | 130 |  |  |
| Base Capacity（vph） | 351 | 2155 | 1192 | 527 | 2312 | 1205 | 484 | 2044 | 263 | 978 | 893 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | о | o | 0 | o |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | － | 0 | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v／c Ratio | 0.51 | 0.39 | 0.30 | 0.07 | 0.39 | 0.14 | 0.61 | 0.15 | 0.48 | 0.12 | 0.16 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 7 |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  | ＊ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Contigurations | ${ }^{4 *}$ | 个4 | 7 | \％${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 个 $\uparrow$ | $\overline{7}$ | \％${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 个 ${ }_{\text {d }}$ |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume（vel／h） | 144 | 679 | 291 | 30 | 734 | 132 | 239 | 220 | 34 | 102 | 99 | 117 |
| Future Volume（vel／h） | 144 | 679 | 291 | 30 | 734 | 132 | 239 | 220 | 34 | 102 | 99 | 117 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 99 | ． 00 |  | 99 | 00 |  | 99 | 00 |  | 8 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Adj Sat Fow，vehlVlı | 1863 | 1610 | 1863 | 1863 | 1610 | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 186 | 1863 | 1863 |
| Adj Fow Rate，velVh | 178 | 838 | 359 | 37 | 906 | 163 | 295 | 272 | 42 | 126 | 122 | 144 |
| Adj No．of Lanes | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 |
| Percent Heany Veh，\％ | 2 | 18 | 2 | 2 | 18 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，ver／h | 265 | 1128 | 579 | 228 | 1178 | 605 | 392 | 720 | 110 | 202 | 334 | 279 |
| Arive On Green | 0.08 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.07 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.11 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.06 | 0.18 | 0.18 |
| Sat How，verl／ | 3442 | 3059 | 1570 | 3442 | 3059 | 1571 | 3442 | 3074 | 469 | 3442 | 1863 | 1557 |
| Gpp Volume（v），vel／h | 178 | 838 | 359 | 37 | 906 | 163 | 295 | 155 | 159 | 126 | 122 | 144 |
|  | 1721 | 1530 | 1570 | 1721 | 1530 | 1571 | 1721 | 1770 | 1773 | 172 | 1863 | 1557 |
| QServe（g．s），s | 3.7 | 17.5 | 8.3 | 0.7 | 19.0 | 5.2 | 6.1 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 2.6 | 4.2 | 6.1 |
| Oycle Q Clear（q＿c），s | 3.7 | 17.5 | 8.3 | 0.7 | 19.0 | 5.2 | 6.1 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 2.6 | 4.2 | 6.1 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.26 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Gpp Cap（c），veh／h | 265 | 1128 | 579 | 228 | 1178 | 605 | 392 | 415 | 415 | 202 | 334 | 279 |
| V／CRatio（ $($ ） | 0.67 | 0.74 | 0.62 | 0.16 | 0.77 | 0.27 | 0.75 | 0.37 | 0.38 | 0.62 | 0.37 | 0.52 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 375 | 2289 | 1175 | 562 | 2456 | 1261 | 515 | 1108 | 1110 | 281 | 1039 | 868 |
| 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 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），siveh | 33.0 | 20.2 | 6.9 | 32.4 | 19.7 | 15.5 | 31.6 | 23.6 | 23.7 | 33.8 | 26.5 | 27.3 |
| Incr Delay（d2），slveh | 2.9 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 4.4 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 3.1 | 0.7 | 1.5 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），Siveh | 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 Backof（ $50 \%$ ），vehlı | 1.9 | 7.5 | 4.7 | 0.4 | 8.1 | 2.3 | 3.1 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 1.3 | 2.2 | 2.8 |
| Lngrp Delay（d），Sveh | 36.0 | 21.2 | 8.0 | 32.7 | 20.8 | 15.7 | 36.0 | 24.2 | 24.2 | 36.9 | 27.2 | 28.8 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | c | A | c | c | B | D | c | c | D | c | C |
| Approach Vol，vel／h |  | 1375 |  |  | 1106 |  |  | 609 |  |  | 392 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 19.6 |  |  | 20.5 |  |  | 29.9 |  |  | 30.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | c |  |  | c |  |  | c |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋RC），$s$ | 8.3 | 21.2 | 10.9 | 33.1 | 12.4 | 17.2 | 9.7 | 34.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{RC}$ ）， s | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 | ＊6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Seting（Gmax），s | 6.0 | 46.0 | 12.0 | ＊55 | 11.0 | 41.0 | 8.0 | 59.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（ $\mathrm{c}_{\text {c } \mathrm{c}+11) \text { ，} \mathrm{s}}$ | 4.6 | 7.5 | 2.7 | 19.5 | 8.1 | 8.1 | 5.7 | 21.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 7.4 | 0.3 | 3.0 | 0.1 | 7.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Crr Delay |  |  | 23.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM2010 LOS |  |  | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Destino Paso



|  | \% |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | ¢ $\uparrow$ | $\stackrel{7}{7}$ | \% ${ }^{1 / 1}$ | 个 $\uparrow$ | 7 | \% ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | \% ${ }^{1 / 4}$ | $\uparrow$ | 7 |
| Traffic Volume (vel/h) | 146 | 825 | 281 | 49 | 830 | 133 | 203 | 184 | 53 | 181 | 211 | 231 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 146 | 825 | 281 | 49 | 830 | 133 | 203 | 184 | 53 | 181 | 211 | 231 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | . 99 |
| 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 |
| Adj Sat How, vel/hln | 1863 | 1610 | 1863 | 1863 | 1610 | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 |
| Adj Fow Rate, veh/h | 152 | 859 | 293 | 51 | 865 | 139 | 211 | 192 | 55 | 189 | 220 | 241 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heay Veh, \% | 2 | 18 | 2 | 2 | 18 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veV/h | 240 | 1141 | 586 | 168 | 1160 | 595 | 306 | 621 | 173 | 280 | 410 | 4 |
| Arive On Green | 0.07 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.05 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.09 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.08 | 0.22 | 0.22 |
| Sat How, veh/h | 3442 | 3059 | 1571 | 3442 | 3059 | 1571 | 3442 | 2727 | 759 | 3442 | 1863 | 1562 |
| Grp Volume(v) veh/h | 152 | 859 | 293 | 51 | 865 | 139 | 211 | 123 | 124 | 189 | 220 | 241 |
| Gpp Sat How(s), veh/h/lin | 1721 | 1530 | 1571 | 1721 | 1530 | 1571 | 1721 | 1770 | 1717 | 1721 | 1863 | 1562 |
| Q Serve(a_s), $s$ | 3.2 | 18.2 | 6.9 | 1.1 | 18.2 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 7.8 | 10.6 |
| Cycle Q Clear(q_c), s | 3.2 | 18.2 | 6.9 | 1.1 | 18.2 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 7.8 | 10. |
| Prop in Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 100 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.44 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 240 | 1141 | 586 | 168 | 1160 | 595 | 306 | 403 | 391 | 280 | 410 | 344 |
| V/CRatio( $($ ) | 0.63 | 0.75 | 0.50 | 0.30 | 0.75 | 0.23 | 0.69 | 0.30 | 0.32 | 0.67 | 0.54 | 0.70 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), verh | 556 | 2798 | 1437 | 370 | 2634 | 1352 | 509 | 1095 | 1062 | 463 | 1128 | 945 |
| 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 Fiter(1) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), siveh | 33.7 | 20.3 | 7.4 | 34.1 | 20.0 | 15.7 | 32.9 | 23.8 | 23.9 | 33.2 | 25.6 | 26.7 |
| Incr Delay (d2), slveh | 2.8 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 2.8 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 2.8 | 1.1 | 2.6 |
| 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 Backof( $50 \%$ ), vehlı | 1.6 | 7.8 | 3.8 | 0.5 | 7.8 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 4.1 | 4.8 |
| LnGrp Delay (d), siveh | 36.4 | 21.4 | 8.1 | 35.1 | 21.0 | 15.9 | 35.7 | 24.2 | 24.4 | 36.0 | 26.7 | 29.3 |
| LnGplos | D | c | A | D | c | B | D | c | c | D | c | C |
| Approach Vol, verlh |  | 1304 |  |  | 1055 |  |  | 458 |  |  | 650 |  |
| Approach Delay, Slveh |  | 20.1 |  |  | 21.0 |  |  | 29.5 |  |  | 30.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | c |  |  | c |  |  | c |  |  | c |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+R \mathrm{R}$ ), s | 10.0 | 20.9 | 9.6 | 33.7 | 10.6 | 20.4 | 9.2 | 34.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{R}$ ), $s$ | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 | *6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 10.0 | 46.0 | 8.0 | *68 | 11.0 | 45.0 | 12.0 | 64.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Cear Time ( C c c +11), s | 6.0 | 6.5 | 3.1 | 20.2 | 6.4 | 12.6 | 5.2 | 20.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.2 | 3.6 | 2.5 | 7.5 | 0.3 | 3.6 | 0.2 | 6.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Crr D Delay |  |  | 23.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Destino Paso <br> 2：Golden Hill Rd | R 46 |  |  |  |  |  | Existing＋Project Saturday MD |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |  |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Group Fow（vph） | 182 | 867 | 150 | 47 | 1400 | 230 | 134 | 252 | 139 | 214 | 298 |  |
| v／c Ratio | 0.58 | 0.55 | 0.20 | 0.08 | 0.83 | 0.27 | 0.48 | 0.41 | 0.53 | 0.68 | 0.73 |  |
| Control Delay | 59.4 | 29.2 | 5.0 | 38.8 | 30.4 | 3.5 | 58.4 | 40.5 | 60.6 | 56.2 | 29.5 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 59.4 | 29.2 | 5.0 | 38.8 | 30.4 | 3.5 | 58.4 | 40.5 | 60.6 | 56.2 | 29.5 |  |
| Queue Length 50th（t） | 69 | 313 | － | 13 | 446 | 3 | 50 | 83 | 53 | 156 | 87 |  |
| Queue Length 95th（t） | 116 | 391 | 45 | 34 | 624 | 47 | 90 | 125 | 94 | 242 | 191 |  |
| Intemal Link Dist（ti） |  | 3280 |  |  | 2376 |  |  | 566 |  | 648 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length（t） | 550 |  | 490 | 460 |  | 390 | 160 |  | 130 |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity（vph） | 337 | 2116 | 979 | 564 | 1926 | 937 | 306 | 1419 | 275 | 748 | 727 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | o | 0 | o | 0 | o | o |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | － | 0 | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | － | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | o | － | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | － | － | 0 | o |  |
| Reduced v／c Ratio | 0.54 | 0.41 | 0.15 | 0.08 | 0.73 | 0.25 | 0.44 | 0.18 | 0.51 | 0.29 | 0.41 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  | 7 | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7 \%}$ | 个4 | 7 | ＊＊ | 个 $\uparrow$ | F | \％${ }^{1 / 1}$ | 㻢 |  | \％${ }^{1 / 1}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume（vel／h） | 175 | 832 | 144 | 45 | 1344 | 221 | 129 | 199 | 43 | 133 | 205 | 286 |
| Future Volume（vel／h） | 175 | 832 | 144 | 45 | 1344 | 221 | 129 | 199 | 43 | 133 | 205 | 286 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 99 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0．99 |
| 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 |
| Adj Sat How，veh／hlin | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 | 1900 | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 |
| Adj Fow Rate，vel／h | 182 | 867 | 150 | 47 | 1400 | 230 | 134 | 207 | 45 | 139 | 214 | 298 |
| Adj No．of Lanes | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | ． 96 |
| Percent Heay Veh，\％ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Cap，veth | 244 | 1073 | 475 | 722 | 1628 | 724 | 194 | 667 | 142 | 198 | 431 | 62 |
| Arive On Green | 0.07 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.21 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.06 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.06 | 0.24 | 0.24 |
| Sat How，vel／h | 3375 | 3471 | 1538 | 3375 | 3471 | 1543 | 3375 | 2842 | 605 | 3375 | 1827 | 1533 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 182 | 867 | 150 | 47 | 1400 | 230 | 134 | 125 | 127 | 139 | 214 | 298 |
|  | 1688 | 1736 | 1538 | 1688 | 1736 | 1543 | 1688 | 1736 | 1711 | 1688 | 1827 | 1533 |
| Q Serve（d．s），s | 5.8 | 25.1 | 6.4 | 1.2 | 39.1 | 10.1 | 4.2 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 4.4 | 110 | 20.1 |
| Oycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 5.8 | 25.1 | 6.4 | 1.2 | 39.1 | 10.1 | 4.2 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 4.4 | 11.0 | 20.1 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.35 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Gpp Cap（c），veh／h | 244 | 1073 | 475 | 722 | 1628 | 724 | 194 | 407 | 402 | 198 | 431 | 362 |
| V／CRatio（ $($ ） | 0.75 | 0.81 | 0.32 | 0.07 | 0.86 | 0.32 | 0.69 | 0.31 | 0.32 | 0.70 | 0.50 | 0.82 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 341 | 2134 | 946 | 722 | 1943 | 864 | 310 | 733 | 722 | 279 | 754 | 633 |
| 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 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| UniformDelay（d），siveh | 49.6 | 34.7 | 17.7 | 34.1 | 25.7 | 18.1 | 50.4 | 34.4 | 34.5 | 50.3 | 36.0 | 39.5 |
| Incr Delay（d2），slveh | 5.5 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.3 | 4.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 4.5 | 0.9 | 4.7 |
| 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 Backof（ $50 \%$ ），vehlı | 2.9 | 12.3 | 2.8 | 0.6 | 19.5 | 4.3 | 2.1 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 2.2 | 5.7 | 8.9 |
| Lngrp Delay（d），Sveh | 55.1 | 36.2 | 18.1 | 34.2 | 29.3 | 18.3 | 54.8 | 34.8 | 34.9 | 54.8 | 36.9 | 44.2 |
| LnGrp Los | E | D | B | c | c | B | D | c | c | D | D | D |
| Approach Vol，verlh |  | 1199 |  |  | 167 |  |  | 386 |  |  | 651 |  |
| Approach Delay，slveh |  | 36.8 |  |  | 28.0 |  |  | 41.8 |  |  | 44.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | c |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋RC），$s$ | 10.4 | 29.6 | 29.3 | 39.7 | 10.3 | 29.7 | 11.9 | 57.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{RC}$ ）， s | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 | ＊ 6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 9.0 | 46.0 | 5.0 | ＊67 | 10.0 | 45.0 | 11.0 | 61.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6.4 | 8.7 | 3.2 | 27.1 | 6.2 | 22.1 | 7.8 | 41.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（ p c） c ， s | 0.1 | 3.9 | 1.4 | 6.6 | 0.1 | 3.6 | 0.2 | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Crr Delay |  |  | 34.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010LOS |  |  | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Destino Paso
Existing+Project Saturday MD
4: SR 46 E \& Airport Road
6/21/2016


| Destino Paso <br> 2: Golden Hill Rd | R 46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Near Term AM 11/08/2016 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ | \% | $\dagger$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Fow (yph) | 268 | 880 | 448 | 67 | 938 | 228 | 342 | 428 | 152 | 162 | 177 |
| V/c Ratio | 0.67 | 0.69 | 0.49 | 0.18 | 0.78 | 0.31 | 0.65 | 0.55 | 0.59 | 0.60 | 0.46 |
| Control Delay | 50.2 | 27.3 | 3.9 | 42.5 | 31.8 | 4.3 | 44.0 | 33.0 | 53.5 | 47.8 | 8.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 50.2 | 27.3 | 3.9 | 42.5 | 31.8 | 4.3 | 44.0 | 33.0 | 53.5 | 47.8 | 8.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 80 | 246 | 0 | 18 | 252 | 0 | 100 | 113 | 46 | 92 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (t) | 118 | 265 | 32 | 41 | 325 | 33 | 136 | 140 | 75 | 144 | 32 |
| Intemal Link Dist (ti) |  | 3280 |  |  | 2376 |  |  | 566 |  | 648 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (t) | 550 |  | 490 | 460 |  | 390 | 160 |  | 130 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 407 | 1480 | 978 | 371 | 1220 | 753 | 666 | 1758 | 259 | 723 | 718 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | o | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.66 | 0.59 | 0.46 | 0.18 | 0.77 | 0.30 | 0.51 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 0.22 | 0.25 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 7 |  | 7 | $\downarrow$ |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | BT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Contigurations | 9 | 个 $\uparrow$ | ${ }^{7}$ | \％${ }^{4}$ | ヶ个 | 7 | ${ }^{*}$ | 个家 |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ | 7 |
| Traffic Volume（ver／h） | 217 | 713 | 363 | 54 | 760 | 185 | 277 | 296 | 51 | 123 | 131 | 143 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 217 | 713 | 363 | 54 | 760 | 185 | 277 | 296 | 51 | 123 | 131 | 143 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 0 |  | 99 | 00 |  | 99 | 00 |  | 99 | 1.00 |  | 88 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0 | 1.0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Adj Sat Fow，vel／h／ln | 1863 | 1610 | 1863 | 1863 | 1610 | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 186 | 1863 | 1863 |
| Adj How Rate，veh／h | 268 | 880 | 448 | 67 | 938 | 228 | 342 | 365 | 63 | 152 | 162 | 77 |
| Adj No．of Lanes | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 |
| Percent Heary Veh，\％ | 2 | 18 | 2 | 2 | 18 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，velh | 351 | 1116 | 573 | 266 | 1113 | 571 | 442 | 770 | 132 | 226 | 358 | 300 |
| Arive On Green | 0.10 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.08 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.13 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.07 | 0.19 | 0.19 |
| Sat How，veh／h | 3442 | 3059 | 1570 | 3442 | 3059 | 1570 | 3442 | 3018 | 516 | 3442 | 1863 | 1559 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 268 | 880 | 448 | 67 | 938 | 228 | 342 | 213 | 215 | 15 | 162 | 17 |
| Gp Sat Fows（s），veh／V／lin | 1721 | 1530 | 1570 | 1721 | 1530 | 1570 | 1721 | 1770 | 1764 | 1721 | 1863 | 1559 |
| QServe（g s ）， s | 6.4 | 21.6 | 13.1 | 1.5 | 23.7 | 9.1 | 8.1 | 8.6 | 8.7 | 3.6 | 6.5 | 8.7 |
| Cycle Q clear（ g c），s | 4 | 21.6 | 13.1 | 1.5 | 23.7 | 9.1 | 8.1 | 8.6 | 8.7 | 3.6 | 6.5 | 8.7 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.29 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），ver／h | 351 | 1116 | 573 | 266 | 1113 | 571 | 442 | 452 | 450 | 226 | 358 | 300 |
| V／CRatio（ $x$ ） | 0.76 | 0.79 | 0.78 | 0.25 | 0.84 | 0.40 | 0.77 | 0.47 | 0.48 | 0.67 | 0.45 | 0.59 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 449 | 1595 | 819 | 266 | 1341 | 688 | 734 | 985 | 983 | 285 | 794 | 665 |
| 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 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），sveh | 36.9 | 23.9 | 8.9 | 36.6 | 24.6 | 20.0 | 35.6 | 26.6 | 26.7 | 38.5 | 30.2 | 31.1 |
| Incr Delay（d2），S／veh | 5.8 | 1.8 | 3.2 | 0.5 | 4.3 | 0.5 | 2.9 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 4.3 | 0.9 | 1.9 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），siveh | 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\％），vehlın | 3.3 | 9.3 | 7.1 | 0.8 | 10.7 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 1.9 | 3.4 | 3.9 |
| Lngrp Delay（d），sveh | 42.7 | 25.7 | 12.1 | 37.1 | 28.9 | 20.4 | 38.5 | 27.4 | 27.5 | 42.8 | 31.0 | 329 |
| LnGp LOS | D | c | B | D | C | c | D | c | c | D | c | C |
| Approach Vol，vel／h |  | 1596 |  |  | 1233 |  |  | 70 |  |  | 491 |  |
| Approach Delay，slveh |  | 24.7 |  |  | 27.8 |  |  | 32.3 |  |  | 35.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | c |  |  | c |  |  | c |  |  | D |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ）， s | 9.5 | 25.5 | 12.5 | 36.8 | 14.9 | 20.2 | 12.6 | 36.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $Y+$ RC），$s$ | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 | ＊ 6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 7.0 | 47.0 | 4.0 | ＊44 | 18.0 | 36.0 | 11.0 | 37.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（a c $\mathrm{c}+1)^{\text {a }}$ ， s | 5.6 | 10.7 | 3.5 | 23.6 | 10.1 | 10.7 | 8.4 | 25.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.1 | 4.2 | 0.3 | 7.1 | 0.7 | 4.0 | 0.2 | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Crr D Delay |  |  | 28.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Los |  |  | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Destino Paso | Near Term AM |
| :--- | ---: |
| 4: SR 46 E \& Airport Road | $11 / 08 / 2016$ |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, S/veh 3.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, vel/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 122 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 146 | 25 | 4 | 240 | 0 |
| Future Vol, vel/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 122 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 146 | 25 | 4 | 240 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 25 | - | - | 25 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | o |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Mmithow | o | 0 | 1 | 154 | - | 8 | 0 | 185 | 32 | 5 | 304 |  |


| Major/Minor | Mnor2 |  | Minor1 |  |  |  |  |  | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicing Aow All | 503 | 499 | 304 |  | 500 | 499 | 185 |  | 304 | 0 | o | 185 | 0 | o |
| Stage 1 | 314 | 314 | - |  | 185 | 185 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 189 | 185 | - |  | 315 | 314 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Howy | 7.15 | 6.55 | 6.25 |  | 7.15 | 6.55 | 6.25 |  | 4.15 | - | - | 4.15 | - |  |
| Citical Howy Stg 1 | 6.15 | 5.55 | - |  | 6.15 | 5.55 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Citical Howy Stg 2 | 6.15 | 5.55 | - |  | 6.15 | 5.55 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Follow-up Havy | 3.545 | 4.045 | 3.345 |  | 3.545 | 4.045 | 3.345 |  | 2.245 | - | - | 2.245 | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Manewer | 474 | 469 | 729 |  | 476 | 469 | 850 |  | 1240 | - | - | 1372 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 690 | 651 | - |  | 810 | 741 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 806 | 741 | - |  | 690 | 651 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Manewer | 468 | 467 | 729 |  | 474 | 467 | 850 |  | 1240 | - | - | 1372 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Manewner | 468 | 467 | - |  | 474 | 467 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 690 | 648 | - |  | 810 | 741 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 799 | 741 | - |  | 686 | 648 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9.9 |  |  |  | 16.1 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |
| HCMLOS | A |  |  |  | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Mzior M Mmt | NBL | NBT | NBR | EBLEIV | WBLn1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (velVh) | 1240 | - | - | 729 | 484 | 1372 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCMLane V/C Ratio | - | - | - | 0.002 | 0.335 | 0.004 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | o | - | - | 9.9 | 16.1 | 7.6 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCMLane LOS | A | - | - | A | c | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%/ile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Destino Paso <br> 2: Golden Hill Rd | R 46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Near Term PM 11/08/2016 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |  |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Group Fow (vph) | 199 | 918 | 365 | 76 | 921 | 173 | 265 | 318 | 252 | 309 | 323 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.58 | 0.75 | 0.44 | 0.27 | 0.83 | 0.26 | 0.60 | 0.37 | 0.63 | 0.72 | 0.61 |  |
| Control Delay | 55.3 | 33.1 | 4.2 | 52.9 | 39.0 | 5.0 | 51.4 | 30.4 | 54.3 | 47.9 | 17.2 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 55.3 | 33.1 | 4.2 | 52.9 | 39.0 | 5.0 | 51.4 | 30.4 | 54.3 | 47.9 | 17.2 |  |
| Queue Length 50th (t) | 69 | 306 | - | 24 | 294 | o | 91 | 87 | 87 | 201 | 58 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (t) | 121 | 404 | 59 | 57 | 443 | 48 | 148 | 128 | 146 | 308 | 155 |  |
| Intemal Link Dist (ti) |  | 3280 |  |  | 2376 |  |  | 566 |  | 648 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (t) | 550 |  | 490 | 460 |  | 390 | 160 |  | 130 |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 374 | 1485 | 937 | 286 | 1303 | 757 | 544 | 1567 | 42 | 794 | 788 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | o | o | 0 | 0 | o | - | o |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | $\bigcirc$ | - | 0 | - | - | - |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | о | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ○ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | - |  |
| Reduced V/c Ratio | 0.53 | 0.62 | 0.39 | 0.27 | 0.71 | 0.23 | 0.49 | 0.20 | 0.57 | 0.39 | 0.41 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Destino Paso
4: SR 46 E \& Airport Road
Near Term PM


[^0]

Destino Paso
Near Term Saturday MD

\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum atter two cycles.


| Destino Paso <br> 4: SR 46 E \& Airport Road |  |  |  | Near Term Saturday MD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11/08/2016 |  |  |  |  |

Destino Paso
Near Term Plus Project AM
Destino Paso
1: Airport Road \& Dry Creek Road
11/08/2016


| Destino Paso <br> 2：Golden Hill Rd | R 46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ter |  | Project AM <br> 11／08／2016 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | $t$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SB | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Fow（yph） | 268 | 21 | 448 | 68 | 954 | 230 | 342 | 432 | 156 | 162 | 17 |
| v／c Ratio | 0.68 | 0.70 | 0.49 | 0.20 | 0.79 | 0.31 | 0.65 | 0.55 | 0.61 | 0.60 | 0.46 |
| Control Delay | 50.6 | 26.8 | 3.8 | 43.9 | 32.0 | 4.2 | 44.3 | 33.1 | 54.5 | 48.1 | 8.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 50.6 | 26.8 | 3.8 | 43.9 | 32.0 | 4.2 | 44.3 | 33.1 | 54.5 | 48.1 | 8.7 |
| Queue Length 50th（ti） | 80 | 258 | 0 | 18 | 258 | － | 100 | 114 | 47 | 92 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th（tt） | 118 | 281 | 32 | 41 | 333 | 33 | 136 | 141 | 77 | 144 | 32 |
| Intemal Link Dist（ti） |  | 8280 |  |  | 2376 |  |  | 566 |  | 648 |  |
| Turn Bay Length（t） | 550 |  | 490 | 460 |  | 390 | 160 |  | 130 |  |  |
| Base Capacity（vph） | 03 | 1490 | 982 | 336 | 1210 | 749 | 660 | 1742 | 257 | 716 | 713 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | － | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | o | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | － |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | － | － | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | － |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v／c Ratio | 0.67 | 0.62 | 0.46 | 0.20 | 0.79 | 0.31 | 0.52 | 0.25 | 0.61 | 0.23 | 0.25 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 7 | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Contigurations | \％${ }^{\text {\％}}$ | 个4 | 7 | \％ | 个 $\uparrow$ | $\overline{7}$ | \％${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 个 ${ }_{\text {a }}$ |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（vel／h） | 217 | 746 | 363 | 55 | 773 | 186 | 27 | 296 | 54 | 126 | 131 | 143 |
| Future Volume（vel／h） | 217 | 746 | 363 | 55 | 773 | 186 | 277 | 296 | 54 | 126 | 131 | 143 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 99 | ． 00 |  | 99 | 00 |  | 99 | 00 |  | 8 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Adj Sat Fow，vehlVlı | 1863 | 1610 | 1863 | 1863 | 1610 | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 186 | 1863 | 1863 |
| Adj Fow Rate，velVh | 268 | 921 | 448 | 68 | 954 | 230 | 342 | 365 | 67 | 156 | 162 | 177 |
| Adj No．of Lanes | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | ， | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 |
| Percent Heary Veh，\％ | 2 | 18 | 2 | 2 | 18 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，ver／h | 350 | 1152 | 591 | 236 | 1122 | 576 | 441 | 61 | 138 | 229 | 60 | 302 |
| Arive On Green | 0.10 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.07 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.13 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.07 | 0.19 | 0.19 |
| Sat How，verl／ | 3442 | 3059 | 1571 | 3442 | 3059 | 1570 | 3442 | 2986 | 543 | 3442 | 1863 | 1559 |
| Gpp Volume（v），vel／h | 268 | 921 | 448 | 68 | 954 | 230 | 342 | 215 | 217 | 156 | 162 | 17 |
|  | 1721 | 1530 | 1571 | 1721 | 1530 | 1570 | 1721 | 1770 | 1759 | 1721 | 1863 | 1559 |
| QServe（g．s），s | 6.5 | 23.0 | 13.0 | 1.6 | 24.6 | 9.3 | 8.2 | 8.8 | 9.0 | 3.8 | 6.6 | 8.9 |
| Oycle Q Clear（q＿c），s | 6.5 | 23.0 | 13.0 | 1.6 | 24.6 | 9.3 | 8.2 | 8.8 | 9.0 | 3.8 | 6.6 | 8.9 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.31 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Gpp Cap（c），veh／h | 350 | 1152 | 591 | 236 | 1122 | 576 | 441 | 451 | 449 | 229 | 360 | 302 |
| V／CRatio（ $($ ） | 0.77 | 0.80 | 0.76 | 0.29 | 0.85 | 0.40 | 0.78 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.68 | 0.45 | 0.59 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），vel／h | 442 | 1571 | 806 | 236 | 1321 | 678 | 723 | 971 | 965 | 281 | 783 | 655 |
| 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 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），siveh | 37.5 | 23.8 | 8.6 | 37.9 | 25.0 | 20.1 | 36.2 | 27.1 | 27.1 | 39.1 | 30.5 | 31.4 |
| Incr Delay（d2），slveh | 6.1 | 2.1 | 2.8 | 0.7 | 4.8 | 0.4 | 3.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 4.9 | 0.9 | 1.8 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），Siveh | 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 BackOf（f（50\％），verlin | 3.4 | 10.1 | 6.9 | 0.8 | 11.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 2.0 | 3.5 | 3.9 |
| Lngrp Delay（d），siveh | 43.6 | 26.0 | 11.4 | 38.6 | 29.8 | 20.6 | 39.1 | 27.8 | 27.9 | 44.0 | 31.4 | 33.2 |
| LnGp LOS | D | C | B | D | c | c | D | c | c | D | c | C |
| Approach Vol，vehlh |  | 1637 |  |  | 1252 |  |  | 77 |  |  | 495 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 24.9 |  |  | 28.5 |  |  | 32.9 |  |  | 36.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | c |  |  | c |  |  | c |  |  | D |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋RC），$s$ | 9.7 | 25.9 | 11.9 | 38.3 | 15.0 | 20.6 | 12.7 | 37.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{RC}$ ）， s | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 | ＊ 6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Seting（Gmax），s | 7.0 | 47.0 | 4.0 | ＊44 | 18.0 | 36.0 | 11.0 | 37.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5.8 | 11.0 | 3.6 | 25.0 | 10.2 | 10.9 | 8.5 | 26.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.1 | 4.2 | 0.3 | 7.2 | 0.7 | 4.0 | 0.2 | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Crr Delay |  |  | 28.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM2010 LOS |  |  | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Destino Paso
Near Term Plus Project AM
4: SR 46 E \& Airport Road
11/08/2016

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, S/veh 3.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR |  | WBL | WBT | WBR |  | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\dagger$ |  |  |  | ¢ |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Vol, velVh | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 123 | 0 | 6 |  | 0 | 148 | 26 | 4 | 242 | 0 |
| Future Vol, vel/h | - | 0 | 1 |  | 123 | o | 6 |  | o | 148 | 26 | 4 | 242 | 0 |
| Confficting Peds, \#fhr | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |  | Stop | Stop | Stop |  | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - |  | None |  | - |  | None |  | - |  | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - | - | 25 | - | - | 25 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | - | - |  | - | 0 | - |  | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - |  | - | 0 | - |  | - | - | - |  | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 79 | 79 | 79 |  | 79 | 79 | 79 |  | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Mmit How | - | - | 1 |  | 156 | - | 8 |  | 0 | 187 | 33 | 5 | 306 | 0 |
| Major/Minor | Mnor2 |  | Mnor1 |  |  |  |  | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Alow All | 507 | 503 | 306 |  | 504 | 503 | 187 |  | 306 | o | o | 187 | 0 | o |
| Stage 1 | 316 | 316 | - |  | 187 | 187 | - |  | - |  | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 191 | 187 | - |  | 317 | 316 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Howy | 7.15 | 6.55 | 6.25 |  | 7.15 | 6.55 | 6.25 |  | 4.15 | - | - | 4.15 | - |  |
| Citical Howy Stg 1 | 6.15 | 5.55 | - |  | 6.15 | 5.55 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Citical Howy Stg 2 | 6.15 | 5.55 | - |  | 6.15 | 5.55 | - |  | - |  | - | - | - |  |
| Follow-up Hawy | 3.545 | 4.045 | 3.345 |  | 3.545 | 4.045 | 3.345 |  | 2245 | - | - | 2.245 | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuner | 471 | 467 | 727 |  | 473 | 467 | 847 |  | 1238 | - | - | 1369 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 689 | 650 | - |  | 808 | 740 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 804 | 740 | - |  | 688 | 650 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Manewer | 465 | 465 | 727 |  | 471 | 465 | 847 |  | 1238 | - | - | 1369 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Manewer | 465 | 465 | - |  | 471 | 465 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 689 | 647 | - |  | 808 | 740 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 797 | 740 | - |  | 684 | 647 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 10 |  |  |  | 16.3 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |
| HCMLOS | B |  |  |  | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mumt | NBL | NBT | NBRE | BLniV | WBLI1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (verVh) | 1238 | - | - | 727 | 481 | 1369 | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - | - | 0.002 | 0.339 | 0.004 | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - | - | 10 | 16.3 | 7.6 | A | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS HCM 95th \%ile Q(veh) | A | - | - | B | c | A | A | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0 | - | - | o | 1.5 | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Queue shomn is maximum after two cycles.




95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, que

Destino Paso
2: Golden Hill Rd \& SR 46 E

|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% ${ }^{1 / 1}$ | 个 $\uparrow$ | 7 | ** | ¢ $\uparrow$ | 7 | \% ${ }^{1 / 1}$ | 个t |  | \% ${ }^{1 / 1}$ | $\uparrow$ | 7 |
| Traffic Volume (vel/h) | 215 | 921 | 223 | 78 | 1433 | 254 | 183 | 242 | 71 | 173 | 258 | 330 |
| Future Volume (vel/h) | 215 | 921 | 223 | 78 | 1433 | 254 | 183 | 242 | 71 | 173 | 258 | 330 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| 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 |
| Adj Sat How, veh/hlin | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 | 1900 | 1827 | 1827 | 1827 |
| Adj Fow Rate, vel/h | 224 | 959 | 232 | 81 | 1493 | 265 | 191 | 252 | 74 | 180 | 269 | 344 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heary Veh, \% | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |
| Cap, verlh | 276 | 1141 | 506 | 649 | 1577 | 701 | 243 | 695 | 199 | 229 | 470 | 395 |
| Arive On Green | 0.08 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.19 | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.07 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.07 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| Sat How, verlh | 3375 | 3471 | 1539 | 3375 | 3471 | 1543 | 3375 | 2656 | 762 | 3375 | 1827 | 1535 |
| Gpp Volume(v), vel/h | 224 | 959 | 232 | 81 | 1493 | 265 | 191 | 163 | 163 | 180 | 269 | 344 |
| Grp Sat Hows (s),veh/h/ln | 1688 | 1736 | 1539 | 1688 | 1736 | 1543 | 1688 | 1736 | 1682 | 1688 | 1827 | 1535 |
| Q Serve(C_s), s | 8.7 | 34.3 | 12.5 | 2.7 | 55.1 | 15.1 | 7.4 | 10.2 | 10.6 | 7.0 | 17.1 | 28.7 |
| Cycle Q Clear (q_c), s | 8.7 | 34.3 | 12.5 | 2.7 | 55.1 | 15.1 | 7.4 | 10.2 | 10.6 | 7.0 | 17.1 | 28. |
| Prop in Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.45 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Gpp Cap(c), veh/h | 276 | 1141 | 506 | 649 | 1577 | 701 | 243 | 454 | 440 | 229 | 470 | 395 |
| V/CRatio( $($ ) | 0.81 | 0.84 | 0.46 | 0.12 | 0.95 | 0.38 | 0.79 | 0.36 | 0.37 | 0.79 | 0.57 | 0.87 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), verlh | 353 | 1791 | 794 | 649 | 1609 | 715 | 328 | 597 | 578 | 252 | 587 | 493 |
| HCMPlatoon 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 Fiter(1) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), slveh | 60.4 | 41.6 | 21.7 | 44.7 | 35.0 | 24.1 | 61.1 | 40.2 | 40.4 | 61.4 | 43.2 | 47.5 |
| Incr Delay (d2), slveh | 10.6 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 12.0 | 0.3 | 8.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 14.0 | 1.1 | 13.1 |
| 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\%), vehlı | 4.5 | 16.7 | 5.8 | 1.2 | 29.0 | 6.5 | 3.8 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 3.7 | 8.8 | 13. |
| Lngrp Delay (d), sveh | 71.0 | 43.8 | 22.3 | 44.8 | 47.0 | 24.4 | 69.7 | 40.7 | 40.9 | 75.3 | 44.3 | 60.7 |
| LnGrp Los | E | D | c | D | D | c | E | D | D | E | D |  |
| Approach Vol, verlh |  | 1415 |  |  | 1839 |  |  | 517 |  |  | 793 |  |
| Approach Delay, slveh |  | 44.6 |  |  | 43.6 |  |  | 51.5 |  |  | 58.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | E |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 13.1 | 39.0 | 31.7 | 50.0 | 13.6 | 38.4 | 14.9 | 66.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{R}$ ), $s$ | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 | * 6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 10.0 | 46.0 | 7.0 | *69 | 13.0 | 43.0 | 14.0 | 62.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time ( C c c +11), s | 9.0 | 12.6 | 4.7 | 36.3 | 9.4 | 30.7 | 10.7 | 57.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.1 | 5.0 | 1.9 | 7.7 | 0.2 | 3.7 | 0.2 | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Cril Delay |  |  | 47.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Los |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Destino Paso
Near Term+Project Saturday MD
4: SR 46 E \& Airport Road
11/08/2016

Destino Paso
Existing+Hotel $1+2$ Saturday MD
4: SR 46 E \& Airport Road
11/10/2016


[^1]Destino Paso
Near Term+ Hotel 1 Saturday MD
4: SR 46 E \& Airport Road

- 1115/2016

$\because$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\$$ : Delay exceeds 300 s $\quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon


Destino Paso
4: SR 46 E \& Airport Road



Destino Paso
Mitigated Existing+Project Saturday MD
3: Union Road \& SR 46 E


| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |  | Mnor1 |  |  | Minor2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Alow All | 1663 | 0 | 0 | 999 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 499 | - | - | 831 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Citical Hohy | 4.2 | - | - | 4.2 | - | - | - | - | 7.2 | - | - | 6.2 |
| Citical Hday Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Citical Hdyy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Follow-up Havy | 2.25 | - | - | 2.25 | - | - | - | - | 3.35 | - | - | 3.35 |
| Pot Cap-1 Manewer | 370 | - | - | 671 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 495 | 0 | 0 | 369 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | o | 0 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Manewer | 370 | - | - | 671 | - | - | - | - | 495 | - | - | 369 |
| Mov Cap-2 Manewer | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, S | 0.1 |  |  | 1.2 |  |  | 17.5 |  |  | 14.8 |  |  |
| HCMLOS |  |  |  |  |  |  | c |  |  | B |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major M Mmt | NBLn1 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBRS | SBLn1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity (vel/h) | 495 | 370 | - | - | 671 | - | - | 369 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.421 | 0.025 | - | - | 0.27 | - | - | 0.003 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 17.5 | 15 | - | - | 12.3 | - | - | 14.8 |
| HCMLane LOS | c | B | - | - | B | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%/ile Q(veh) | 2.1 | 0.1 |  |  | 1.1 |  |  | - |





[^2]

Destino Paso
Existing Jardine
103: Jardine Road - Sat \& SR 46 E - Sat
1 117/2016


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, S/veh 1.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR |  | WBL | WBT | WBR |  | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | 性 |  |  | ${ }_{0}$ | 个 $\uparrow$ | F |  |  | 4 |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, velVh | 122 | 759 | 0 |  | 0 | 929 | 18 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 140 |
| Future Vol, vel/h | 122 | 759 | o |  | 0 | 929 | 18 |  | o | o | o | 14 | o | 140 |
| Confficting Peds, \#\#hr | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | o |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free |  | Free | Free | Free |  | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None |  | - | - | None |  | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | 900 | - | - |  | 680 | - | 680 |  | - | - | - | 300 | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - |  | - | 0 | - |  | - | 2 | - | - | 2 |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - |  | - | o | - |  | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 97 | 97 | 97 |  | 97 | 97 | 97 |  | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Heaw Vehicles, \% | 6 | 6 | 6 |  | 6 | 6 | 6 |  | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| muthow | 126 | 782 | o |  | 0 | 958 | 19 |  | o | o | 0 | 14 | o | 144 |
| Major/Minor | Major1 |  |  |  | Major2 |  |  |  | Minor1 |  |  | Inor2 |  |  |
| Conflicting How All | 958 | o | 0 |  | 782 | 0 | o |  | 1513 | 1992 | 391 | 1601 | 1992 | 479 |
| Stage 1 | - | - |  |  |  | - | - |  | 1034 | 1034 |  | 958 | 958 |  |
| Stage 2 |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  | 479 | 958 | - | 643 | 1034 |  |
| Citical Howy | 4.22 | - | - |  | 4.22 | - | - |  | 7.62 | 6.62 | 7.02 | 7.62 | 6.62 | 7.02 |
| Critical Howy Stg 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.62 | 5.62 |  | 6.62 | 5.62 |  |
| citical Howy Stg 2 | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | 6.62 | 5.62 | - | 6.62 | 5.62 |  |
| Follow-up Havy | 2.26 | - | - |  | 2.26 | - | - |  | 3.56 | 4.06 | 3.36 | 3.56 | 4.06 | 3.36 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneiver | 690 | - | - |  | 806 | - | - |  | 79 | 57 | 597 | 68 | 57 | 522 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | 241 | 299 | - | 269 | 325 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | 526 | 325 | - | 419 | 299 |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Manewer | 690 | - | - |  | 806 | - | - |  | 49 | 47 | 597 | 58 | 47 | 522 |
| Mov Cap-2 Manewer | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | 155 | 153 | - | 182 | 189 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | - | - |  |  | 197 | 244 | - | 220 | 325 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | 381 | 325 | - | 342 | 244 |  |
| Approach | ${ }^{\text {e }}$ |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, $s$ | 1.6 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | o |  |  | 15.6 |  |  |
| HCMLOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |  | c |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major M Mrt | NBLn1 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (ver/h) | - | 690 | - | - | 806 | - | - | 182 | 522 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.182 | - |  | - | - | - | 0.079 | 0.276 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 0 | 11.4 |  |  | 0 | - | - | 26.5 | 14.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCMLane LOS | A | B | - |  | A | - | - | D | B |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%dile Q(veh) | - | 0.7 | - | - | o | - | - | 0.3 | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |

Destino Paso
Existing Jardine+Hotel 1+2
103: Jardine Road - Sat \& SR 46 E - Sat
11/14/2016

| Destino Paso | Existing Jardine+Hotel $1+2+3$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 103: Jardine Road - Sat \& SR 46 E - Sat | $1 / 14 / 2016$ |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, siveh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR |  | WBL | WBT | WBR |  | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | * | ¢ $\uparrow$ | * |  |  | $\dagger$ |  | \% | $\hat{\square}$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, ver/h | 122 | 764 | 0 |  | 0 | 936 | 18 |  | 0 | o | 0 | 14 | o | 140 |
| Future Vol, vel/h | 122 | 764 | 0 |  | 0 | 936 | 18 |  | 0 | 0 | - | 14 | 0 | 140 |
| Confficting Peds, \#fhr | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free |  | Free | Free | Free |  | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None |  | - | - | None |  | - | - | None |  | - | None |
| Storage Length | 900 | - | - |  | 680 | - | 680 |  | - | - | - | 300 | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - |  | - | 0 | - |  | - | 2 |  | - | 2 |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - |  | - | - | - |  | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 97 | 97 | 97 |  | 97 | 97 | 97 |  | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Heaw Vehicles, \% | 6 | 6 | 6 |  | 6 | 6 | 6 |  | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |  |
| Muthow | 126 | 788 | 0 |  | 0 | 965 | 19 |  | 0 | 0 | o | 14 | o | 144 |
| Major/Minor | Major1 |  |  |  | Major2 |  |  |  | Minor1 |  |  | Minor |  |  |
| Conflicting How All | 965 | 0 | 0 |  | 788 | 0 | 0 |  | 1521 | 2004 | 394 | 1610 | 200 | 482 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | 1039 | 1039 | - | 965 | 965 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | 482 | 965 | - | 645 | 1039 |  |
| Citical Howy | 4.22 | - | - |  | 4.22 | - | - |  | 7.62 | 6.62 | 7.02 | 7.62 | 6.62 | 7.02 |
| Critical Howy Stg 1 | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | 6.62 | 5.62 | - | 6.62 | 5.62 |  |
| Oitical Howy $\operatorname{stg} 2$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | 6.62 | 5.62 | - | 6.62 | 5.62 |  |
| Follow-up Havy | 2.26 | - | - |  | 2.26 | - | - |  | 3.56 | 4.06 | 3.36 | 3.56 | 4.06 | 3.36 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneiver | 685 |  | - |  | 802 | - | - |  | 78 | 56 | 594 | 67 | 56 | 520 |
| Stage 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  | 239 | 297 | - | 266 | 323 |  |
| Stage 2 | - |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | 524 | 323 | - | 418 | 297 |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Manewer | 685 | - | - |  | 802 | - | - |  | 48 | 46 | 594 | 58 | 46 | 520 |
| Mov Cap-2 Manewer | - | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | 153 | 151 | - | 181 | 188 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | 195 | 242 |  | 217 | 323 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | 379 | 323 | - | 341 | 242 |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, S | 1.6 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 15.7 |  |  |
| HCMLOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major M Mrt | NBLn1 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | BLn1 | SBLn2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (vel/h) | - | 685 | - |  | 802 |  | - | 181 | 520 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCMLane V/C Ratio | - | 0.184 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.08 | 0.278 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 0 | 11.4 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 26.6 | 14.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCMLane LOS | A | B | - | - | A | - | - | D | B |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%/dile Q(veh) | - | 0.7 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0.3 | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |

Destino Paso

| Destino Paso | Near Term Jardine |
| :--- | ---: |
| 103: Jardine Road - Sat \& SR 46 E - Sat | 11/15/2016 |



Destino Paso
Mitigated Existing Jardine+Hotel 1
103: Jardine Road - Sat \& SR 46 E - Sat
11/14/2016

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 螥 |  | \% | 个4 | 7 |  | A |  | \% | F |  |
| Traffic Vol, vel/h | 122 | 751 | 0 | 0 | 929 | 18 | 0 | o | 0 | 22 | 0 | 140 |
| Future Vol, vel/h | 122 | 751 | 0 | 0 | 929 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | $\bigcirc$ | 140 |
| Confficiting Peds, \#\#hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channeliz | - |  | None | - |  | None | - | - | None | - |  | None |
| Storage Length | 900 | - | - | 680 | - | 680 | - | - | - | 300 | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Mmit How | 126 | 774 | 0 | o | 958 | 19 | o | o | o | 23 | o | 144 |


| Major/Mnor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |  | Minor1 |  |  | Minor2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Alow All | 958 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 1505 | 1984 | 387 | 1597 | 1984 | 479 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1026 | 1026 | - | 958 | 958 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 479 | 958 | - | 639 | 1026 |  |
| Citical Howy | 4.22 | - | - | 4.22 | - | - | 7.62 | 6.62 | 7.02 | 7.62 | 6.62 | 7.02 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6.62 | 5.62 | - | 6.62 | 5.62 |  |
| Oitical Howy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6.62 | 5.62 | - | 6.62 | 5.62 |  |
| Follow-up Hawy | 2.26 | - | - | 2.26 | - | - | 3.56 | 4.06 | 3.36 | 3.56 | 4.06 | 3.36 |
| Pot Cap-1 Manewer | 690 | - | - | 812 | - | - | 80 | 58 | 600 | 68 | 58 | 522 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 244 | 302 | - | 269 | 325 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 526 | 325 | - | 421 | 302 |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Manewer | 690 | - | - | 812 | - | - | 50 | 47 | 600 | 58 | 47 | 522 |
| Mov Cap-2 Manewer | - | - | - | - | - | - | 156 | 153 | - | 183 | 191 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 199 | 247 | - | 220 | 325 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 381 | 325 | - | 344 | 247 |  |
| Approach | ® |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, S | 1.6 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 16.3 |  |  |
| HCMLOS |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |  | c |  |  |



| Destino Paso $\quad$ Mitigated Existing Jardine+Hotel 1+2 |
| :--- |
| 103: Jardine Road - Sat \& SR 46 E - Sat |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, S/veh 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{4}$ | 性 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | ¢ $\uparrow$ | F |  | ${ }^{4}$ |  | \% | F |  |
| Traffic Vol, vel/h | 122 | 751 | 0 | 0 | 934 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 140 |
| Future Vol, vellh | 122 | 751 | 0 | 0 | 934 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | o | 140 |
| Confficting Peds, \#thr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - |  | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - |  | None |
| Storage Length | 900 | - | - | 680 | - | 680 | - | - | - | 300 | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Mmithow | 126 | 74 | 0 | - | 963 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | - | 144 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |  |  |  | Minor1 |  |  |  | Mnor2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Aow All | 963 | 0 | o |  | 74 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1507 | 1989 | 387 | 1602 | 1989 | 481 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1026 | 1026 | - | 963 | 963 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | - |  | 481 | 963 | - | 639 | 1026 |  |
| Critical Howy | 4.22 | - | - |  | 4.22 | - |  | - |  | 7.62 | 6.62 | 7.02 | 7.62 | 6.62 | 7.02 |
| Critical Howy Stg 1 | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | - |  | 6.62 | 5.62 |  | 6.62 | 5.62 |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | - |  | 6.62 | 5.62 | - | 6.62 | 5.62 |  |
| Follow-up Havy | 2.26 | - | - |  | 2.26 | - |  | - |  | 3.56 | 4.06 | 3.36 | 3.56 | 4.06 | 3.36 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneiver | 686 | - | - |  | 812 | - |  | - |  | 80 | 57 | 600 | 68 | 57 | 521 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | - |  | 244 | 302 | - | 267 | 323 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | - |  | 525 | 323 | - | 421 | 302 |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Manewer | 686 | - | - |  | 812 | - |  | - |  | 50 | 47 | 600 | 58 | 47 | 521 |
| Mov Cap-2 Manewer | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | - |  | 156 | 152 | - | 182 | 190 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | - |  | 199 | 247 |  | 218 | 323 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | - |  | 380 | 323 | - | 344 | 247 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, S | 1.6 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 6.6 |  |  |
| HCMLOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |  | c |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mmit | NBLn1 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |  | WBRS | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (vel/h) | - | 686 | - |  | 812 |  |  | - | 182 | 521 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCMLane V/C Ratio | - | 0.183 | - |  | - |  |  | - | 0.147 | 0.277 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 0 | 11.4 | - |  | 0 |  |  | - | 28.2 | 14.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCMLane LOS | A | B | - |  | A |  |  | - | D | B |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%/ile Q(veh) | - | 0.7 | - | - | 0 | - |  | - | 0.5 | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |

Destino Paso
Mitigated Existing Jardine + Hotel $1+2+3$
103: Jardine Road - Sat \& SR 46 E - Sat
11/14/2016

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, Slveh 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR |  | WBL | WBT | WBR |  | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 㤽 |  |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow \uparrow$ | F |  |  | ¢ |  | \% | $\hat{\square}$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, vellh | 122 | 751 | 0 |  | 0 | 936 | 18 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 140 |
| Future Vol, vel/h | 122 | 751 | 0 |  | 0 | 936 | 18 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 140 |
| Confficting Peds, \#\#hr | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | o |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free |  | Free | Free | Free |  | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None |  | - | - | None |  | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | 900 | - | - |  | 680 | - | 680 |  | - | - | - | 300 | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - |  | - | 0 | - |  | - | 2 | - | - | 2 |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - |  | - | o | - |  | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 97 | 97 | 97 |  | 97 | 97 | 97 |  | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Heaw Vehicles, \% | 6 | 6 | 6 |  | 6 | 6 | 6 |  | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Muthow | 126 | 774 | o |  | 0 | 965 | 19 |  | o | o | o | 28 | o | 144 |
| Major/Minor | Major1 |  |  |  | Major2 |  |  |  | Minor1 |  |  | inor2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Aow All | 965 | 0 | 0 |  | 774 | 0 | 0 |  | 1508 | 1991 | 387 | 1604 | 1991 | 482 |
| Stage 1 | - |  | - |  | - | - | - |  | 1026 | 1026 | - | 965 | 965 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | 482 | 965 | - | 639 | 1026 |  |
| Critical Havy | 4.22 | - | - |  | 4.22 | - | - |  | 7.62 | 6.62 | 7.02 | 7.62 | 6.62 | 7.02 |
| Oitical Howy Stg 1 | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  | 6.62 | 5.62 | - | 6.62 | 5.62 |  |
| Citical Howy Stg 2 | - | - | - |  | - |  |  |  | 6.62 | 5.62 | - | 6.62 | 5.62 |  |
| Follow-up Hawy | 2.26 | - | - |  | 2.26 | - | - |  | 3.56 | 4.06 | 3.36 | 3.56 | 4.06 | 3.36 |
| Pot Cap-1 Manewer | 685 | - | - |  | 812 | - | - |  | 80 | 57 | 600 | 68 | 57 | 520 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | 244 | 302 | - | 266 | 323 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | 524 | 323 | - | 421 | 302 |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Manewer | 685 | - | - |  | 812 | - | - |  | 50 | 47 | 600 | 58 | 47 | 520 |
| Mov Cap-2 Manewer | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | 155 | 152 | - | 181 | 190 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | 199 | 246 | - | 217 | 323 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | 379 | 323 | - | 344 | 246 |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, S | 1.6 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 16.8 |  |  |
| HCMLOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |  | c |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major M Mrit | NBLn1 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (verVh) | - | 685 | - | - | 812 | - | - | 181 | 520 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | 0.184 | - | - | - |  |  | 0.154 | 0.278 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 0 | 11.4 |  |  | 0 |  | - | 28.5 | 14.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCMLane LOS | A | B | - | - | A |  | - | D | B |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%/dile Q(veh) | - | 0.7 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0.5 | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay，S／veh 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR |  | WBL | WBT |  | BR |  | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 性 |  |  | \％ | 个 $\uparrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | ¢ |  | \％ | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Vol，velVh | 122 | 751 | 0 |  | － | 940 |  | 18 |  | 0 | o | 0 | 30 | o | 140 |
| Future Vol，vel／h | 122 | 751 | 0 |  | 0 | 940 |  | 18 |  | － | 0 | － | 30 | 0 | 140 |
| Conflicting Peds，\＃thr | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free |  | Free | Free |  | free |  | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | － | － | None |  | － | － |  | 㖪e |  | － | － | None | － | － | None |
| Storage Length | 900 | － | － |  | 680 | － |  | 680 |  | － | － | － | 300 | － |  |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | － | 0 | － |  | － | $\bigcirc$ |  | － |  | － | 2 | － | － | 2 |  |
| Grade，\％ | － | 0 | － |  | － | o |  | － |  | － | 0 | － |  | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 97 | 97 | 97 |  | 97 | 97 |  | 97 |  | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 6 | 6 | 6 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 6 |  | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Major／Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |  |  |  | Minor1 |  |  |  | Mnor2 |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Aow All | 969 | 0 | 0 |  | 77 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1511 | 1995 | 387 | 1608 | 1995 | 485 |
| Stage 1 | － | － | － |  | － | － |  | － |  | 1026 | 1026 | － | 969 | 969 |  |
| Stage 2 | － | － | － |  | － | － |  | － |  | 485 | 969 | － | 639 | 1026 |  |
| Critical Howy | 4.22 | － | － |  | 4.22 | － |  | － |  | 7.62 | 6.62 | 7.02 | 7.62 | 6.62 | 7.02 |
| Citical Howy Stg 1 | － | － | － |  | － | － |  | － |  | 6.62 | 5.62 | － | 6.62 | 5.62 |  |
| Citical Howy $\operatorname{stg} 2$ | － | － | － |  | － | － |  | － |  | 6.62 | 5.62 | － | 6.62 | 5.62 |  |
| Follow－up Hawy | 2.26 | － | － |  | 2.26 | － |  | － |  | 3.56 | 4.06 | 3.36 | 3.56 | 4.06 | 3.36 |
| Pot Cap－1 Maneuner | 683 | － | － |  | 812 | － |  | － |  | 80 | 57 | 600 | 67 | 57 | 517 |
| Stage 1 | － | － | － |  | － | － |  | － |  | 244 | 302 | － | 265 | 321 |  |
| Platoon Slacked，\％ |  | － | － |  | － | － |  | － |  | 522 | 321 | － | 421 | 302 |  |
|  |  | － | － |  |  | － |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap－1 Manewer | 683 | － | － |  | 812 | － |  | － |  | 49 | 46 | 600 | 57 | 46 | 517 |
| Mov Cap－2 Manewer | － | － | － |  | － | － |  | － |  | 154 | 151 | － | 180 | 189 |  |
| Stage 1 | － |  | － |  | － |  |  |  |  | 199 | 246 |  | 216 | 321 |  |
| Stage 2 | － | － | － |  | － | － |  | － |  | 376 | 321 | － | 343 | 246 |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay， S | 1.6 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 17.2 |  |  |
| нСмlos |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |  | c |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane／Major Mmit | NBLI 1 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |  | BRS | SBLn1S | SBLn2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity（vel／h） | － | 683 | － |  | 812 | － |  | － | 180 | 517 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCMLane V／C Ratio |  | 0.184 | － |  | － |  |  | － | 0.172 | 0.279 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay（s） | 0 | 11.5 | － |  | 0 |  |  | － | 29.1 | 14.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCMLane LOS | A | B | － |  | A | － |  | － | D | B |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 95th \％dile Q（veh） | － | 0.7 | － | － | o | － |  | － | 0.6 | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES RECOMMENDING APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT (PD 08-002), AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AMENDMENT (CUP 08-002) FOR DESTINO PASO RESORT 3350 AIRPORT ROAD, APN: 025-436-029 \& 025-346-030

WHEREAS, an application for an amendment to Planned D evelopment 08-002 and Conditional Use Permit 08-002 has been filed by Karen Stier for development of a resort with four (4) hotels and up to 291 rooms, and ancillary site improvements, as shown in the proposed Site Plan in Exhibit B; and

WHEREAS, this project was considered by the Planning Commission on October 11, 2016, and was continued to provide time for the applicant and staff to address specific concerns regarding the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and associated mitigation measures, and to reconsider the site design near hotel \#4 to determine if oak tree \#155 could be preserved; and

WHEREAS, the TIA and proposed traffic mitigation was modified to address issues raised by the Planning Commission and comments received from Caltrans. The Site Plan for hotel \#4 and the Oak Tree Preservation Plan were modified to preserve oak tree \#155. No other modifications to the plans were incorporated; and

WHEREAS, the subject property is designated in the General Plan, Land Use Element as Parks and Open Space with Resort Lodging/ Airport Overlays (POS/ RL/AP), and the proposed project is consistent with the intent of the land use designation since the project would provide development of "... hotels in close proximity to golf courses and commercial recreation... and provide resorts, lodging and related ancillary land uses..."; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Paso Robles Zoning Map, the property is located in the Parks and Open Space zoning district with Resort Lodging/ Airport Overlays (PO S/ RL/ AP), and the proposed hotel project is a conditionally permitted land use, and it is consistent with the applicable zoning district and development standards, with Conditions of Approval applied as provided in Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, the subject property is partially located in three (3) different Airport Safety Zones, including Zones 2, 3, and 4, and the proposed development project is compatible with the land uses identified for each safety zone and the applicable density limitations; and

WHEREAS, the proposed architectural design and site layout are complementary with the rural nature of the property incorporating natural materials of wood and stone, with minimal site disturbance preserving the majority of the property in its natural open space condition with no impacts to the oak woodland area, as shown in Exhibit D; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the City's Procedures for Implementing CEQA, an Initial Study was prepared for the project; and
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WHEREAS, based on the information and analysis contained in the Initial Study, staff determined that the proposed project as designed, and with appropriate mitigation measures added as conditions of approval, will not result in significant environmental impacts, and a Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for public review and comment in full compliance with CEQA; and

WHEREAS, a duly noticed public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission on October 11, 2016 and on December 13, 2016, on this project to accept public testimony on the Mitigated Negative D eclaration and the proposed project. Comments were received from Caltrans regarding the TIA and proposed traffic mitigations. The traffic mitigation measures were modified, and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and incorporated into the in compliance with CEQA; and

WHEREAS, at the conclusion of the October 11, 2016 Planning Commission meeting, the Commission recommended that the City Council adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and approve Planned Development Amendment 08-002 and Conditional Use Permit Amendment 08-002; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 21.23B.050, Findings for Approval of Development Plans, and based upon the facts and analysis presented in the staff report and the attachments thereto, the public testimony received, and subject to the Conditions of Approval listed below, the Planning Commission makes the following findings:

1. The goals and policies established by the general plan, since the project would provide hotels in proximity to commercial recreation uses such as Barney Schwartz Park, the water park, golf courses, horse park and other amenities.
2. The zoning code, particularly the purpose and intent of the zoning district in which a development project is located since the PO S/ RL/ AP district conditionally permits hotels, and the site will maintain a significant portion of the site in natural open space while minimizing disturbance of natural features on the property.
3. The proposed project complies with all other adopted codes, policies, standards, and plans of the city including the zoning district height limitations, setbacks, and parking requirements, and it would comply with the land uses and applicable density provided for in the Paso Robles Airport Land Use Plan.
4. The proposed development plan will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort, convenience and general welfare of the person residing or working in the neighborhood, or be injurious or detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city since the property is not located in close proximity to other residents or neighborhoods, and it would not result in significant noise, traffic, light, glare, or other potential effects.
5. The proposed development plan accommodates the aesthetic quality of the city as a whole, especially where development will be visible from gateways to the city and scenic corridors since it proposes to utilize high-quality architectural design with elements of "Prairie" architectural style that fits in with and is compatible with the site, and will provide an attractive view as would be seen from surrounding properties and streets.
6. The proposed development plan is compatible with, and is not detrimental to, surrounding land uses and improvements, provides appropriate visual appearance, and contributes to the mitigation of any environmental and social (e.g., privacy) impacts, since it is proposed to be a low-intensity
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development on the rural landscape, and would mitigate potentially significant environmental impacts.
7. The proposed development plan is compatible with existing scenic and environmental resources such as hillsides, drainage courses, oak tree woodlands, vistas, and historic buildings, as noted in \#5 and \#6 above.
8. The proposed development plan contributes to the orderly development of the city as a whole by providing a well-designed project that is suitable for the location where it is proposed and surrounding land uses including agricultural land uses, a recreational vehicle park, open space areas of the Huer Huero Creek, and other uses in the vicinity.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles does hereby recommend approval of Planned D evelopment Amendment 08-002 and Conditional Use Permit Amendment 08-002 to the City Council, subject to the following conditions:

## STANDARD CONDITIONS:

1. This project shall comply with the checked standard Conditions of Approval, attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by reference.

## SITE SPECIFIC CONDITIONS:

NOTE: In the event of conflict or duplication between standard and site-specific conditions, the site-specific condition shall supersede the standard condition.

## Planning Division Conditions:

2. The project shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the Conditions of Approval established by this Resolution and it shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the following Exhibits:

## EXHIBITS DESCRIPTION

A. Standard Conditions of Approval
B. Architectural Appearance Renderings
C. Project D escription
D. Site Plan
E. Elevations / Plot Plans
F. Color and Materials
G. Landscape Plan
H. Tentative Tract Map / Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan
I. Floor Plans / Airport Land Use Plan Consistency Study
J. Architect's Statement of Airport Land Use Plan consistency
3. The project shall be designed and constructed to be in substantial conformance with the site plan, landscape plan, elevations, floor plans, colors and materials, and preliminary grading plan approved with this resolution.
4. Approval of this project is valid for a period of two (2) years from date of approval. Unless permits have been issued and site work has begun, the approval of Planned D evelopment Amendment 08-
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002 and Conditional Use Permit Amendment 08-002 shall expire on December 13, 2018. The Planning Commission may extend this expiration date if a Time Extension application has been filed with the City along with the fees before the expiration date.
5. Prior to issuance of certificates of use and occupancy, the property owner or authorized agent is required to pay the City's D evelopment Impact Fees.
6. No underground or aboveground storage of hazardous materials shall be allowed on-site without first obtaining City approval.
7. Temporary construction noise levels in excess of 60 decibels shall be restricted to the daylight hours of 7 am to 6 pm . Noise levels shall be measured or monitored from site boundaries or the nearest adjoining residential use to determine compliance.
8. Use and operation of the project and its appurtenances shall be conducted in compliance with the City's General Performance Standards for all uses (Section 21.21.040 of Chapter 21.21 Performance Standards of the City's Zoning Ordinance).
9. Prior to occupancy, all overhead utilities adjacent to the property shall be relocated underground.
10. The use and occupancy of the hotel and common shall conform to the floor plans as shown in Exhibits I and J. Occupancy of the hotel shall comply with density limitation of the Airport Land Use Plan, Zones 2, 3, and 4 as follows:

Zone 2: No development shall be permitted.
Zone 3 The use intensity of this activity shall not exceed an average of 60 persons per gross acre, maximum 120 persons per single acre, at any time. Usage calculations shall include all people (e.g., employees, customers/ visitors, etc.) who may be on the property at any single point in time, whether indoors or outside. The building density will be calculated on an average of 1.8 persons per room or group of rooms to be occupied as a suite; plus one person per 60 sq. ft. floor area of any restaurants, coffee shops, bars, or night clubs; plus one person per 10 sq . ft. of floor area of meeting rooms shall be permitted.

Zone 4 The use intensity of this activity shall not exceed an average of 40 persons per gross acre, maximum 120 persons per single acre, at any time. Usage calculations shall include all people (e.g., employees, customers/ visitors, etc.) who may be on the property at any single point in time, whether indoors or outside. The building density will be calculated on an average of 1.8 persons per room or group of rooms to be occupied as a suite; plus one person per 60 sq . ft . floor area of any restaurants, coffee shops, bars, or night clubs; plus one person per 10 sq. ft. of floor area of meeting rooms shall be permitted.

## Engineering Division Conditions:

11. Stormwater Control Measures shall be constructed in accordance with the Stormwater Control Plan.
12. Airport Road shall be improved in accordance with plans designed in accordance with the recommendations of the Traffic Impact Analysis and as approved by the City Engineer. A crosswalk shall be established at the entrance road in accordance with plans approved by a Traffic
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Engineer. The walking path on the west side of Airport Road shall be extended south to the Ravine Water Park parking lot.
13. No development shall occur after Phase I until an updated TIA demonstrates that Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures are effective. If it is determined that they are not effective, the applicant shall coordinate with the Community Development Director to develop alternative TD M measures.
14. Prior to occupancy of any development, a gravity sewer main must be constructed in Airport Road consistent with the Master Plan of the area, along with a lift station and force main to an appropriate connection point as determined by the Wastewater Division Manager. All of the regional sewer infrastructure will be subject to a reimbursement agreement for collection from future development interests.
16.a Self-generating water softener equipment shall be prohibited.

## Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting:

15. AES - 1 The project shall be designed in accordance with the attached specific architectural features to ensure visual impacts are mitigated.
16. BIO-1 To the maximum extent possible, site preparation, ground-disturbing, and construction activities should be conducted outside of the migratory bird breeding season. If such activities are required during this period, the applicant should retain a qualified biologist to conduct a nesting bird survey and verify that migratory birds are not occupying the site. If nesting activity is detected the following measures should be implemented:
a. The project should be modified or delayed as necessary to avoid direct take of identified nests, eggs, and/ or young protected under the MBTA;
b. The qualified biologist should determine an appropriate biological buffer zone around active nest sites. Construction activities within the established buffer zone will be prohibited until the young have fledged the nest and achieved independence; and,
c. The qualified biologist should document all active nests and submit a letter report to the City documenting project compliance with the MBTA.
17. BIO-2 Prior to construction, a qualified biologist should conduct a pre-activity survey to identify known or potential dens or sign of San Joaquin kit fox no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days prior to the beginning of the site preparation, ground-disturbing, or construction activities, or any other activity that has the potential to adversely affect the species. If a known or potential den or any other sign of the species is identified or detected within the project area, the biologist will contact USFWS and CDFW immediately. No work will commence or continue until such time that USFWS and CDFW determine that it is appropriate to proceed. Under no circumstances will a known or potential den be disturbed or destroyed without prior authorization from USFWS and CDFW. Within 7 days of survey completion, a report will be submitted to USFWS, CDFW, and the City. The report will include, at a minimum, survey dates, field personnel, field conditions, survey methodology, and survey results.
18. BIO-3 During the site-disturbance and/ or construction phase, to prevent entrapment of the San Joaquin kit fox, all excavation, steep-walled holes, or trenches in excess of 2 feet in depth should be covered at the close of each working day by plywood or similar materials, or provided with one or more escape ramps constructed of earth fill or wooden planks. Trenches should also be inspected for entrapped kit fox each morning prior to onset of field activities and immediately prior to covering
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with plywood at the end of each working day. Before such holes or trenches are filled or covered, they should be thoroughly inspected for entrapped kit fox. If any kit fox is found, work will stop and USFWS and CDFW will be contacted immediately to determine how to proceed.
19. BIO-4 During the site disturbance and/ or construction phase, any pipes, culverts, or similar structures with a diameter of 4 inches or greater stored overnight at the project site should be thoroughly inspected for trapped San Joaquin kit foxes before the subject pipe is subsequently buried, capped, or otherwise used or moved in any way. If any kit fox is found, work will stop and USFWS and CDFW will be contacted immediately to determine how to proceed.
20. BIO-5 Prior to, during, and after the site disturbance and/ or construction phase, use of pesticides or herbicides should be in compliance with all federal, state, and local regulations. This is necessary to minimize the probability of primary or secondary poisoning of endangered species utilizing adjacent habitats, and the depletion of prey upon which San Joaquin kit foxes depend.
21. BIO-6 During the site disturbance and/ or construction phase, any contractor or employee that inadvertently kills or injures a San Joaquin kit fox or who finds any such animal either dead, injured, or entrapped should be required to report the incident immediately to the applicant and City. In the event that any observations are made of injured or dead kit fox, the applicant should immediately notify USFWS and CDFW by telephone. In addition, formal notification should be provided in writing within 3 working days of the finding of any such animal(s). Notification should include the date, time, location, and circumstances of the incident. Any threatened or endangered species found dead or injured should be turned over immediately to CDFW for care, analysis, or disposition.
22. BIO-7 Prior to final inspection, should any long internal or perimeter fencing be proposed or installed, the City should do the following to provide for kit fox passage:
a. If a wire strand/ pole design is used, the lowest strand should be no closer to the ground than 12 inches.
b. If a more solid wire mesh fence is used, $8 \times 12$-inch openings near the ground should be provided every 100 yards. Upon fence installation, the applicant should notify the City to verify proper installation. Any fencing constructed after issuance of a final permit should follow the above guidelines.
23. BIO-8 Prior to site disturbance, the CRZ of all oak trees with a D BH of 6 inches or greater must be fenced to protect from construction activities. The proposed fencing shall be shown in orange ink on the grading plan. It must be a minimum of 4' high chain link, snow or safety fence staked (with t posts 8 feet on center) at the edge of the critical root zone or line of encroachment for each tree or group of trees. The fence shall be up before any construction or earth moving begins. The owner shall be responsible for maintaining an erect fence throughout the construction period. The arborist(s), upon notification, will inspect the fence placement once it is erected. After this time, fencing shall not be moved without arborist inspection/ approval. If the orange plastic fencing is used, a minimum of four zip ties shall be used on each stake to secure the fence. All efforts shall be made to maximize the distance from each saved tree. Weather proof signs shall be permanently posted on the fences every 50 feet (See Arborist Report for specific language required for signage). All areas within the critical root zone of the trees that can be fenced shall receive a 4-6" layer of chip mulch to retain moisture, soil structure and reduce the effects of soil compaction.
24. BIO-9 All trenching within the critical root zone of native trees shall be hand dug. All major roots shall be avoided whenever possible. All exposed roots larger than 1" in diameter shall be clean cut with sharp pruning tools and not left ragged. A Mandatory meeting between the arborists and grading contractor(s) must take place prior to work start. D uring the site disturbance and/ or construction phase, grading, cutting, or filling within 5 feet of a CRZ of all oak trees with a DBH of
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6 inches or greater must be supervised by a certified arborist approved by the City. Such activities beyond 5 feet of a CRZ must be monitored to ensure that activities are in accordance with approved plans. Root pruning outside of the CRZ must be done by hand. G rading should not encroach within the critical root zone unless authorized. Grading should not disrupt the normal drainage pattern around the trees. Fills should not create a ponding condition and excavations should not leave the tree on a rapidly draining mound.BIO-10
Oil, gasoline, chemicals, or other construction materials potentially harmful to oak trees may not be stored in the CRZ of any oak tree with a DBH of 6 inches or greater. No liquid or solid construction waste shall be dumped on the ground within the critical root zone of any native tree. The critical root zone areas are not for storage of materials either.
25. BIO-11 D rains shall be installed according to City specification so as to avoid harm by excessive watering to oak trees with a D BH of 6 inches or greater.
26. BIO-12 Landscaping within the CRZ of any oak tree with a DBH of 6 inches or greater is limited to indigenous plant species or non-plant material, such as cobbles or wood chips. All landscape within the critical root zone shall consist of drought tolerant or native varieties. Lawns shall be avoided. All irrigation trenching shall be routed around critical root zones, otherwise above ground drip-irrigation shall be used.
27. BIO-13 Wires, signs, or other similar items shall not be attached to oak trees with a DBH of 6 inches or greater.
28. BIO-14 For each oak tree removed (DBH of 6 inches or greater), a tree or trees of the same species must be planted with a combined D BH of $25 \%$ of the removed tree's D BH within the property's boundary.
29. BIO-15 It is the responsibility of the owner or project manager to provide a copy of the tree protection plan to any and all contractors and subcontractors that work within the critical root zone of any native tree and confirm they are trained in maintaining fencing, protecting root zones and conforming to all tree protection goals. Each contractor must sign and acknowledge this tree protection plan.
30. BIO-16 Any exposed roots shall be re-covered the same day they were exposed. If they cannot, they must be covered with burlap or another suitable material and wetted down 2 x per day until re-buried. All heavy equipment shall not be driven under the trees, as this will contribute to soil compaction. Also there is to be no parking of equipment or personal vehicles in these areas. All areas behind fencing are off limits unless pre-approved by the arborist.
31. BIO-17 As the project moves toward completion, the arborist(s) may suggest either fertilization and/ or mycorrhiza applications that will benefit tree health. Mycorrhiza offers several benefits to the host plant, including faster growth, improved nutrition, greater drought resistance, and protection from pathogens.
32. BIO-18 Class 4 pruning includes crown reduction pruning shall consist of reduction of tops, sides or individual limbs. A trained arborist shall perform all pruning. No pruning shall take more than $25 \%$ of the live crown of any native tree. Any trees that may need pruning for road/ home clearance shall be pruned prior to any grading activities to avoid any branch tearing.
33. BIO-19 An arborist shall be present for selected activities (trees identified in Arborist Report and items bulleted below). The monitoring does not necessarily have to be continuous but observational at times during these activities. It is the responsibility of the owner(s) or their designee to inform us
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prior to these events so we can make arrangements to be present. All monitoring will be documented on the field report form which will be forwarded to the project manager and the City of Paso Robles Planning D epartment.

- pre-construction fence placement inspection
- all grading and trenching identified on the spreadsheet
- any other encroachment the arborist feels necessary

34. BIO-20 Pre-Construction Meeting: An on-site pre-construction meeting with the Arborist(s), O wner(s), Planning Staff, and the earth moving team shall be required for this project. Prior to final occupancy, a letter from the arborist(s) shall be required verifying the health/ condition of all impacted trees and providing any recommendations for any additional mitigation. The letter shall verify that the arborist(s) were on site for all grading and/ or trenching activity that encroached into the critical root zone of the selected native trees, and that all work done in these areas was completed to the standards set forth above.
35. GHG-1 The proposed project shall implement, at a minimum, the following G HG-reduction measures:
a. Install high efficiency lights in parking lots, streets, and other public areas.
b. Comply with mandatory California Green Building Standards Code bicycle parking standards.
c. Install bicycle facilities and/ or amenities beyond those required in building standards.
d. Incorporate a pedestrian access network that internally links all uses and connects all existing or planned external streets and pedestrian facilities contiguous with the project site.
e. The project site shall be designed to minimize barriers to pedestrian access and interconnectivity.
f. Implement traffic calming improvements as appropriate (e.g., marked crosswalks, countdown signal timers, curb extensions, speed tables, raised crosswalks, median islands, minicircles, tight corner radii, etc.).
g. Comply with CALG reen Tier 1 or Tier 2 standards for water efficiency and conservation.
h. Divert 65 percent of non-hazardous construction or demolition debris.
i. Include the planting of native and drought tolerant trees beyond those required as mitigation for tree removal.
j. Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-2.
k. Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-3,e-k.
36. AQ-1 The following measures shall be implemented to minimize construction-generated emissions. These measures shall be shown on grading and building plans:
a. Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible.
b. Use of water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 mph . Reclaimed (non-potable) water should be used whenever possible.
c. All dirt stock pile areas should be sprayed daily as needed.
d. Permanent dust control measures identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans should be implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil disturbing activities;
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e. Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading should be sown with a fast germinating, non-invasive grass seed and watered until vegetation is established.
f. All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation should be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the SLOAPCD.
g. All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
h. Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site.
i. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with CVC Section 23114.
j. Install wheel washers at the construction site entrance, wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site, or implement other SLOAPCD -approved methods sufficient to minimize the track-out of soil onto paved roadways.
k. Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water should be used where feasible.
l. The burning of vegetative material shall be prohibited.
m . The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the fugitive dust emissions and enhance the implementation of the measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints, reduce visible emissions below $20 \%$ opacity, and to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SLOAPCD Compliance Division prior to the start of any grading, earthwork or demolition.
n. Construction of the proposed project shall use low-VOC content paints not exceeding 50 grams per liter.
37. AQ-2 To reduce operational emissions, the proposed project shall implement the following measures. The project proponent shall submit proof to the Paso Robles Community D evelopment D epartment Staff that implementation of all measures have been met in accordance with a time schedule deemed appropriate by Community D evelopment D epartment staff.
a. Utilize green building materials (materials which are resource efficient, recycled, and sustainable) available locally if possible.
b. Provide shade tree planting in parking lots to reduce evaporative emissions from parked vehicles. Design should provide 50\% tree coverage within 10 years of construction using low RO G emitting, low maintenance native drought resistant trees.
c. Pave and maintain roads in parking areas.
d. Plant drought tolerant native shade trees along southern exposures of buildings to reduce energy used to cool buildings in summer.
e. Provide native and drought tolerant trees beyond those required as mitigation for tree removal.
f. Incorporate outdoor electrical outlets to encourage the use of electric appliances and tools.
g. Install high-efficiency heating and cooling systems.
h. Utilize high-efficiency gas or solar water heaters.
i. Utilize built-in energy efficient appliances (i.e., Energy Star rated).
j. Utilize double- or triple-paned windows.
k. Utilize low energy street lights (i.e., sodium, light-emitting diode [LED ]).
l. Utilize energy-efficient interior lighting.
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m . Install door sweeps and weather stripping (if more efficient doors and windows are not available).
n. Install energy-reducing programmable thermostats.
0. Install low water consumption landscape. Use native plants that do not require watering after they are well established or minimal watering during the summer months and are low RO G emitting.
p. Provide a designated parking space for alternatively fueled vehicles.
q. Provide a shuttle service for guests to local destinations, including Paso Robles Transit/ Amtrak Station
r. Install energy-saving systems in guest rooms that reduce energy usage when rooms are not occupied.
s. Provide a pedestrian access network that internally links all uses and connects all existing or planned external streets and pedestrian facilities contiguous with the project site
t. Provide on-site bicycle parking beyond those required by California G reen Building Standards Code and related facilities to support long-term use (lockers, or a locked room with standard racks and access limited to bicyclists only).
u. Implement traffic calming improvements as appropriate (e.g., marked crosswalks, countdown signal timers, curb extensions, speed tables, raised crosswalks, median islands, minicircles, tight corner radii, etc.)
38. AQ-3 The following measures shall be implemented to reduce expose of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. These measures shall be shown on grading and building plans:
a. Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-1, as identified in "Impact AQ-C", above.
b. Demolition of onsite structures shall comply with the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Emissions (NESHAP) requirements (NESHAP, 40 CFR, Part 61, Subpart M) for the demolition of existing structures. The SLOAPCD is delegated authority by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to implement the Federal A sbestos NESHAP. Prior to demolition of onsite structures, the SLOAPCD shall be notified, per NESHAP requirements. SLOAPCD notification form and reporting requirements are included in Appendix A. Additional information may be obtained at website url: http:/ / slocleanair.org/ business/ asbestos.php.
c. If during demolition of existing structures, paint is separated from the construction materials (e.g. chemically or physically), the paint waste will be evaluated independently from the building material by a qualified hazardous materials inspector to determine its proper management. All hazardous materials shall be handled and disposed in accordance with local, state and federal regulations. According to the D epartment of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), if paint is not removed from the building material during demolition (and is not chipping or peeling), the material can be disposed of as construction debris (a nonhazardous waste). The landfill operator will be contacted prior to disposal of building material debris to determine any specific requirements the landfill may have regarding the disposal of lead-based paint materials. The disposal of demolition debris shall comply with any such requirements. Contact the SLOAPCD Enforcement Division at (805) 781-5912 for more information. Approval of a lead work plan and permit may be required. Lead work plans, if required, will need to be submitted to SLOAPCD ten days prior to the start of demolition
d. On-road diesel vehicles shall comply with Section 2485 of Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations. This regulation limits idling from diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles with gross vehicular weight ratings of more than 10,000 pounds and licensed for operation on highways. It applies to Califormia and non-California based vehicles. In general, the regulation specifies that drivers of said vehicles:

1) Shall not idle the vehicle's primary diesel engine for greater than 5 minutes at any location, except as noted in Subsection (d) of the regulation; and, 2) Shall not operate a diesel-fueled auxiliary power system to power a heater, air conditioner, or any ancillary equipment on that vehicle during sleeping or resting in a sleeper berth for greater than 5.0 minutes at any location when within 1,000 feet of a restricted area, except as noted in Subsection (d) of the regulation.
e. Maintain all construction equipment in proper tune according to manufacturer's specifications;
f. Fuel all off-road and portable diesel powered equipment with ARB certified motor vehicle diesel fuel (non-taxed version suitable for use off-road);
g. Use diesel construction equipment meeting ARB's Tier 2 certified engines or cleaner offroad heavy duty diesel engines, and comply with the State off-Road Regulation;
h. Idling of all on and off-road diesel-fueled vehicles shall not be permitted when not in use. Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas and or job site to remind drivers and operators of the no idling limitation.
i. Electrify equipment when possible;
j. Substitute gasoline-powered in place of diesel-powered equipment, when available; and,
k. Use alternatively fueled construction equipment on-site when available, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), propane or biodiesel.
39. TR-1 A sidewalk is proposed along Airport Road between Hotels 3 and 4. A four foot or greater aggregate base walking path is shown on the west side of Airport Road from Destino Paso Way to the northernmost Ravine Water Park parking area. Detailed construction documents should be reviewed once they are ready to ensure that adequate sight distance is provided at the driveways serving Hotels 1 and 3, which are located on the inside of horizontal curves. Landscaping and other features should be restricted near these driveways to provide clear sight lines to approaching traffic.
40. TR-2 The applicant will be required to pay traffic mitigation fees to offset to offset its impacts to the citywide transportation network.
41. TR-3 The applicant will implement employee transportation demand measures to reduce traffic congestion, such as:
(1) The applicant shall implement a program to direct eastbound guest traffic to the Jardine Road/ SR 46E intersection, and not be permitted to develop Phase II without additional traffic analysis demonstrating effectiveness of this TDM.
(2) Provide information on regional rideshare programs, bike racks, well as provide shuttle service to the multi-modal transportation center and downtown for residents and guests.
(3) TR-4 The project will be required to participate in the SLO Car Free program with SLO County APCD.
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PASSED AND AD OPTED THIS 11 th day of October, 2016 by the following Roll Call Vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

> Bob Rollins, Chairperson

## ATTEST:

Warren Frace, Secretary of the Planning Commission

EXHIBIT A
CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
STANDARD DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS

| $\boxtimes$ Planned Development | $\boxed{\square}$ Conditional Use Permit |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ Tentative Parcel Map |  | $\square$ Tentative Tract Map |
| Approval Body: Planning Commission | Date of Approval: December 13, 2016 |  |
| $\underline{\text { Applicant: Destino Paso Resort }}$ | Location: 3350 Airport Road |  |
| $\underline{\text { APN: 025-436-029 \& 025-346-030 }}$ |  |  |

The following conditions that have been checked are standard conditions of approval for the above referenced project. The checked conditions shall be complied with in their entirety before the project can be finalized, unless otherwise specifically indicated. In addition, there may be site specific conditions of approval that apply to this project in the resolution.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT - The applicant shall contact the Community
Development Department, (805) 237-3970, for compliance with the following conditions:
A. GENERAL CONDITIONS - PD/CUP:
$\boxtimes$ 1. This project approval shall expire on October 11, 2018 unless a time extension request is filed with the Community Development Department, or a State mandated automatic time extension is applied prior to expiration.
2. The site shall be developed and maintained in accordance with the approved plans and unless specifically provided for through the Planned Development process shall not waive compliance with any sections of the Zoning Code, all other applicable City Ordinances, and applicable Specific Plans.
3. To the extent allowable by law, Owner agrees to hold City harmless from costs and expenses, including attorney's fees, incurred by City or held to be the liability of City in connection with City's defense of its actions in any proceeding brought in any State or Federal court challenging the City's actions with respect to the project. Owner understands and acknowledges that City is under no obligation to defend any legal actions challenging the City's actions with respect to the project.
$\boxtimes \quad$ 4. Any site specific condition imposed by the Planning Commission in approving this project (Conditional Use Permit) may be modified or eliminated, or new conditions may be added, provided that the Planning Commission shall first conduct a public hearing in the same manner as required for the approval of this project. No such modification shall be made unless the Commission finds that such modification is necessary to protect the public interest and/or neighboring properties, or, in the case of deletion of an existing condition, that such action is necessary to permit reasonable operation and use for this approval.
$\boxtimes \quad$ 5. The site shall be kept in a neat manner at all times and the landscaping shall be continuously maintained in a healthy and thriving condition.
$\boxtimes \quad 6 . \quad$ All signs shall be subject to review and approval as required by Municipal Code Section 21.19 and shall require a separate application and approval prior to installation of any sign.
$\boxtimes \quad$ 7. All walls/fences and exposed retaining walls shall be constructed of decorative materials which include but are not limited to splitface block, slumpstone, stuccoed block, brick, wood, crib walls or other similar materials as determined by the Development Review Committee, but specifically excluding precision block.
8. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit a landscape and irrigation plan consistent with the Landscape and Irrigation Ordinance, shall be submitted for City review and approval. The plan needs to be designed in a manner that utilizes drought tolerant plants, trees and ground covers and minimizes, if not eliminates the use of turf. The irrigation plan shall utilize drip irrigation and limit the use of spray irrigation. All existing and/or new landscaping shall be installed with automatic irrigation systems.
$\boxtimes$ 9. A reciprocal parking and access easement and agreement for site access, parking, and maintenance of all project entrances, parking areas, landscaping, hardscape, common open space, areas and site lighting standards and fixtures, shall be recorded prior to or in conjunction with the Final Map. Said easement and agreement shall apply to all properties, and be referenced in the site Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC\&Rs).
$\boxtimes \quad$ 10. All outdoor storage shall be screened from public view by landscaping and walls or fences per Section 21.21.110 of the Municipal Code.
$\boxtimes$ 11. For commercial, industrial, office or multi-family projects, all refuse enclosures are required to provide adequate space for recycling bins. The enclosure shall be architecturally compatible with the primary building. Gates shall be view obscuring and constructed of durable materials. Check with Paso Robles Waste Disposal to determine the adequate size of enclosure based on the number and size of containers to be stored in the enclosure.
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$\boxtimes \quad$ 12. For commercial, industrial, office or multi-family projects, all existing and/or new ground-mounted appurtenances such as air-conditioning condensers, electrical transformers, backflow devices etc., shall be screened from public view through the use of decorative walls and/or landscaping subject to approval by the Community Development Director or his designee. Details shall be included in the building plans.
$\boxtimes \quad$ 13. All existing and/or new roof appurtenances such as air-conditioning units, grease hoods, etc. shall be screened from public view. The screening shall be architecturally integrated with the building design and constructed of compatible materials to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or his designee. Details shall be included in the building plans.
14. All existing and/or new lighting shall be shielded so as to be directed downward in such a manner as to not create off-site glare or adversely impact adjacent properties. The style, location and height of the lighting fixtures shall be submitted with the building plans and shall be subject to approval by the Community Development Director or his designee.
$\boxtimes \quad$ 15. It is the property owner's responsibility to insure that all construction of private property improvements occur on private property. It is the owner's responsibility to identify the property lines and insure compliance by the owner's agents.
16. Any existing Oak trees located on the project site shall be protected and preserved as required in City Ordinance No. 835 N.S., Municipal Code No. 10.01 "Oak Tree Preservation", unless specifically approved to be removed. An Oak tree inventory shall be prepared listing the Oak trees, their disposition, and the proposed location of any replacement trees required. In the event an Oak tree is designated for removal, an approved Oak Tree Removal Permit must be obtained from the City, prior to removal.
$\boxtimes \quad$ 17. No storage of trash cans or recycling bins shall be permitted within the public right-of-way.
$\boxtimes \quad$ 18. Prior to recordation of the map or prior to occupancy of a project, all conditions of approval shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and Community Developer Director or his designee.
19. Two sets of the revised Planning Commission approved plans incorporating all Conditions of Approval, standard and site specific, shall be submitted to the Community Development Department prior to the issuance of building permits.
$\boxtimes \quad 20$. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the
$\boxtimes$ Development Review Committee shall approve the following: Planning Division Staff shall approve the following:

| 】 | a． | A detailed site plan indicating the location of all structures， parking layout，outdoor storage areas，walls，fences and trash enclosures； |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q | b． | A detailed landscape plan； |
| 区 | c． | Detailed building elevations of all structures indicating materials，colors，and architectural treatments； |
| 】 | d． | Other：grading plan review |

## B．GENERAL CONDITIONS－TRACT／PARCEL MAP：

1．In accordance with Government Section 66474．9，the subdivider shall defend， indemnify and hold harmless the City，or its agent，officers and employees，from any claim，action or proceeding brought within the time period provided for in Government Code section 66499．37，against the City，or its agents，officers，or employees，to attack，set aside，void，annul the City＇s approval of this subdivision．The City will promptly notify subdivider of any such claim or action and will cooperate fully in the defense thereof．

2．The Covenants，Conditions，and Restrictions（CC\＆Rs）and／or Articles Affecting Real Property Interests are subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department，the Public Works Department and／or the City Attorney．They shall be recorded concurrently with the Final Map or prior to the issuance of building permits，whichever occurs first．A recorded copy shall be provided to the affected City Departments．

3．The owner shall petition to annex residential Tract（or Parcel Map） $\qquad$ into the City of Paso Robles Community Facilities District No．2005－1 for the purposes of mitigation of impacts on the City＇s Police and Emergency Services Departments．4．Street names shall be submitted for review and approval by the Planning Commission，prior to approval of the final map．

5．The following areas shall be permanently maintained by the property owner， Homeowners＇Association，or other means acceptable to the City：

ENGINEERING DIVISION－The applicant shall contact the Engineering Division，（805）237－ 3860，for compliance with the following conditions：

All conditions marked are applicable to the above referenced project for the phase indicated．

## C．PRIOR TO ANY PLAN CHECK：

$\boxtimes$ 1．The applicant shall enter into an Engineering Plan Check and Inspection Services Agreement with the City．

## D．PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A GRADING PERMIT：

1．Prior to approval of a grading plan，the developer shall apply through the City，to FEMA and receive a Letter of Map Amendment（LOMA）issued from FEMA．The developer＇s engineer shall provide the required supporting data to justify the application．
$\boxtimes \quad$ 2．Any existing Oak trees located on the project site shall be protected and preserved as required in City Ordinance No．553，Municipal Code No． 10.01 ＂Oak Tree Preservation＂，unless specifically approved to be removed．An Oak tree inventory shall be prepared listing the Oak trees，their disposition，and the proposed location of any replacement trees required．In the event an Oak tree is designated for removal，an approved Oak Tree Removal Permit must be obtained from the City，prior to its removal．
$\boxtimes \quad$ 3．A complete grading and drainage plan shall be prepared for the project by a registered civil engineer and subject to approval by the City Engineer．The project shall conform to the City＇s Storm Water Discharge Ordinance．

4．A Preliminary Soils and／or Geology Report providing technical specifications for grading of the site shall be prepared by a Geotechnical Engineer．
$\boxtimes \quad$ 5．A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan per the State General Permit for Strom Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity shall be provided for any site that disturbs greater than or equal to one acre，including projects that are less than one acre that are part of a larger plan of development or sale that would disturb more than one acre．

## E．PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT：

1．All off－site public improvement plans shall be prepared by a registered civil engineer and shall be submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval．The improvements shall be designed and placed to the Public Works Department Standards and Specifications．
$\square \quad$ 2．The applicant shall submit a composite utility plan signed as approved by a representative of each public utility．

3．Landscape and irrigation plans for the public right－of－way shall be incorporated into the improvement plans and shall require approval by the Streets Division Supervisor and the Community Development Department．
$\square \quad$ 4. In a special Flood Hazard Area as indicated on a Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) the owner shall provide an Elevation Certificate in accordance with the National Flood Insurance program. This form must be completed by a land surveyor or civil engineer licensed in the State of California.

## F. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY OR RECORDATION OF THE FINAL MAP:

## The Planning Commission has made a finding that the fulfillment of the construction requirements listed below are a necessary prerequisite to the orderly development of the surrounding area.

$\square$ 1. The applicant shall pay any current and outstanding fees for Engineering Plan Checking and Construction Inspection services.
2. All public improvements are completed and approved by the City Engineer, and accepted by the City Council for maintenance.
3. The owner shall offer to dedicate and improve the following street(s) to the standard indicated:

Street Name City Standard $\quad$ Standard Drawing No.
4. If, at the time of approval of the final map, any required public improvements have not been completed and accepted by the City the owner shall be required to enter into a Subdivision Agreement with the City in accordance with the Subdivision Map Act.

Bonds required and the amount shall be as follows: Performance Bond $\qquad$ $100 \%$ of improvement costs. Labor and Materials Bond........50\% of performance bond.
5. If the existing City street adjacent to the frontage of the project is inadequate for the traffic generated by the project, or will be severely damaged by the construction, the applicant shall excavate the entire structural section and replace it with a standard half-width street plus a 12' wide travel lane and 8' wide graded shoulder adequate to provide for two-way traffic.
6. If the existing pavement and structural section of the City street adjacent to the frontage of the project is adequate, the applicant shall provide a new structural section from the proposed curb to the edge of pavement and shall overlay the existing paving to centerline for a smooth transition.
7. Due to the number of utility trenches required for this project, the City Council
adopted Pavement Management Program requires a pavement overlay on Airport Road along the frontage of the project.
$\square$ 8. The applicant shall install all utilities. Street lights shall be installed at locations as required by the City Engineer. All existing overhead utilities adjacent to or within the project shall be relocated underground except for electrical lines 77 kilovolts or greater. All utilities shall be extended to the boundaries of the project.
9. The owner shall offer to dedicate to the City the following easement(s). The location and alignment of the easement(s) shall be to the description and satisfaction of the City Engineer:

a. Public Utilities Easement;
b. Water Line Easement;
c. Sewer Facilities Easement;
d. Landscape Easement;
e. Storm Drain Easement.
10. The developer shall annex to the City's Landscape and Lighting District for payment of the operating and maintenance costs of the following:

a. Street lights;
b. Parkway/open space landscaping;
c. Wall maintenance in conjunction with landscaping;
d. Graffiti abatement;
e. Maintenance of open space areas.
$\square \quad$ 11. For a building with a Special Flood Hazard Area as indicated on a Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the developer shall provide an Elevation Certificate in accordance with the National Flood Insurance Program. This form must be completed by a lands surveyor or civil engineer licensed in the State of California.
$\square \quad$ 12. All final property corners shall be installed.
13. All areas of the project shall be protected against erosion by hydro seeding or landscaping.
14. All construction refuse shall be separated (i.e. concrete, asphalt concrete, wood gypsum board, etc.) and removed from the project in accordance with the City's Source Reduction and Recycling Element.
15. Clear blackline mylars and paper prints of record drawings, signed by the engineer of record, shall be provided to the City Engineer prior to the final inspection. An electronic autocad drawing file registered to the California State Plane - Zone 5 / NAD83 projected coordinate system, units in survey feet, shall be provided.

PASO ROBLES DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY SERVICES- The applicant shall contact the Department of Emergency Services, (805) 227-7560, for compliance with the following conditions:

## G. GENERAL CONDITIONS

1. $\boxtimes$ Prior to the start of construction:
$\boxtimes$ Plans shall be reviewed, approved and permits issued by Emergency Services for underground fire lines.
$\boxtimes$ Applicant shall provide documentation to Emergency Services that required fire flows can be provided to meet project demands.
$\boxtimes$ Fire hydrants shall be installed and operative to current, adopted edition of the California Fire Code.
$\boxtimes$ A based access road sufficient to support the department's fire apparatus (HS-20 truck loading) shall be constructed and maintained for the duration of the construction phase of the project.
$\boxtimes$ Access road shall be at least twenty (20) feet in width with at least thirteen (13) feet, six (6) inches of vertical clearance.
2. $\boxtimes$ Provide central station monitored fire sprinkler system for all residential, commercial and industrial buildings that require fire sprinklers in current, adopted edition of the California Building Code, California Fire Code and Paso Robles Municipal Code.
$\boxtimes$ Plans shall be reviewed, approved and permits issued by Emergency Services for the installation of fire sprinkler systems.
3. $\boxtimes$ Provide central station monitored fire alarm system for all residential, commercial and industrial buildings that require fire alarm system in current, adopted edition of the California Building Code, California Fire Code and Paso Robles Municipal Code.
4. $\boxtimes$ If required by the Fire Chief, provide on the address side of the building if applicable:


Fire alarm annunciator panel in weatherproof case. Knox box key entry box or system.
Fire department connection to fire sprinkler system.
5. $\boxtimes$ Provide temporary turn-around to current City Engineering Standard for phased construction streets that exceed 150 feet in length.
6. $\boxtimes$ Project shall comply with all requirements in current, adopted edition of California Fire Code and Paso Robles Municipal Code.
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7. $\boxtimes$ Prior to the issuance of Certificate of Occupancy:
$\boxtimes \quad$ Final inspections shall be completed on all underground fire lines, fire sprinkler systems, fire alarm systems and chemical hood fire suppression systems.
$\boxtimes \quad$ Final inspections shall be completed on all buildings.
$\qquad$ )
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Destino Paso, a destination resort, was approved by the City of Paso Robles in 2009. The purpose of this submittal is to modify the previous City of Paso Robles approvals for the Destino Paso development. Specifically, this submittal seeks to modify:
the Vesting Tentative Map Tract 2962 (PC Resolution 09-008 as modified by PC Resolution 09-015),
the Existing Planned Development (PC Resolution 09-006 supported by Mitigated Negative Declaration PC Resolution 09-005)

## SITE

Destino Paso is a 40.3-acre site bordering the east side of Airport Road (A.P.N 025-436-029 and 030) and immediately north of the Wine Country R.V. Park. The site consists of several flat mesa areas and an oak-filled ravine. An existing farmhouse, outbuildings, and livestock pond are accessed via an easement from Airport Road, while a house and large garage at the site's northeastern end has an access road.

## SUMMARY OF EXISTING APPROVALS

The currently approved development calls for 291 visitor-serving accommodations on this site. These accommodations were to be spread amongst a 16-room boutique hotel, 175 individual casitas clustered in two locations, and two fifty-room hotels that would feature separate swimming pools as well as on-site retail and recreational facilities. These overnight accommodations were to be supplemented by a spa, a restaurant, a recreation center and pool complex, and an event pavilion. As approved, Destino Paso would comprise of approximately 59 individual buildings. The existing Vesting
Tentative Map for Destino Paso divides the 40.3-acre site into nine separate parcels that would roughly correspond to anticipated phases of development. The existing access road to the site was proposed to be improved to be a new public street called "Beijo Way" that would connect both the site and the adjacent property to the east owned by William and Kenneth Mundee to Airport Road.

## SUMMARY OF PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING APPROVALS

The modifications to the approved Destino Paso project proposed in this submittal are: Elimination of the casitas and the reconfiguration of the currently approved 291 visitorserving accommodations into four hotels.

Consolidation and reduction in overall area of the approved restaurant, recreation center, and event center.

Elimination of the spa.
Relocation of the proposed new development to the east to get further visual separation from Airport Road.

The renaming of Beijo Way to Destino Paso Way
Adjusting the currently approved nine parcels to create six new parcels on the site These modifications will have a number of positive features over the current approved design. The reconfiguration of the approved 291 visitor-serving accommodations will bring the proposed development more in line with the operational requirements of national hotel chains, thus improving both the economic viability of the project, its benefits to the growing tourist market in Paso Robles, and its ability to create jobs for local residents. By concentrating the development into four hotels, a greater percentage of the site can be left in its natural state as open space. The proposed modifications to the existing development plan have been carefully laid out to maintain all the existing oak trees on the site with the exception of trees to be removed for improvements to Airport Road and trees identified by the arborist as being in poor condition and one tree removal that is necessary to construct the access road to Hotel 4.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT
Following is a description of the proposed development on each of the proposed new parcels of Destino Paso:
Parcel 1 -Parcel 1 is a .090-acre site at the northwest corner of the site on the western side of Airport Road. Except for roadway configuration modifications, no development is proposed for this parcel. It will be dedicated as Open Space along Huerhuero Creek. Parcel 2 - Parcel 2 is located east of Parcel 1 across Airport Road and is bisected by Destino Paso Way. Consisting of 6.75 acres, proposed development on this parcel is a small 28 -room hotel with 34 parking spaces, a swimming pool and a breakfast room. Access will be from Destino Paso Way, and a portion of Parcel 2 will provide on-site storm water retention and dissipation for Parcels 3 and 4 .
Parcel 3 - Parcel 3, a 6.30-acre site located at the northeast corner, is the proposed site of an 80 -room, limited-service hotel. This hotel, a single three-level building, is envisioned to complement the larger full-service hotel to be developed on Parcel 4 (described next). This hotel will have approximately 93 parking spaces for guests and employees. Hotel amenities will be limited to a small fitness room, a breakfast room, and an outdoor swimming pool.
Parcel 4 - Parcel 4, a 12.97-acre site south of Parcel 3 across Destino Paso Way, will be the location of the Main Hotel, the first hotel to be built. This three-story 136 room fullservice hotel will feature a small three-meal restaurant with adjacent outdoor deck, a lobby bar for tasting local wines, a small function space with an adjacent landscape terrace, and a south-facing pool and deck. The hotel will overlook the ravine with its oak trees that will remain in their natural state. Its adjacent surface parking for about 196 cars will be located on an open mesa at the top of the hill.
Parcel 5 - Parcel 5, a 5.09-acre site, includes the existing farmhouse and support buildings currently on the site accessed via an easement from Parcel 6 from Airport Road. No new development is proposed for this parcel.
Parcel 6 - Parcel 6, a 5.0 acre site located at the southwest corner, will house a two level 47 -room hotel with about 53 surface parking spaces. This will be a rooms-only hotel with a breakfast room and deck as its guest amenities. Access to this parcel will be from the current road accessing the existing farm house on Parcel 5 . This road will be improved at the time this hotel is developed. A portion of Parcel 6 east of Airport Road will provide on-site storm water retention and dissipation.

## DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL CONCEPTS

The design of the hotels that will be built at Destino Paso will evoke the best of the cordial hospitality venues found throughout California wine country.

Siting - Destino Paso has been planned to blend smoothly into the topography and vegetation of its handsome location. Great care has been taken to site the structures so hey will have minimal impact on the native flora and fauna of the site.

Materials - The structures will be built using the traditional materials found in wine country The walls of the buildings will be finished with stained wood siding, ashlar stone, and cement plaster. High quality prefinished metal roofing with deep roof overhangs will cover the buildings. The designs will be further enriched by the use of loose stone site walls, exposed heavy-timber construction, and accents of high-quality materials

Sustainability - Destino Paso will be an environmentally responsible project incorporating the best practices in sustainability. Locally sourced and renewable materials will be used o the greatest extent possible. State-of-the-art plumbing fixtures that reduce water consumption will be specified. The buildings will incorporate passive systems to further reduce energy consumption

Style - The buildings of Destino Paso will be contemporary interpretations of the best architecture found in the wine regions of California, providing fresh and congenial accommodations for use by the visitors and residents of Paso Robles.

## DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED LANDSCAPE CONCEPTS

The Landscape Design for Destino Paso embodies the essence of EI Paso de Robles Pass of the Oaks -and reflects the client's and project team's commitment to conserving native habitat, regional plant ecology, and water resources throughout.

At Destino Paso, architecture, gardens, roads, pathways, infrastructure, and amenities are carefully and thoughtfully nestled into the rolling golden slopes of the Huerhuero Creek watershed. Taking advantage of the existing large flat mesa areas for development, the landscape borrows the scenery that abounds: native hillsides composed of grasslands oak woodlands, ravines, and picturesque views to nearby wineries. These are expressed in the landscape through the use of natural stone, wood, metal, native and appropriate plant materials to provide ample opportunities for guests to enjoy and immerse themselves in the landscape.

After a day of exploring the local community, culture and attractions of the region guests are greeted with a range of opportunities at Destino Paso. Subtle project signage built of regionally appropriate materials marks the project entrance on Airport Road. Turning onto Destino Paso Way, the road gracefully winds up the hillside bordered with large canopy shade trees and an adjacent pedestrian walk with a generous landscape buffer, to provide a safe and scenic approach. Pedestrian scale, dark-sky compliant lighting subtly lights the way in the evening.------

The contemporary landscapes provide stunning California Mediterranean resort gardens celebrating the native Oak Woodland ecosystem and creating visual, material, and spatia continuity between the hotels, the landscape, and the natural setting beyond. Ample shade trees, pathways covered by grape arbors, and lounge areas provide distinctive opportunities for weddings, family gatherings, relaxing around a pool, strolling, dining, and play

The proposed development has been designed to minimize impacts to the native oaks and ecology of the site. An arborist has surveyed 155 of the $300+$ trees found on the site. Of these, seven are being proposed for removal: two are in poor health and are being removed due to safety concerns; four are located directly adjacent to Airport Road and will be impacted due to roadway widening; one additional tree is being removed, due to steep hillside constraints, in order to provide access to Hotel 4.

More than a hundred new native and appropriate trees will be added to the site in the initial phases of the project to provide shade and to add beauty and character to the site. Each new planting is meant to provide the public with direct contact to the regional ecology. Plants are utilized to attract pollinators and other beneficial insects. Grasses capture the movement of the wind. The aromas of lavenders and sages awaken the senses. An abundance of new oak trees planted throughout the project complements the existing native majestic oak woodlands. Olive trees and grape-covered arbors scale the garden spaces and frame views to the natural landscape beyond.

A carefully considered site drainage strategy heightens the experience of stormwate infrastructure and is responsive to seasonal inundations typical of the region. Subtle manipulation of grades directs rainwater along vegetated swales and into larger detention basins, planted with native plants to naturally filter and absorb rainwater captured from the site and slow its return to the water table and ultimately, Huerhuero Creek. Permeable ground plane surfaces such as pavers and decomposed granite allow for additional opportunity for groundwater recharge

Stantomarchitectuar com

## :

Site Access - The Destino Paso project is located on Airport Road north of the intersection of Highway 46 East and Airport Road. Proposed site access is taken from Airport Road in two places. The main access point is on Destino Paso Way which is proposed as a City Standard road in a 50-foot Offer-of-Dedication bisecting the property and connecting to the Mundee property to the east. The road is proposed to be 34 feet wide from curb to curb with a sidewalk on the south side connecting Parcels 2, 3 and 4 to Airport Road. When the hotel on Parcel 6 is constructed, a sidewalk along Airport road will be constructed connecting the hotel to the Destino Paso Way/Airport Road intersection. Airport Road is proposed to be widened to include two 12 -foot travel lanes, two 5 -foot bike lanes with a 2 -foot striped buffer and a 12 -foot median. The median will collect drainage from the east side of the road and act as an infiltration area.

Water -Currently there is an existing 16 -inch water line in Airport Road and a 12-inch water line that crosses the site under the proposed alignment of Destino Paso Way. Both domestic and fire water will be accessed from these lines.

Sewer -There currently is no sewer adjacent to the site. To serve the project a sewe line will be constructed in Destino Paso Way and a sewer line will be constructed in Airport Road. The closest sewer connection is in Dry Creek Road, approximately 3,750 feet from the northerly property line. Due to the topography the sewer will be a gravity line to the low point in Airport Road approximately half way to the Dry Creek connection point. At that point a sewer lift station will be constructed and the sewage will be pumped in a force main line to Dry Creek road. The sewer line will be constructed in Airport Road for the frontage of the property at which point it will be available for the Ravine Water Park, the Wine Country RV Park and the Firestone Winery. This will provide sewer service for these existing projects which are currently using septic systems. Since this sewer will provide a regional benefit the existing projects and any future projects that may use the sewer line will become part of an Assessment District to share in the cost of the sewer construction. The existing Assessts were conditioned to not oppose the future formation of an Assessment District when their projects were approved

Site Grading and Stormwater -The proposed hotels are located on the flatter areas of the site so that grading is minimized. Due to the grading required for the access road to the Parcel 6 hotel stepped retaining walls will be required in order to accommodate the change of grade. There will be a small retaining wall at the back of the hotel on Parcel 3 to provide outside areas for the adjacent rooms.
The site will contain a number of stormwater retention basins for the purpose of stormwater retention and stormwater quality to comply with the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Due to the extensive site coverage and topography of Parcels 3 and 4, the majority of the stormwater will be piped down to the lower portion of the site along Airport Road where the soils have higher infiltration rates. This will serve to recharge the local aquifer as opposed to piping the stormwater directly into the Huerhuero.

Site Utilities - Existing telephone and electrical services are located along Airport Road in front of the site. There is an existing overhead line that serves the existing farm house. A gas line is located in Airport Road to serve the site.

## ECONOMIC STRATEGY AND BENEFITS

Consistent with the City's Economic Strategy, the project advances tourism and employment goals of the Economic Strategy- to, "Improve quality of place to attract investment and knowledge workers stimulate investment by establishing distinctive, quality, stable, safe and sustainable physical improvements and attractions that welcome industry, commerce, tourism, employment, and wealth necessary to maintain and enhance quality of life."
The economic benefits and impacts would be significant for Paso Robles, Among the positive economic impacts of the development of Destino Paso Resort Hotel will be:

The direct benefit of the purchases of local resources (labor, equipment, goods and services) for the construction and operations of the hotel and its infrastructure.

The economic benefits of construction are projected to be 40 full time equivalent (FTE)construction jobs for a period of 12-14 months.

When the hotel starts its operations, it will generate an estimated 130-150 FTE jobs for professionals, skilled labor and services. The hotel will further generate other expenses for its various operational units such as food and beverage, landscape services, pool maintenance, supplies, and the like.

The operation of the hotel will further generate significant fiscal benefits and revenue to the City through the payment of lodging tax (Transient Occupancy Tax TOT), sales taxes, and property tax revenues.
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## S/ <br> STANTON <br> architecture

TO: City of El Paso de Robles<br>FROM: Michael Stanton FAIA, Stanton Architecture<br>DATE: 28 September 2016<br>PROJECT: Destino Paso, Destino Paso Way, Paso Robles<br>REFERENCE: Proposed Density - Destino Paso

## Subject:

The following memo and supporting reports summarizes the proposed density of the Destino Paso Resort for the review by City Staff for the proposed project's Development Plan entitlement.

## Brand Introduction:

The Radisson Paso Robles by Carlson Rezidor will provide the ideal setting for business and leisure travelers to Paso Robles. Guests of Destino Paso will typically stay 2-4 nights, and will range from 'weekend getaways', to extended celebrations such as weddings, parties and events. The Destino Paso aims to attract travelers looking for leisure both at the hotel and the greater Paso Robles area. The hotel has been designed to accommodate the prospective guests with extensive grounds amenities as well as a bar, restaurant and event wing. It is located a short drive to downtown Paso Robles and various wineries, allowing guests to enjoy what the City of El Paso De Robles has to offer.

## Density:

The project's overall density has been carefully planned in accordance with the Paso Robles Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP), which indicates as follow:

1. The maximum number of persons shall not exceed an average of 40 persons per gross acre and;
2. The maximum number of persons shall not exceed 120 per single acre.

As suggested by City Staff, we used the following approach so determine the maximum density per single acre.

## Allowable Maximum Density:

37.1 acres (Gross Site Area) x 40 (persons per acres) $=1,480.4$ persons total.

## Allowable Maximum Density per Safety Zone:

Zone 3: 17.8 Acres $\times 40$ (persons per acres) $=712$ Persons total.
Zone 4: 19.2 Acres x 40 (person per acres) $=768$ Persons total.
Safety Zone 2 has been omitted from calculation as there is no calculated occupied density for this zone.
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| $$ | Parcel | Acre | Calculated Occupancy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | D7 | 115.9 |
|  | 3 | E7 | 43.2 |
|  | 4 | D5 | 118.4 |
|  | 4 | D6 | 24.3 |
|  | 4 | E5 | 87.7 |
|  | 4 | E6 | 81.1 |
|  | 4 | F5 | 91.5 |
|  | 4 | F6 | 110 |
|  |  | Total: | 672.1 |


|  | Parcel | Acre | Calculated Occupancy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | B4 | 18.9 |
|  | 2 | B5 | 18 |
|  | 2 | C4 | 13.5 |
|  | 6 | C1 | 5.4 |
|  | 6 | D0 | 12.6 |
|  | 6 | D1 | 66.6 |
|  |  | Total: | 135 |

As illustrated in the tables above, the occupants per gross acres within each safety zone are well below the allowable maximum density per zone. Please note that the calculated occupancy was derived from the provided Occupant Load Data Table, which breaks down the occupiable space and corresponding occupancy load per acre.

Allowable Density per Single Acre: See Airport Analysis Diagram

## Land Use Intensity Factors:

1. 1.8 Persons per room or group of rooms to be occupied as a suite.
2. 1 Person per 60 sq. ft. of floor area of any restaurants, coffee shops, bars, or night clubs
3. 1 Person per 12 sq. ft. of floor area of public assembly

## Proposed maximum Density:

Parcel 1: No development proposed on this parcel

## Parcel 2:

- Acre B4: 1.8 persons per room $\times$ 10.5 Rooms $=18.9$ Persons
- Acre B5: 1.8 persons per room $\times 10$ Rooms $=18$ Persons
- Acre C4: 1.8 persons per room $\times 7.8$ Rooms $=13.5$ Persons

Each defined acre below 120 persons per acre.
Parcel 3:

- Acre D7*: 1.8 persons per room $\times 56$ (Levels $1-3$ ) Rooms $=100.8$ Persons
- Acre E7: 1.8 persons per room $\times 24$ (Levels 1-3) Rooms $=43.2$ Persons Each defined acre below 120 persons per acre.


## Parcel 4:

- Acre D5: 1.8 persons per room $\times 65.75$ (Levels 1-3) Rooms $=118.4$ Persons
- Acre D6: 1.8 persons per room $\times 13.5$ (Levels 1-3) Rooms $=24.3$ Persons
- Acre E5*: 1.8 persons per room x 23 (Levels 1-2) Rooms $=41.4$ Persons
- Acre E6*: 1.8 persons per room x 31 (Levels 1-2) Rooms $=55.8$ Persons
- Acre F5*: No Guestrooms.
- Acre F6*: No Guestrooms. Each defined acre below 120 persons per acre.

Parcel 5: No development proposed on this parcel

## Parcel 6:

- Acre C1: 1.8 Persons per room x 3 (Levels 1-2) Rooms = 5.4 Persons
- Acre D0: 1.8 Persons per room $\times 7$ (Levels 1-2) Rooms $=12.6$ Persons
- Acre D1: 1.8 Persons per room x 37 (Levels 1-2) Rooms $=66.6$ Persons Each defined acre below 120 persons per acre
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*This defined acre has occupiable space that includes a restaurant, coffee shop, bar or night club with a defined occupancy of one person per 60 sq. ft. of floor area. Please see attached "Occupant Load Data Table" for the complete breakdown of each defined acre for both guestroom occupancy and common area occupancy.

Density of Common Areas: Due to the unique function of the hotel as both a business/leisure destination and an event destination, the hotel has been carefully planned to provide ample space for hotel and function guests for both privacy, enjoyment, and safety. Considering the hotel will both accommodate hotel guests as well as a small portion of the general public visiting the site for dining or special functions, the hotel takes advantage of the natural mesa that occurs at the top of the oak tree ravine on the proposed Parcel 4. It mediates the large density of persons by amassing the majority of the guestrooms at the north end of the mesa, while the event space and restaurant are grouped at the south end of the mesa, distributing the density through a number of acres.

Common areas include the following:
Parcel 1:

- No proposed common areas.
- No proposed guestrooms.


## Parcel 2:

- A lobby/reception for use by hotel guests
- A breakfast area, continental breakfast and seating area for use by hotel guests
- 28 proposed guestrooms distributed across 3 acres


## Parcel 3:

- A lobby/reception for use by hotel guests
- A fitness center for use by hotel guests
- A lobby bar for use by both hotel guests and the general public ( 904 sf . ft.)
- 80 proposed guestrooms distributed across 2 acres

Parcel 4:

- A lobby/reception for use by hotel guests
- A board room for use by hotel guests
- A function room for use by special event guests, consisting of both hotel guests and the general public ( $2,635 \mathrm{sq}$. ft.)
- A pre-function space for use by special event guests prior to events in the ballroom. The ballroom and pre-function will not be occupied simultaneously, so the prefunction space is omitted from our calculations.
- A restaurant for use by hotel guests and the general public ( $1,587 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$.)
- A meeting room for use by hotel guests
- A lobby bar for use by hotel guests and the general public ( $1,077 \mathrm{sq}$. ft.)
- 136 proposed guestrooms distributed across 4 acres

Parcel 5:

- No proposed common areas.
- No proposed guestrooms.

Parcel 6:

- A lobby/reception for use by hotel guests
- A breakfast area, continental breakfast and seating area for use by hotel guests
- 47 proposed guestrooms distributed across 3 acres


## Common Area Total:

Parcel 1: No development proposed on this parcel
Parcel 2: No common areas open to the general public.
Parcel 3: 904 sq . ft. of common area on one acre
Parcel 4: 5,299 sq. ft. of common area distributed over 4 acres
Parcel 5: No development proposed on this parcel
Parcel 6: No common areas open to the general public
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Please note the following:

- The areas specified above as designated 'for use by hotel guests' only have been omitted from our common space calculations. The spaces designated as such are reserved for exclusive use by hotel guests and are not generally leased to the public so the occupants of these are accounted for in the 1.8 occupants assumed for each guestroom.
- For occupancy calculation purposes, all hotels are assumed to have 100 percent occupancy.
- For the purposes of determining maximum occupancy, the areas listed above as available for use by the general public are calculated as 100 percent occupied by non-hotel guest patrons. Since these types are areas open to the public (such as the bar, restaurant and function room), will normally be occupied by a mix of hotel guests and the general public, this assumption is very conservative.


## Occupant Load Data Table:

Included with this memo is an Occupant Load Data Table describing the proposed spaces and breaks down both the guestroom occupancy and common space occupancy for each defined acre. As is clearly indicated in this enclosure, all occupied acres have a calculated density below the maximum occupancy of 120 persons per acre.

## Parking:

We have also looked into the limiting factor that parking may have on our site. The number of parking spaces provided also indicates that the occupancy of this project will be far below the allowable maximums. The project is proposing a total of approximately 388 parking spaces distributed across two Airport Safety Zones. Using an assumed occupancy of 1.5 people per car, the following total site occupancy results:

290 parking spaces in Safety Zone $3 \times 1.5$ persons/parking space** $=435$ Persons 98 parking spaces in Safety Zone $4 \times 1.5$ person/parking spaces** $=147$ Persons
**The assumption regarding the number of people per vehicle is based on the methodology recently presented to Paso Robles for the Residence Inn Project on Union Road that was, in turn, based on the parking requirements in the "Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan - Appendix C: Methods for Determining Concentrations of People."

This total occupancy based on parking spaces is 277 persons below the maximum occupancy of 712 persons based on the gross site area in Safety Zone 3 and 621 persons below the maximum occupancy of 768 persons based on the gross site area in Safety Zone 4.

In summary, our conservative approach to accounting for the various occupancies on the both guestrooms and public area indicates the proposed development will be well below the maximum gross site density and within the 120 persons per single acre.

We thank you for your time and help with this matter.
Michael Stanton FAIA, Principal
Stanton Architecture
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# Attachment 6 Draft Resolution C2 

DRAFT RESOLUTION 16-xxx

A RESOLUTION OF<br>THE PLANNING COMMISSION<br>OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES<br>RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 2692 TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR DESTINO PASO RESORT 3350 AIRPORT ROAD, APN: 025-436-029 \& 025-346-030

WHEREAS, in conjunction with applications filed for Planned Development 08-002 and Conditional Use Permit 08-002 for development of a resort with four (4) hotels, Vesting Tentative Tract Map (VTTM) 2692 has been filed by Karen Stier to subdivide an approximately 40 -acre property into six (6) parcels, ranging in size, as follows:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Lot } 1-0.9 \text { acres } & \text { Lot } 4-12.97 \text { acres } \\
\text { Lot } 2-6.75 \text { acres } & \text { Lot } 5-5.09 \text { acres } \\
\text { Lot } 3-6.3 \text { acres } & \text { Lot } 6-5.00 \text { acres }
\end{array}
$$

WHEREAS, the subject property is designated in the General Plan, Land Use Element as Parks and Open Space with Resort Lodging/ Airport Overlays (PO S/ RL/AP), and the proposed VTTM 2692 is consistent with the intent of the land use designation since the project would provide areas for development of "... hotels in close proximity to golf courses and commercial recreation... and provide resorts, lodging and related ancillary land uses... "; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Vesting Tentative Tract Map 2962 is consistent with applicable new lot development standards in the Parks and Open Space zoning district with Resort Lodging/ Airport Overlays (POS/RL/AP), and includes access to each parcel proposed for development and maintains access to the existing farmhouse, as identified in Exhibit B; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the City's Procedures for Implementing CEQA, an Initial Study was prepared for the project; and

WHEREAS, based on the information and analysis contained in the Initial Study, staff determined that the proposed project as designed, and with appropriate mitigation measures added as conditions of approval, will not result in significant environmental impacts, and a Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for public review and comment in full compliance with CEQA; and

WHEREAS, a duly noticed public hearings were conducted by the Planning Commission on October 11, 2016 and December 13, 2016 on this project to accept public testimony on the Mitigated Negative Declaration and the proposed project; and

WHEREAS, based upon the facts and analysis presented in the staff report, public testimony received and subject to the conditions of approval listed below, the Planning Commission makes the following findings as required by G overnment Code Section 66474:
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1. As conditioned, the proposed tentative subdivision map is consistent with the adopted General Plan for the City of El Paso de Robles by providing areas for commercial recreation and tourism related development.
2. As conditioned, the design of lots, streets, open space, drainage, sewers, water and other improvements is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.
3. The site is physically suitable for the type and density of development proposed.
4. The design of the subdivision is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and unavoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.
5. The design of the subdivision and types of improvements proposed are not likely to cause serious public health problems.
6. The design of the subdivision and the type of improvements proposed will not conflict with easements acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of, property within the proposed subdivision.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles does hereby recommend approval of tentative map approval VTTM 2692 to the City Council, subject to the following conditions of this resolution:

## STANDARD CONDITIONS:

1. The applicant/ developer shall comply with those standard conditions which are indicated as applicable in "Exhibit A" to this resolution. When future applications are submitted to the City for development of the newly created lots, additional site specific conditions will apply. Note: All checked standard conditions shall apply unless superseded by a site specific condition.

## COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SITE SPECIFIC CONDITIONS:

NOTE: In the event of conflict or duplication between standard and site specific conditions, the site specific condition shall supersede the standard condition.
2. The project shall be constructed so as to substantially conform with the following listed exhibits and conditions established by this resolution:

EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION
A. Standard Conditions
B. Vesting Tentative Tract Map 2692
C. Preliminary G rading and D rainage
3. Vesting Tentative Tract Map 2692 authorizes the subdivision of approximately 40 acres into six (6) lots ranging in size as follows: Lot $1-0.9$ acres, Lot $4-12.97$ acres, Lot $2-6.75$ acres, Lot $5-5.09$ acres, Lot $3-6.3$ acres, Lot $6-5.00$ acres
4. The Final Subdivision Map shall be in substantial compliance with the tentative subdivision map, and preliminary grading plan (Exhibits B \& C), reductions attached; full size copies are on file in the Community D evelopment D epartment) and as amended by site specific and standard conditions contained in this resolution.
5. Grading of the tract shall be consistent with City's applicable G rading Regulations.

## ENGINEERING SITE SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

6. The Final Tract Map shall include an easement between the newly dedicated road and the property to the north precluding the need for the driveway on Airport Road directly to the north.
7. Prior to recordation of the Final Map, and in conjunction with construction of the newly dedicated road, rough grade the easement to the north. The applicant shall work with the property owner to the north to complete the connection to eliminate, or at least provide an alternative to their existing driveway.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 13 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ day of December, 2016 by the following Roll Call Vote:
AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:
Bob Rollins, Chairman

## ATTEST:

Warren Frace, Secretary of the Planning Commission

## EXHIBIT A OF RESOLUTION

## CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES STANDARD DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS

$\square$ Planned Development $\qquad$ Conditional Use Permit
Ø Tentative Tract Map
Date of Approval: December 13, 2016
Location: 3350 Airport Road

APN: 025-436-029 \& 025-346-030

The following conditions that have been checked are standard conditions of approval for the above referenced project. The checked conditions shall be complied with in their entirety before the project can be finalized, unless otherwise specifically indicated. In addition, there may be site specific conditions of approval that apply to this project in the resolution.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT - The applicant shall contact the Community Development Department, (805) 237-3970, for compliance with the following conditions:

## A. GENERAL CONDITIONS - PD/CUP:

1. This project approval shall expire on October 11, 2018 unless a time extension request is filed with the Community Development Department, or a State mandated automatic time extension is applied prior to expiration.
2. The site shall be developed and maintained in accordance with the approved plans and unless specifically provided for through the Planned Development process shall not waive compliance with any sections of the Zoning Code, all other applicable City Ordinances, and applicable Specific Plans.
3. To the extent allowable by law, Owner agrees to hold City harmless from costs and expenses, including attorney's fees, incurred by City or held to be the liability of City in connection with City's defense of its actions in any proceeding brought in any State or Federal court challenging the City's actions with respect to the project. Owner understands and acknowledges that City is under no obligation to defend any legal actions challenging the City's actions with respect to the project.
$\square \quad$ 4. Any site specific condition imposed by the Planning Commission in approving this project (Conditional Use Permit) may be modified or eliminated, or new conditions may be added, provided that the Planning Commission shall first
conduct a public hearing in the same manner as required for the approval of this project. No such modification shall be made unless the Commission finds that such modification is necessary to protect the public interest and/or neighboring properties, or, in the case of deletion of an existing condition, that such action is necessary to permit reasonable operation and use for this approval.
4. The site shall be kept in a neat manner at all times and the landscaping shall be continuously maintained in a healthy and thriving condition.
5. All signs shall be subject to review and approval as required by Municipal Code Section 21.19 and shall require a separate application and approval prior to installation of any sign.

All walls/fences and exposed retaining walls shall be constructed of decorative materials which include but are not limited to splitface block, slumpstone, stuccoed block, brick, wood, crib walls or other similar materials as determined by the Development Review Committee, but specifically excluding precision block.
8. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit a landscape and irrigation plan consistent with the Landscape and Irrigation Ordinance, shall be submitted for City review and approval. The plan needs to be designed in a manner that utilizes drought tolerant plants, trees and ground covers and minimizes, if not eliminates the use of turf. The irrigation plan shall utilize drip irrigation and limit the use of spray irrigation. All existing and/or new landscaping shall be installed with automatic irrigation systems.
9. A reciprocal parking and access easement and agreement for site access, parking, and maintenance of all project entrances, parking areas, landscaping, hardscape, common open space, areas and site lighting standards and fixtures, shall be recorded prior to or in conjunction with the Final Map. Said easement and agreement shall apply to all properties, and be referenced in the site Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC\&Rs).
$\square \quad$ 10. All outdoor storage shall be screened from public view by landscaping and walls or fences per Section 21.21.110 of the Municipal Code.
11. For commercial, industrial, office or multi-family projects, all refuse enclosures are required to provide adequate space for recycling bins. The enclosure shall be architecturally compatible with the primary building. Gates shall be view obscuring and constructed of durable materials. Check with Paso Robles Waste Disposal to determine the adequate size of enclosure based on the number and size of containers to be stored in the enclosure.
12. For commercial, industrial, office or multi-family projects, all existing and/or new ground-mounted appurtenances such as air-conditioning condensers, electrical
transformers, backflow devices etc., shall be screened from public view through the use of decorative walls and/or landscaping subject to approval by the Community Development Director or his designee. Details shall be included in the building plans.
$\square$ 13. All existing and/or new roof appurtenances such as air-conditioning units, grease hoods, etc. shall be screened from public view. The screening shall be architecturally integrated with the building design and constructed of compatible materials to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or his designee. Details shall be included in the building plans.
14. All existing and/or new lighting shall be shielded so as to be directed downward in such a manner as to not create off-site glare or adversely impact adjacent properties. The style, location and height of the lighting fixtures shall be submitted with the building plans and shall be subject to approval by the Community Development Director or his designee.
15. It is the property owner's responsibility to insure that all construction of private property improvements occur on private property. It is the owner's responsibility to identify the property lines and insure compliance by the owner's agents.
16. Any existing Oak trees located on the project site shall be protected and preserved as required in City Ordinance No. 835 N.S., Municipal Code No. 10.01 "Oak Tree Preservation", unless specifically approved to be removed. An Oak tree inventory shall be prepared listing the Oak trees, their disposition, and the proposed location of any replacement trees required. In the event an Oak tree is designated for removal, an approved Oak Tree Removal Permit must be obtained from the City, prior to removal.17. No storage of trash cans or recycling bins shall be permitted within the public right-of-way.
18. Prior to recordation of the map or prior to occupancy of a project, all conditions of approval shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and Community Developer Director or his designee.
$\square$ 19. Two sets of the revised Planning Commission approved plans incorporating all Conditions of Approval, standard and site specific, shall be submitted to the Community Development Department prior to the issuance of building permits.
$\square \quad$ 20. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Development Review Committee shall approve the following: Planning Division Staff shall approve the following:
$\square$ a. A detailed site plan indicating the location of all structures, parking layout, outdoor storage areas, walls, fences and
trash enclosures;
b. A detailed landscape plan;
c. Detailed building elevations of all structures indicating materials, colors, and architectural treatments;
d. Other: grading plan review

## B. GENERAL CONDITIONS - TRACT/PARCEL MAP:

$\boxtimes$ 1. In accordance with Government Section 66474.9, the subdivider shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City, or its agent, officers and employees, from any claim, action or proceeding brought within the time period provided for in Government Code section 66499.37, against the City, or its agents, officers, or employees, to attack, set aside, void, annul the City's approval of this subdivision. The City will promptly notify subdivider of any such claim or action and will cooperate fully in the defense thereof.
2. The Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC\&Rs) and/or Articles Affecting Real Property Interests are subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department, the Public Works Department and/or the City Attorney. They shall be recorded concurrently with the Final Map or prior to the issuance of building permits, whichever occurs first. A recorded copy shall be provided to the affected City Departments.
3. The owner shall petition to annex residential Tract (or Parcel Map) $\qquad$ into the City of Paso Robles Community Facilities District No. 2005-1 for the purposes of mitigation of impacts on the City's Police and Emergency Services Departments.
4. Street names shall be submitted for review and approval by the Planning Commission, prior to approval of the final map.
5. The following areas shall be permanently maintained by the property owner, Homeowners' Association, or other means acceptable to the City:

Destino Paso Way

ENGINEERING DIVISION- The applicant shall contact the Engineering Division, (805) 2373860, for compliance with the following conditions:

All conditions marked are applicable to the above referenced project for the phase indicated.

## C. PRIOR TO ANY PLAN CHECK:

$\boxtimes$ 1. The applicant shall enter into an Engineering Plan Check and Inspection Services Agreement with the City.

## D. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A GRADING PERMIT:

1. Prior to approval of a grading plan, the developer shall apply through the City, to FEMA and receive a Letter of Map Amendment (LOMA) issued from FEMA. The developer's engineer shall provide the required supporting data to justify the application.
2. Any existing Oak trees located on the project site shall be protected and preserved as required in City Ordinance No. 553, Municipal Code No. 10.01 "Oak Tree Preservation", unless specifically approved to be removed. An Oak tree inventory shall be prepared listing the Oak trees, their disposition, and the proposed location of any replacement trees required. In the event an Oak tree is designated for removal, an approved Oak Tree Removal Permit must be obtained from the City, prior to its removal.
$\boxtimes \quad$ 3. A complete grading and drainage plan shall be prepared for the project by a registered civil engineer and subject to approval by the City Engineer. The project shall conform to the City's Storm Water Discharge Ordinance.
3. A Preliminary Soils and/or Geology Report providing technical specifications for grading of the site shall be prepared by a Geotechnical Engineer.
$\boxtimes \quad$ 5. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan per the State General Permit for Strom Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity shall be provided for any site that disturbs greater than or equal to one acre, including projects that are less than one acre that are part of a larger plan of development or sale that would disturb more than one acre.

## E. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT:

1. All off-site public improvement plans shall be prepared by a registered civil engineer and shall be submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval. The improvements shall be designed and placed to the Public Works Department Standards and Specifications.2. The applicant shall submit a composite utility plan signed as approved by a representative of each public utility.3. Landscape and irrigation plans for the public right-of-way shall be incorporated into the improvement plans and shall require approval by the Streets Division Supervisor and the Community Development Department.4. In a special Flood Hazard Area as indicated on a Flood Insurance Rate Map
(FIRM) the owner shall provide an Elevation Certificate in accordance with the National Flood Insurance program. This form must be completed by a land surveyor or civil engineer licensed in the State of California.

## F. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY OR RECORDATION OF THE FINAL MAP:

## The Planning Commission has made a finding that the fulfillment of the construction requirements listed below are a necessary prerequisite to the orderly development of the surrounding area.

$\boxtimes$ 1. The applicant shall pay any current and outstanding fees for Engineering Plan Checking and Construction Inspection services.
$\boxtimes \quad$ 2. All public improvements are completed and approved by the City Engineer, and accepted by the City Council for maintenance.
$\boxtimes \quad$ 3. The owner shall offer to dedicate and improve the following street(s) to the standard indicated:

## Destino Paso Way

| Street Name $\quad$ City Standard | Standard Drawing No. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

4. If, at the time of approval of the final map, any required public improvements have not been completed and accepted by the City the owner shall be required to enter into a Subdivision Agreement with the City in accordance with the Subdivision Map Act.

Bonds required and the amount shall be as follows: Performance Bond $\qquad$ 100\% of improvement costs.
Labor and Materials Bond........50\% of performance bond.
$\boxtimes \quad$ 5. If the existing City street adjacent to the frontage of the project is inadequate for the traffic generated by the project, or will be severely damaged by the construction, the applicant shall excavate the entire structural section and replace it with a standard half-width street plus a 12' wide travel lane and 8' wide graded shoulder adequate to provide for two-way traffic.
$\boxtimes \quad$ 6. If the existing pavement and structural section of the City street adjacent to the frontage of the project is adequate, the applicant shall provide a new structural section from the proposed curb to the edge of pavement and shall overlay the existing paving to centerline for a smooth transition.
$\boxtimes \quad$ 7. Due to the number of utility trenches required for this project, the City Council adopted Pavement Management Program requires a pavement overlay on Airport Road along the frontage of the project.
$\boxtimes \quad$ 8. The applicant shall install all utilities. Street lights shall be installed at locations as required by the City Engineer. All existing overhead utilities adjacent to or within the project shall be relocated underground except for electrical lines 77 kilovolts or greater. All utilities shall be extended to the boundaries of the project.
9. The owner shall offer to dedicate to the City the following easement(s). The location and alignment of the easement(s) shall be to the description and satisfaction of the City Engineer:

a. Public Utilities Easement;
b. Water Line Easement;
c. Sewer Facilities Easement;
d. Landscape Easement;
e. Storm Drain Easement.
$\square$ 10. The developer shall annex to the City's Landscape and Lighting District for payment of the operating and maintenance costs of the following:

a. Street lights;
b. Parkway/open space landscaping;
c. Wall maintenance in conjunction with landscaping;
d. Graffiti abatement;
e. Maintenance of open space areas.
11. For a building with a Special Flood Hazard Area as indicated on a Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the developer shall provide an Elevation Certificate in accordance with the National Flood Insurance Program. This form must be completed by a lands surveyor or civil engineer licensed in the State of California.
$\boxtimes \quad$ 12. All final property corners shall be installed.
$\boxtimes \quad$ 13. All areas of the project shall be protected against erosion by hydro seeding or landscaping.
$\boxtimes \quad$ 14. All construction refuse shall be separated (i.e. concrete, asphalt concrete, wood gypsum board, etc.) and removed from the project in accordance with the City's Source Reduction and Recycling Element.
15. Clear blackline mylars and paper prints of record drawings, signed by the engineer of record, shall be provided to the City Engineer prior to the final inspection. An electronic autocad drawing file registered to the California State Plane - Zone 5 / NAD83 projected coordinate system, units in survey feet, shall be provided.
$\qquad$ -)

PASO ROBLES DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY SERVICES- The applicant shall contact the Department of Emergency Services, (805) 227-7560, for compliance with the following conditions:

## G. GENERAL CONDITIONS

1. $\square \quad$ Prior to the start of construction:
$\square$ Plans shall be reviewed, approved and permits issued by Emergency Services for underground fire lines.
$\square$ Applicant shall provide documentation to Emergency Services that required fire flows can be provided to meet project demands.
$\square$ Fire hydrants shall be installed and operative to current, adopted edition of the California Fire Code.
$\square$ A based access road sufficient to support the department's fire apparatus (HS-20 truck loading) shall be constructed and maintained for the duration of the construction phase of the project.
$\square$ Access road shall be at least twenty (20) feet in width with at least thirteen (13) feet, six (6) inches of vertical clearance.
2. $\square$ Provide central station monitored fire sprinkler system for all residential, commercial and industrial buildings that require fire sprinklers in current, adopted edition of the California Building Code, California Fire Code and Paso Robles Municipal Code.
$\square$ Plans shall be reviewed, approved and permits issued by Emergency Services for the installation of fire sprinkler systems.
3. $\square$ Provide central station monitored fire alarm system for all residential, commercial and industrial buildings that require fire alarm system in current, adopted edition of the California Building Code, California Fire Code and Paso Robles Municipal Code.
4. $\square$ If required by the Fire Chief, provide on the address side of the building if applicable:


Fire alarm annunciator panel in weatherproof case.
Knox box key entry box or system.
Fire department connection to fire sprinkler system.
5. $\quad \square \quad$ Provide temporary turn-around to current City Engineering Standard for phased construction streets that exceed 150 feet in length.
6. $\square$ Project shall comply with all requirements in current, adopted edition of California Fire Code and Paso Robles Municipal Code.
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7. $\square \quad$ Prior to the issuance of Certificate of Occupancy:

Final inspections shall be completed on all underground fire lines, fire sprinkler systems, fire alarm systems and chemical hood fire suppression systems.

Final inspections shall be completed on all buildings.
$\qquad$ -)
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# Attachment 7 Draft Resolution D2 

DRAFT RESOLUTION 16-xxx

## A RESOLUTION OF <br> THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES RECOMMENDING APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL <br> OF AN OAK TREE REMOVAL (OTR 16-009) <br> FOR DESTINO PASO RESORT 3350 AIRPORT ROAD, APN'S: 025-436-029 \& 025-436-030

WHEREAS, in conjunction with Planned Development Amendment 08-002, Conditional Use Permit Amendment 08-002, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map 2962, an Oak Tree Removal (OTR 16-009) application has been filed by Karen Stier for the Destino Paso Resort, with four (4) hotels and up to 291 rooms and ancillary site improvements; and

WHEREAS, the application for OTR 16-009 includes a request to remove six (6) oak trees; and
WHEREAS, the applicant submitted an Arborist Report and Oak Tree Protection Plan (Exhibit A and B) for the project, which includes an inventory of 156 oak trees on the project site. The report indicates that the majority of oak trees (which are included in an oak woodland area would not be impacted by the project, but that the proposed oak tree removals are necessary to facilitate property frontage improvements and parking lots; and

WHEREAS, the Arborist Report indicates that the condition of the oak trees proposed for removal range between poor $=1$, to good $=9$ as follows:

| Tree Number | Size (inches at dbh) | Rank/ Tree Condition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $30^{\prime \prime}$ | $1-$ poor |
| 2 | $30^{\prime \prime}$ | $2-$ poor |
| 18 | $46^{\prime \prime}$ | $2-$ poor |
| 19 | $18^{\prime \prime}$ | $5-$ average |
| 20 | $6^{\prime \prime}$ | $9-$ good |
| 156 | $7^{\prime \prime}$ | $5-$ average |

WHEREAS, oak tree protection measures are also incorporated into the plan to reduce potential impacts to oak trees that are located near areas proposed for development; and

WHEREAS, the Arborist Report also includes oak tree replacement mitigation measures in compliance with the City's adopted Oak Tree Protection O rdinance (Ordinance No. 835 N.S.); and

WHEREAS, the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance establishes factors to consider for requests to remove healthy oak trees, and compensatory mitigation, should oak trees be approved for removal, which includes the following:

1. The condition of the oak tree(s) with respect to its general health, status as a public nuisanoe, danger of falling, prox imity to ex isting or proposed structures, interference with utility servios, and its status as host for a plant, pest or disease endangering other species of trees or plants with infection or infestation;
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Trees \#1, \#2, \#18, \#19 \& \#156 are in poor to average condition of health, and tree \#20 is in good condition.
2. The necessity of the requested action to allow construction of improvements or otherwise allow reasonable use of the property for the purpose for which it has been zoned. In this context, it shall be the burden of the person seeking the permit to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the director that there are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed design and use of the property. E very reasonable effort shall be made to avoid impacting oak trees, induding but not limited to use of custom building design and incurring ex traordinary costs to save oak trees;

The location of the trees conflict with the ability to complete street frontage improvements on Airport Road, and/ or are located in areas proposed proposed for hotel parking lots. The trees in the parking lots are in average condition, and the tree in good health (\#20) is within the public right-of-way necessary for frontage improvements on Airport Road.
3. The topography of land, and the potential effect of the requested tree removal on soil retention, water retention, and diversion or increased flow of surface waters. The director shall consider how either the preservation or removal of the oak treef(s) would relate to grading and drainage. Ex øept as speaifically authorized by the planning commission and city coundil, ravines, stream beds and other natural wateroourses that provide a habitat for oak trees shall not be disturbed:

There are no water features, soil conditions or drainage patterns on the site that would be disrupted by the removal of the oak trees.
4. The number, species, size and location of ex isting trees in the area and the effect of the requested action on shade areas, air pollution, historic values, scenic beauty and the general welfare of the city as a whole;

The quality of the oak trees proposed for removal are mostly poor to average, and would not significantly impact scenic values to the general welfare of the City.
5. G ood forestry practioes such as, but not limited to, the number of healthy trees the subject parool of land will support.

The other existing oak trees located on the site will be preserved with development of the property. The landscape plan includes planting oak tree replacements on the site.

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the City's Procedures for Implementing CEQ A, an Initial Study was prepared for the project; and

WHEREAS, based on the information and analysis contained in the Initial Study, staff determined that the proposed project as designed, and with appropriate mitigation measures added as conditions of approval, will not result in significant environmental impacts, and a Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for public review and comment in full compliance with CEQA; and

WHEREAS, a duly noticed public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission on October 11, 2016 and on December 13, 2016 on this project to accept public testimony on the Mitigated Negative D eclaration and the project; and

WHEREAS, at the conclusion of the December 13, 2016 Planning Commission meeting, the Commission recommended that the City Council adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and approve Planned Development Amendment 08-002, Conditional Use Permit Amendment 08-002, Vesting Tentative Tract Map 2962, and Oak Tree Removal 16-009; and
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WHEREAS, any oak tree removals requested to accommodate the proposed development site plan shall be approved by the City Council at a future meeting, with oak tree replacements established in compliance with the City's O ak Tree Preservation Ordinance; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles does hereby recommend approval of OTR 16-009 to the City Council.

PASSED AND AD OPTED THIS 13th day of December, 2016 by the following Roll Call Vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

Bob Rollins, Chairperson
ATTEST:

Warren Frace, Secretary of the Planning Commission

Exhibits:
A. Nov. 2016- Updated Arborist Report
B. $\quad 6 / 2 / 16$ Project Arborist Report
C. Tree Condition Survey

# Oak Tree Protection Plan 

Destino Paso Resort Hotel, Airport Road<br>Prepared By<br>Chip Tamagni<br>Certified Arborist \#WE 6436-A<br>Certified Hazard Risk Assessor \#1209

Steven Alvarez
Certified Arborist \#WE 0511-A
P.O. Box 1311

Templeton, CA 93465
(805) 434-0131

As consulting arborists, we have been hired to inform and educate how to protect trees both during the design phase and construction. Different species can adapt to more impacts than others just as young trees can sustain more root disturbance that older trees. All individuals and firms involved in the planning stages should be made completely aware of the limitations regarding setbacks from critical root zones that are recommended to protect the trees. When we are given a plan, it should show all possible disturbances within the critical root zone areas. This includes all cuts, fills, over-excavation limits, building clearances, and all utilities. We will suggest changes if we feel the impacts are too great and it is up to the owner or their designee to follow our recommendations. If the plan we receive is not complete with potential impacts, we will fairly assume any additions will fall completely out of the critical root zone areas. It is the burden of the property owner or their designee to inform us of any changes, omissions, or deletions that may impact the critical root zone area of the trees in any way.

It is the responsibility of the owner to provide a copy of this tree protection plan to any and all contractors and subs that work within the critical root zone of any native tree. We recommend making it mandatory that the grading/trenching operator have all of his/her employees sign that they have read this plan plans. It is highly recommended that all other contractors sign and acknowledge this tree protection plan as well. In addition, each their respective employees shall be made aware of this tree plan.

The term "critical root zone" is often referred to in this report. The CRZ is an imaginary circle around the trunk of the tree with a radius in feet equal to the tree's diameter in inches. Therefore, a 10 inch diameter tree would have a critical root zone with a 10 foot radius.

This tree evaluation and protection plan is in regard to Destino Paso on Airport Road. Plans are to construct four new hotels with parking. During the original tree inventory for a previous project, we inventoried 155 oak trees that may have had the potential to be impacted during construction. The species on site include both blue oaks (Quercus douglasii) and valley oaks (Quercus lobata). There are literally twice that many trees on the property with the majority being completely out of the impact areas. There are seven trees being proposed for removal at this time. Tree \#1 is a 30 " blue oak that is in major decline. It is located at the edge of the planned parking lot for one of the hotels. In the last 8 years, this tree has steadily declined to a point where only about $10 \%$ of its live canopy remains. The plans originally called for this tree to be saved, however, its useful life expectancy is probably less than three years at best. Tree \#2 is located in the middle of the same parking lot. This tree is also a 30" blue oak. It is also showing signs of decline such as excessive dieback. Trees \#18 (46"), \#19 (18"), \#20 (9"), and tree \#156 (7") are all valley oaks located directly adjacent to Airport Road and will be in the way of improvements in that area. The large tree in this section is in poor condition with major deadwood beginning to fail from the upper canopy. Tree \#155 was originally
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slated to be removed. Due to the fact it is a quality tree, North Coast Engineering has redesigned the roadway and parking lot sections to save the tree. The critical root zone encroachment will be approximately $15 \%$ that will include some cut to accommodate recompaction at the bottom of the slope. The other blue oak in this area is tree \#154 (31") which was slated to have soil cut away from the critical root zone on the downslope side and the hotel on the south side. The engineer has slightly shifted the road to reduce impacts to this tree. The storm drain has also been designed to run down the center of the roadway.

In addition to the standard mitigation measures listed later in this report, the following items are of significant importance. There is a planned deck that will encroach into the CRZ of tree \#48. Due to the ideal shape of the canopy, very minor trimming will have to occur to accommodate the deck. Deck shall be constructed using pier/post or similar to minimize impacts to the CRZ of this tree. Tree \#60 has some simple dg paths passing through the CRZ which should pose no problem. Other than the previous concerns regarding trees \#154 and \#155, there do no appear to be any other impacts to the trees.

Projects usually require an on-site pre-construction meeting with the city, owner, grading contractor and the arborist. Topics will include fencing, monitoring and requirements for a positive final occupancy letter. It is the owner's responsibility to adequately inform us prior to any meetings where we need to be present.

All trees potentially impacted by this project are numbered and identified on both the grading plan and the spreadsheet. Trees whose CRZ edges are greater than 50 feet from site disturbance will generally not be tagged and inventoried. Trees that are inherently protected by other saved trees will also not be tagged. Trees are numbered on the grading plans and in the field with an aluminum tag. Tree protection fencing is shown on the grading plan.

## Tree Rating System

A rating system of 1-10 was used for visually establishing the overall condition of each tree on the spreadsheet.

Determining factors include:

- Previous impacts to tree root zone
- Observation of cavities, conks or other structurally limiting factors
- Pest, fungal, or bacterial disorders
- Past failures
- Current growth habit

The rating system is defined as follows:

Rating Condition

0
1 Evidence of massive past failures, extreme disease and is in severe decline.
2
3

4
5

6

10
Deceased

May be saved with attention to class 4 pruning, insect/pest eradication and future monitoring. Some past failures, some pests or structural defects that may be mitigated by class IV pruning. May have had minor past failures, excessive deadwood or minor structural defects that can be mitigated with pruning. Relatively healthy tree with little visual structural and or pest defects.
Healthy tree that probably can be left in its natural state. Future pruning may be required.
The tree has had proper arboricultural pruning and attention or have no apparent structural defects. Specimen tree with perfect shape, structure and foliage in a protected setting (i.e. park, arboretum).

The following mitigation measures/methods must be fully understood and followed by anyone working within the drip line of any native tree. Any necessary clarification will be provided by us (the arborists) upon request.

Fencing: The proposed fencing shall be shown in orange ink on the grading plan. It must be a minimum of 4 high chain link, snow or safety fence staked at the edge of the CRZ or line of encroachment for each tree or group of trees. The fence shall be up before any construction or earth moving begins. The owner or their designee shall be responsible for maintaining an erect fence throughout the construction period. The arborist(s), upon notification, will inspect the fence placement once it is erected. After this time, fencing shall not be moved without arborist inspection/approval. If the orange plastic fencing is used, a minimum of four zip ties shall be used on each stake to secure the fence. All efforts shall be made to maximize the distance from each saved tree. The fencing must be constructed prior to the city pre-construction meeting for inspection by the city and the arborists. Fence maintenance is an issue with many job sites. Windy conditions and other issues can cause the fence to sage and fall. Keeping it erect should be a part of any general contractor's bid for a project. Down fencing is one of the causes for a stop work notice to be placed on a project.

Soil Aeration Methods: Soils within the CRZ that have been compacted by heavy equipment and/or construction activities must be returned to their original state before all work is completed. Methods include adding specialized soil conditioners, water jetting, adding organic matter, and boring small holes with an auger (18" deep, 2-3' apart with a $2-4$ " auger) and the application of moderate amounts of nitrogen fertilizer. The arborist(s) shall advise.

## Agenda Item 1

Chip Mulch: All areas within the CRZ of the trees that cannot be fenced shall receive a 4-6" layer of chip mulch to retain moisture, soil structure and reduce the effects of soil compaction.

Trenching Within CRZ: All trenching/excavation for foundations within the CRZ of native trees shall be hand dug. All major roots shall be avoided whenever possible. All exposed roots larger than 1 " in diameter shall be clean cut with sharp pruning tools and not left ragged. A Mandatory meeting between the arborists and grading/trenching contractor(s) shall take place prior to work start. This activity shall be monitored by the arborist(s) to insure proper root pruning is talking place. Any landscape architects and contractors involved shall not design any irrigation or other features within any drip line unless previously approved by the project arborist.

Grading Within CRZ: Grading shall not encroach within the drip line unless approved by the project arborist. Grading should not disrupt the normal drainage pattern around the trees. Fills should not create a ponding condition and excavations should not leave the tree on a rapidly draining mound.

Exposed Roots: Any exposed roots shall be re-covered the same day they were exposed. If they cannot, they must be covered with burlap or another suitable material and wetted down 2 x per day until re-buried.

Paving Within The CRZ: The preferred method on paving within the drip line consists of placing base material on existing grade. Any grade lowering removes important surface roots. Pavers can be used with limitations. The base material must be above natural grade and the curbing to retain the pavers shall not be trenched any deeper than six inches into the natural grade.

Equipment Operation: Vehicles and all heavy equipment shall not be driven under the trees, as this will contribute to soil compaction. Also there is to be no parking of equipment or personal vehicles in these areas. All areas behind fencing are off limits unless pre-approved by the arborist. All soil compaction within drip line areas shall be mitigated as described previously.

Existing Surfaces: The existing ground surface within the CRZ of all native trees shall not be cut, filled, compacted or pared, unless shown on the grading plans and approved by the arborist.

Construction Materials And Waste: No liquid or solid construction waste shall be dumped on the ground within the CRZ of any native tree. The CRZ areas are not for storage of materials either. Any violations shall be remedied through proper cleanup approved by the project arborist at the expense of the owner.

Arborist Monitoring: An arborist shall be present for selected activities (trees identified on spreadsheet and items bulleted below). The monitoring does not necessarily have to be continuous but observational at times during these activities. It is the responsibility of the owner(s) or their designee to inform us prior to these events so we can make arrangements to be present. It is the responsibility of the owner to contract (prior to construction) a locally licensed and insured arborist that will document all monitoring activities.
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- pre-construction fence placement
- any utility or drainage trenching within any CRZ
- All grading and trenching near trees requiring monitoring on the spreadsheet

Pre-Construction Meeting: An on-site pre-construction meeting with the Arborist(s), Owner(s), Planning Staff, and all contractors and subs is highly recommended prior to the start of any work. At a minimum, the grading contractor shall be present. It is the sole responsibility of the owner that all topics covered during the preconstruction meeting are appropriately passed on to non-present contractors. Prior to final occupancy, a letter from the arborist(s) shall be required verifying the health and condition of all impacted trees and providing any recommendations for any additional mitigation. The letter shall verify that the arborist(s) were on site for all grading and/or trenching activity that encroached into the CRZ of the selected native trees, and that all work done in these areas was completed to the standards set forth above.

Pruning: All native tree pruning shall be completed by a licensed and insured D49 tree trimming contractor that has a valid city business license. Class 4 pruning includes: Crown reduction pruning consisting of reduction of tops, sides or individual limbs. A trained arborist shall perform all pruning. No pruning shall take more than $25 \%$ of the live crown of any native tree. Any trees that may need pruning for road/home clearance shall be pruned prior to any grading activities to avoid any branch tearing.

Landscape: All landscape under the CRZ shall be drought tolerant or native varieties. Lawns shall be avoided. All irrigation trenching shall be routed around drip lines; otherwise above ground drip-irrigation shall be used. It is the owner's responsibility to notify the landscape architect and contractor regarding this mitigation. The project arborist shall approve all landscape materials and irrigation within the CRZ of any oak tree.

Utility Placement: All utilities and sewer/storm drains shall be placed down the roads/driveways and when possible outside of the CRZ. If roads exist between two trees, the utilities shall be routed down the middle of the road or completely hand dug. The arborist shall supervise trenching within the CRZ. All trenches in these areas shall be exposed by air spade or hand dug with utilities routed under/over the roots. Roots greater than 2 inches in diameter shall not be cut.

Fertilization and Cultural Practices: As the project moves toward completion, the arborist(s) may suggest fertilization, insecticide, fungicide, soil amendments, and/or mycorrhiza applications that will benefit tree health.

The included spreadsheet includes trees listed by number, species and multiple stems if applicable, diameter and breast height (4.5'), condition (scale from poor to excellent), status (avoided, impacted, removed, exempt), percent of drip line impacted, mitigation required (fencing, root pruning, monitoring), construction impact (trenching, grading), recommended pruning and individual tree notes.

If all the above mitigation measures are followed, we feel there will be no additional long-term significant impacts to the remaining native trees.

A \& T Arborists strongly suggests that the responsible party (owner of their designee) make copies of this report. Any reproduction by A \& T Arborists or changes to this original report will require an additional charge.

Please let us know if we can be of any future assistance to you for this project.
Steven G. Alvarez
Certified Arborist \#WC 0511

Chip Tamagni
Certified Arborist \#WE 6436-A
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As consulting arborists, we have been hired to inform and educate how to protect trees both during the design phase and construction. Different species can adapt to more impacts than others just as young trees can sustain more root disturbance that older trees. All individuals and firms involved in the planning stages should be made completely aware of the limitations regarding setbacks from critical root zones that are recommended to protect the trees. When we are given a plan, it should show all possible disturbances within the critical root zone areas. This includes all cuts, fills, over-excavation limits, building clearances, and all utilities. We will suggest changes if we feel the impacts are too great and it is up to the owner or their designee to follow our recommendations. If the plan we receive is not complete with potential impacts, we will fairly assume any additions will fall completely out of the critical root zone areas. It is the burden of the property owner or their designee to inform us of any changes, omissions, or deletions that may impact the critical root zone area of the trees in any way.

It is the responsibility of the owner to provide a copy of this tree protection plan to any and all contractors and subs that work within the critical root zone of any native tree. We recommend making it mandatory that the grading/trenching operator have all of his/her employees sign that they have read this plan plans. It is highly recommended that all other contractors sign and acknowledge this tree protection plan as well. In addition, each their respective employees shall be made aware of this tree plan.

The term "critical root zone" is often referred to in this report. The CRZ is an imaginary circle around the trunk of the tree with a radius in feet equal to the tree's diameter in inches. Therefore, a 10 inch diameter tree would have a critical root zone with a 10 foot radius.

This tree evaluation and protection plan is in regard to Destino Paso on Airport Road. Plans are to construct four new hotels with parking. During the original tree inventory for a previous project, we inventoried 155 oak trees that may have had the potential to be impacted during construction. The species on site include both blue oaks (Quercus douglasii) and valley oaks (Quercus lobata). There are literally twice that many trees on the property with the majority being completely out of the impact areas. There are seven trees being proposed for removal at this time. Tree \#1 is a 30 " blue oak that is in major decline. It is located at the edge of the planned parking lot for one of the hotels. In the last 8 years, this tree has steadily declined to a point where only about $10 \%$ of its live canopy remains. The plans originally called for this tree to be saved, however, its useful life expectancy is probably less than three years at best. Tree \#2 is located in the middle of the same parking lot. This tree is also a 30" blue oak. It is also showing signs of decline such as excessive dieback. Trees \#18 (46"), \#19 (18"), \#20 (9"), and tree \#156 (7") are all valley oaks located directly adjacent to Airport Road and will be in the way of improvements in that area. The large tree in this section is in poor condition with major deadwood beginning to fail from the upper canopy. Tree \#155 (39") blue oak is
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located directly in the roadway to the hotel on the south side. Unfortunately, this tre Fiswibit B one of the better trees on the property. We would like to see this tree saved. It is a focal tree directly off of Airport Road and it would be a shame to remove it. The other issue we have in this area is tree \#154 (31") is slated to have soil cut away from the critical root zone on the downslope side and cut for over-excavation on the south side to accommodate the hotel. We strongly feel this tree will not survive these impacts. We feel that the road could be re-oriented in addition to the parking lot and hotel being built a little smaller to accommodate these two trees. We also noticed there is ample space higher up in the property that could potentially be used for the hotel site and not impact any trees at all. Some decisions need to be made with regard to these two trees as removing them does not follow the spirit of the Paso Robles Oak Tree Ordinance.

In addition to the standard mitigation measures listed later in this report, the following items are of significant importance. There is a planned deck that will encroach into the CRZ of tree \#48. Due to the ideal shape of the canopy, very minor trimming will have to occur to accommodate the deck. Deck shall be constructed using pier/post or similar to minimize impacts to the CRZ of this tree. Tree \#60 has some simple dg paths passing through the CRZ which should pose no problem. Other than the previous concerns regarding trees \#154 and \#155, there do no appear to be any other impacts to the trees.

Projects usually require an on-site pre-construction meeting with the city, owner, grading contractor and the arborist. Topics will include fencing, monitoring and requirements for a positive final occupancy letter. It is the owner's responsibility to adequately inform us prior to any meetings where we need to be present.

All trees potentially impacted by this project are numbered and identified on both the grading plan and the spreadsheet. Trees whose CRZ edges are greater than 50 feet from site disturbance will generally not be tagged and inventoried. Trees that are inherently protected by other saved trees will also not be tagged. Trees are numbered on the grading plans and in the field with an aluminum tag. Tree protection fencing is shown on the grading plan.

## Tree Rating System

A rating system of 1-10 was used for visually establishing the overall condition of each tree on the spreadsheet.

Determining factors include:

- Previous impacts to tree root zone
- Observation of cavities, conks or other structurally limiting factors
- Pest, fungal, or bacterial disorders
- Current growth habit

The rating system is defined as follows:

| Rating | Condition |
| :---: | :---: |
| 0 | Deceased |
| 1 | Evidence of massive past failures, extreme disease and is in severe decline. |
| 2 | May be saved with attention to class 4 pruning, insect/pest eradication and future monitoring. |
| 3 | Some past failures, some pests or structural defects that may be mitigated by class IV pruning. |
| 4 | May have had minor past failures, excessive deadwood or minor structural defects that can be mitigated with pruning. |
| 5 | Relatively healthy tree with little visual structural and or pest defects. |
| 6 | Healthy tree that probably can be left in its natural state. Future pruning may be required. |
| 7-9 | The tree has had proper arboricultural pruning and attention or have no apparent structural defects. |
| 10 | Specimen tree with perfect shape, structure and foliage in a protected setting (i.e. park, arboretum). |

The following mitigation measures/methods must be fully understood and followed by anyone working within the drip line of any native tree. Any necessary clarification will be provided by us (the arborists) upon request.

Fencing: The proposed fencing shall be shown in orange ink on the grading plan. It must be a minimum of 4 ' high chain link, snow or safety fence staked at the edge of the CRZ or line of encroachment for each tree or group of trees. The fence shall be up before any construction or earth moving begins. The owner or their designee shall be responsible for maintaining an erect fence throughout the construction period. The arborist(s), upon notification, will inspect the fence placement once it is erected. After this time, fencing shall not be moved without arborist inspection/approval. If the orange plastic fencing is used, a minimum of four zip ties shall be used on each stake to secure the fence. All efforts shall be made to maximize the distance from each saved tree. The fencing must be constructed prior to the city pre-construction meeting for inspection by the city and the arborists. Fence maintenance is an issue with many job sites. Windy conditions and other issues can cause the fence to sage and fall. Keeping it erect should be a part of any general contractor's bid for a project. Down fencing is one of the causes for a stop work notice to be placed on a project.

Soil Aeration Methods: Soils within the CRZ that have been compacted by heavy equipment and/or construction activities must be returned to their original state before all work is completed. Methods include adding specialized soil conditioners, water jetting, adding organic matter, and boring small holes with an auger (18" deep, 2-3'

Chip Mulch: All areas within the CRZ of the trees that cannot be fenced shall receive a 4-6" layer of chip mulch to retain moisture, soil structure and reduce the effects of soil compaction.

Trenching Within CRZ: All trenching/excavation for foundations within the CRZ of native trees shall be hand dug. All major roots shall be avoided whenever possible. All exposed roots larger than 1 " in diameter shall be clean cut with sharp pruning tools and not left ragged. A Mandatory meeting between the arborists and grading/trenching contractor(s) shall take place prior to work start. This activity shall be monitored by the arborist(s) to insure proper root pruning is talking place. Any landscape architects and contractors involved shall not design any irrigation or other features within any drip line unless previously approved by the project arborist.

Grading Within CRZ: Grading shall not encroach within the drip line unless approved by the project arborist. Grading should not disrupt the normal drainage pattern around the trees. Fills should not create a ponding condition and excavations should not leave the tree on a rapidly draining mound.

Exposed Roots: Any exposed roots shall be re-covered the same day they were exposed. If they cannot, they must be covered with burlap or another suitable material and wetted down $2 x$ per day until re-buried.

Paving Within The CRZ: The preferred method on paving within the drip line consists of placing base material on existing grade. Any grade lowering removes important surface roots. Pavers can be used with limitations. The base material must be above natural grade and the curbing to retain the pavers shall not be trenched any deeper than six inches into the natural grade.

Equipment Operation: Vehicles and all heavy equipment shall not be driven under the trees, as this will contribute to soil compaction. Also there is to be no parking of equipment or personal vehicles in these areas. All areas behind fencing are off limits unless pre-approved by the arborist. All soil compaction within drip line areas shall be mitigated as described previously.

Existing Surfaces: The existing ground surface within the CRZ of all native trees shall not be cut, filled, compacted or pared, unless shown on the grading plans and approved by the arborist.

Construction Materials And Waste: No liquid or solid construction waste shall be dumped on the ground within the CRZ of any native tree. The CRZ areas are not for storage of materials either. Any violations shall be remedied through proper cleanup approved by the project arborist at the expense of the owner.

Arborist Monitoring: An arborist shall be present for selected activities (trees identified on spreadsheet and items bulleted below). The monitoring does not necessarily have to be continuous but observational at times during these activities. It is the responsibility of the owner(s) or their designee to inform us prior to these events so
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we can make arrangements to be present. It is the responsibility of the owner to con raxhibit B (prior to construction) a locally licensed and insured arborist that will document all monitoring activities.

- pre-construction fence placement
- any utility or drainage trenching within any CRZ
- All grading and trenching near trees requiring monitoring on the spreadsheet

Pre-Construction Meeting: An on-site pre-construction meeting with the Arborist(s), Owner(s), Planning Staff, and all contractors and subs is highly recommended prior to the start of any work. At a minimum, the grading contractor shall be present. It is the sole responsibility of the owner that all topics covered during the preconstruction meeting are appropriately passed on to non-present contractors. Prior to final occupancy, a letter from the arborist(s) shall be required verifying the health and condition of all impacted trees and providing any recommendations for any additional mitigation. The letter shall verify that the arborist(s) were on site for all grading and/or trenching activity that encroached into the CRZ of the selected native trees, and that all work done in these areas was completed to the standards set forth above.

Pruning: All native tree pruning shall be completed by a licensed and insured D49 tree trimming contractor that has a valid city business license. Class 4 pruning includes: Crown reduction pruning consisting of reduction of tops, sides or individual limbs. A trained arborist shall perform all pruning. No pruning shall take more than $25 \%$ of the live crown of any native tree. Any trees that may need pruning for road/home clearance shall be pruned prior to any grading activities to avoid any branch tearing.

Landscape: All landscape under the CRZ shall be drought tolerant or native varieties. Lawns shall be avoided. All irrigation trenching shall be routed around drip lines; otherwise above ground drip-irrigation shall be used. It is the owner's responsibility to notify the landscape architect and contractor regarding this mitigation. The project arborist shall approve all landscape materials and irrigation within the CRZ of any oak tree.

Utility Placement: All utilities and sewer/storm drains shall be placed down the roads/driveways and when possible outside of the CRZ. If roads exist between two trees, the utilities shall be routed down the middle of the road or completely hand dug. The arborist shall supervise trenching within the CRZ. All trenches in these areas shall be exposed by air spade or hand dug with utilities routed under/over the roots. Roots greater than 2 inches in diameter shall not be cut.

Fertilization and Cultural Practices: As the project moves toward completion, the arborist(s) may suggest fertilization, insecticide, fungicide, soil amendments, and/or mycorrhiza applications that will benefit tree health.

The included spreadsheet includes trees listed by number, species and multiple stems if applicable, diameter and breast height (4.5'), condition (scale from poor to excellent), status (avoided, impacted, removed, exempt), percent of drip line impacted, mitigation
required (fencing, root pruning, monitoring), construction impact (trenching, gradintwhibit B
recommended pruning and individual tree notes.
If all the above mitigation measures are followed, we feel there will be no additional long-term significant impacts to the remaining native trees.

A \& T Arborists strongly suggests that the responsible party (owner of their designee) make copies of this report. Any reproduction by A \& T Arborists or changes to this original report will require an additional charge.

Please let us know if we can be of any future assistance to you for this project.
Steven G. Alvarez
Certified Arborist \#WC 0511

Chip Tamagni
Certified Arborist \#WE 6436-A

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TREE | TREE | SCIENTIFIC | TRUNK | TREE | CONST | CRZ \% | CONST | IMITIGATION | MONT | PRUNING | AESTH. | FIELD | NS |
| \# | SPECIES | NAME | DBH | CONDITION | STATUS | IMPACT | IMPACT | PROPOSAL | REQUIRED | CLASS | VALUE | NOTES | Ew |
| 1 | BO | Q. doug. | 30 | 1 | R | 40\% | GR | None | NO |  | POOR | severe decline | 75/80 |
| 2 | BO | Q. doug. | 30 | 2 | R | 100\% | GR | None | NO |  | POOR | dieback | 50/49 |
| 3 | BO | Q. doug. | 16 | 4 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | GOOD | embeded wire | 20 w |
| 4 | BO | Q. doug. | 17 | 5 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | GOOD | embeded wire | 22 w |
| 5 | BO | Q. doug. | 13 | 5 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | GOOD |  | 10 w |
| 6 | BO | Q. doug | 5 | 4 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | FAIR |  | 9 w |
| 7 | BO | Q. doug. | 6 | 4 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | GOOD |  | 8 w |
| 8 | BO | Q. doug. | 9 | 5 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | GOOD |  | 5 w |
| 9 | BO | Q. doug. | 8 | 4 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | GOOD |  | 4 w |
| 10 | BO | Q. doug. | 4 | 5 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | GOOD |  | 3 w |
| 11 | BO | Q. doug. | 2 | 4 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | GOOD |  | 2w |
| 12 | BO | Q. doug. | 22 | 6 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | EXCEL. |  | 25 w |
| 13 | BO | Q. doug. | 14 | 2 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | FAIR | split trunk | 25 w |
| 14 | BO | Q. doug. | 8 | 5 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | GOOD |  | 16 w |
| 15 | BO | Q. doug. | 17 | 5 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | EXCEL. |  | 12 w |
| 16 | VO | Q. lobata | 40 | 2 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | FAIR | hollow cavity | 25/33 |
| 17 | BO | Q.doug. | 38 | 6 | 1 | 5\% | GR | F,RP,M | YES |  | EXCEL. |  | 63/59 |
| 18 | Vo | Q. lobata | 46 | 2 | R | 100\% | GR | None | NO |  | POOR | declining | 22 e |
| 19 | VOX4 | Q. lobata | 18 | 5 | R | 100\% | GR | None | NO |  | GOOD |  | 10/12 |
| 20 | VO | Q. lobata | 6 | 9 | R | 100\% | GR | None | NO |  | GOOD |  | 8/7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TREE | TREE | SCIENTIFIC | TRUNK | TREE | CONST | CRZ \% | CONST | MITIGATION | MONT | PRUNING | AESTH. | FIELD | NS |
| \# | SPECIES | NAME | DBH | CONDITION | STATUS | IMPACT | IMPACT | PROPOSAL | REQUIRED | CLASS | VALUE | NOTES | EW |
| 21 | BO | Q. doug. | 29 | 2 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD | cavity | 41/18 |
| 22 | BO | Q. doug. | 23 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 30 n |
| 23 | BOX2 | Q. doug. | 14 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 12 n |
| 24 | BO | Q. doug. | 14 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | EXCEL. |  | 15 n |
| 25 | BO | Q. doug. | 8 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 8 n |
| 26 | BO | Q. doug. | 16 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 19 n |
| 27 | BO | Q. doug. | 10 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | suppressed | 22 n |
| 28 | BO | Q. doug. | 16 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | major deadwood | 28 n |
| 29 | BO | Q. doug. | 6 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 6 n |
| 30 | BO | Q. doug. | 17 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 21 n |
| 31 | BO | Q. doug. | 13 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 27 n |
| 32 | BO | Q. doug. | 13 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 20 n |
| 33 | BO | Q. doug. | 18 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 20 n |
| 34 | BO | Q. doug. | 12 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 19 n |
| 35 | BO | Q. doug. | 15 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 21 n |
| 36 | BO | Q. doug. | 25 | 6 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 15 n |
| 37 | BO | Q. doug. | 28 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 22 n |
| 38 | BO | Q. doug. | 6 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 16 n |
| 39 | BO | Q. doug. | 6 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | suppressed | 8n |
| 40 | BO | Q. doug. | 16 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 26 n |

$2=$ TREE TYPE: COMMON NAME IE.W.O. = WHITE OAK
3= SCIENTIFIC NAME
4 = TRUNK DIAMETER @ 4'6"
5 = TREE CONDITION: 1 = POOR, $10=$ EXCELLENT 6 = CONSTRUCTION STATUS: AVOIDED, IMPACTED, REMOVAL
7 = CRZ: PERCENT OF IMPACTED CRITICAL ROOT ZONE

8 = CONSTRUCTION IMPACT TYPE: GRADING, COMPACTION, TRENCHING
9 = MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS: FENCING, MONITORING, ROOTPRUNING,
$10=$ ARBORIST MONITORING REQUIRED: YES/NO
11 = PERSCRIBED PRUNING: CLASS 1-4
12= AESTHETIC VALUE
$12=$ FIELD NOTES
13= NORTH SOUTH/ EAST WEST CANOPY SPREAD

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TREE | TREE | SCIENTIFIC | TRUNK | TREE | CONST | CRZ \% | CONST | [MITIGATION | MONT | PRUNING | AESTH. | FIELD | NS |
| \# | SPECIES | NAME | DBH | CONDITION | STATUS | IMPACT | IMPACT | PROPOSAL | REQUIRED | CLASS | VALUE | NOTES | EW |
| 41 | BO | Q. doug. | 12 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | suppressed | 22 n |
| 42 | BO | Q. doug. | 14 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 20 n |
| 43 | BO | Q. doug. | 14 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 20 n |
| 44 | BO | Q. doug. | 10 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 15 n |
| 45 | BO | Q. doug. | 12 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 15 n |
| 46 | BO | Q. doug. | 27 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | EXCEL. |  | 25 n |
| 47 | BO | Q. doug. | 10 | 4 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO | 1 | GOOD |  | 15/18 |
| 48 | BO | Q. doug. | 25 | 4 | I | 15\% | GR | F,M | YES | 1 | GOOD |  | 25/33 |
| 49 | BO | Q. doug. | 22 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | EXCEL. |  | 50/45 |
| 50 | BO | Q. doug. | 14 | 5 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO | I | EXCEL. |  | 30/30 |
| 51 | BO | Q. doug. | 6 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 8/10 |
| 52 | BO | Q. doug. | 5 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 6/10 |
| 53 | BO | Q. doug. | 18 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | EXCEL. |  | 25/28 |
| 54 | BO | Q. doug. | 20 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 26/30 |
| 55 | BO | Q. doug. | 7 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | $5 / 5$ |
| 56 | BO | Q. doug. | 9 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 15/15 |
| 57 | BO | Q. doug. | 2 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | $4 / 4$ |
| 58 | BO | Q. doug. | 8 | 6 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO | 1 | GOOD |  | 20/18 |
| 59 | BO | Q. doug. | 17 | 5 | I | 10\% | GR | F,M | YES | 1 | GOOD | mistletoe | 25/27 |
| 60 | BO | Q. doug. | 35 | 2 | 1 | 15\% | GR | F,M | YES | IV | GOOD | past failures | 35/40 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TREE | TREE | SCIENTIFIC | TRUNK | TREE | CONST | CRZ \% | CONST | MITIGATION | MONT | PRUNING | AESTH. | FIELD | NS |
| \# | SPECIES | NAME | DBH | CONDITION | STATUS | IMPACT | IMPACT | PROPOSAL | REQUIRED | CLASS | VALUE | NOTES | EW |
| 61 | BO | Q. doug. | 12 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO | 1 | EXCEL. |  | 22 n |
| 62 | BO | Q. doug. | 12 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | suppressed | 18 n |
| 63 | BO | Q. doug. | 7 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | suppressed | 16 n |
| 64 | BO | Q. doug. | 19 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 24 n |
| 65 | BO | Q. doug. | 14 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 20 n |
| 66 | BO | Q. doug. | 5 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 8 n |
| 67 | BO | Q. doug. | 17 | 6 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 20120 |
| 68 | BO | Q. doug. | 7 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 10 n |
| 69 | BO | Q. doug. | 15 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 19 n |
| 70 | BO | Q. doug. | 15 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 19 n |
| 71 | BO | Q. doug. | 26 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 25 n |
| 72 | BO | Q. doug. | 30 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 15 n |
| 73 | BO | Q. doug. | 13 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 12 n |
| 74 | BO | Q. doug. | 14 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 18 n |
| 75 | BO | Q. doug. | 13 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 18 n |
| 76 | BO | Q. doug. | 23 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 10 n |
| 77 | BO | Q. doug. | 15 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 12 n |
| 78 | BO | Q. doug. | 15 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 15 n |
| 79 | BO | Q. doug. | 15 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 15 n |
| 80 | BO | Q. doug. | 15 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 22 n |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TREE | TREE | SCIENTIFIC | TRUNK | TREE | CONST | CRZ \% | CONST | Mitigation | MONT | PRUNING | AESTH. | FIELD | NS |
| \# | SPECIES | NAME | DBH | CONDITION | Status | IMPACT | IMPACT | PROPOSAL | REQUIRED | CLASS | VALUE | NOTES | EW |
| 81 | BO | Q. doug. | 24 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 17 s |
| 82 | BO | Q. doug. | 15 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 20 s |
| 83 | BO | Q. doug. | 13 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD | mistletoe | 18 s |
| 84 | BO | Q. doug. | 18 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD | mistletoe | 20 s |
| 85 | BO | Q. doug. | 11 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 13 s |
| 86 | BO | Q. doug. | 17 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 14 s |
| 87 | BO | Q. doug. | 7 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | suppressed | 6 s |
| 88 | BO | Q. doug. | 20 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | suppressed | 8 s |
| 89 | BO | Q. doug. | 14 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 10 s |
| 90 | BO | Q. doug. | 19 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 15 s |
| 91 | BO | Q. doug. | 8 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 12 s |
| 92 | BO | Q. doug. | 12 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 17 s |
| 93 | BO | Q. doug. | 6 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 6 s |
| 94 | BO | Q. doug. | 18 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 12 s |
| 95 | BO | Q. doug. | 14 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 12 s |
| 96 | BO | Q. doug. | 8 | 2 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | POOR |  | 5 s |
| 97 | BO | Q. doug. | 22 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 15 s |
| 98 | BO | Q. doug. | 8 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 12 s |
| 99 | BO | Q. doug. | 22 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 18 s |
| 100 | BO | Q. doug. | 5 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 6 s |

$1=$ TREE \#: MOSTLY CLOCKWISE FROM DUE NORTH
$2=$ TREE TYPE: COMMON NAME IE.W.O. $=$ WHITE OAK
$3=$ SCIENTIFIC NAME
4 = TRUNK DIAMETER @ 4'6"
$5=$ TREE CONDITION: $1=$ POOR, $10=$ EXCELLENT
6 = CONSTRUCTION STATUS: AVOIDED, IMPACTED, REMOVAL
, COMPACTION,
$10=$ ARBORIST MONITORING REQUIRED: YES/NO
11 = PERSCRIBED PRUNING: CLASS 1-4
$12=$ AESTHETIC VALUE
12 = FIELD NOTES
13= NORTH SOUTH/ EAST WEST CANOPY SPREAD

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TREE | TREE | SCIENTIFIC | TRUNK | TREE | CONST | CRZ \% | CONST | MITİIGATION | MONT | PRUNING | AESTH. | FIELD | NS |
| \# | SPECIES | NAME | DBH | CONDITION | STATUS | IMPACT | IMPACT | PROPOSAL | REQUIRED | CLASS | VALUE | NOTES | EW |
| 101 | BO | Q. doug. | 4 | 2 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | suppressed | 6 s |
| 102 | BO | Q. doug. | 8 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 10 s |
| 103 | BO | Q. doug. | 10 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 12 s |
| 104 | BO | Q. doug. | 14 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 15 s |
| 105 | BO | Q. doug. | 16 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 12 s |
| 106 | BO | Q. doug. | 15 | 6 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 15 s |
| 107 | BO | Q. doug. | 18 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 15 s |
| 108 | BO | Q. doug. | 10 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 18 s |
| 109 | BO | Q. doug. | 12 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 15 s |
| 110 | BO | Q. doug. | 9 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 8 s |
| 111 | BO | Q. doug. | 12 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 10 s |
| 112 | BO | Q. doug. | 10 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 8 s |
| 113 | BO | Q. doug. | 15 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 12 s |
| 114 | BO | Q. doug. | 14 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 13 s |
| 115 | BO | Q. doug. | 13 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 17 s |
| 116 | BO | Q. doug. | 9 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | suppressed | 5 s |
| 117 | BO | Q. doug. | 12 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 10 s |
| 118 | BO | Q. doug. | 14 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 12 s |
| 119 | BO | Q. doug. | 8 | 2 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 6 s |
| 120 | BO | Q. doug. | 18 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 22 s |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TREE | TREE | SCIENTIFIC | TRUNK | TREE | CONST | CRZ \% | CONST | \|Mitigation | MONT | PRUNING | AESTH. | FIELD | NS |
| \# | SPECIES | NAME | DBH | CONDITION | STATUS | IMPACT | IMPACT | PROPOSAL | REQUIRED | CLASS | VALUE | NOTES | EW |
| 121 | BO | Q. doug. | 36 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | EXCEL. |  | 55/60 |
| 122 | BO | Q. doug. | 29 | 7 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 45/55 |
| 123 | BO | Q. doug. | 9 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 10 s |
| 124 | BO | Q. doug. | 9 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 18 s |
| 125 | BO | Q. doug. | 16 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD | embedded wire | 20 s |
| 126 | BO | Q. doug. | 7 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 12 s |
| 127 | BO | Q. doug. | 13 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 16 s |
| 127 | BO | Q. doug. | 6 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | suppressed | 10 s |
| 129 | BO | Q. doug. | 13 |  | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | mistletoe | 10 s |
| 130 | BO | Q. doug. | 12 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 18 s |
| 131 | BO | Q. doug. | 13 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 18 s |
| 132 | BO | Q. doug. | 16 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 25 s |
| 133 | BO | Q. doug. | 15 | 1 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | POOR | declining | 6 s |
| 134 | BO | Q. doug. | 26 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 25 s |
| 135 | BO | Q. doug. | 18 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | suppressed | 18 s |
| 136 | BO | Q. doug. | 33 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | EXCEL. |  | 56/60 |
| 137 | BO | Q. doug. | 32 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 4045 |
| 138 | BO | Q. doug. | 32 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 35/37 |
| 139 | BO | Q. doug. | 26 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | mistletoe | 30/45 |
| 140 | BO | Q. doug. | 26 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | mistletoe | 30/45 |

$1=$ TREE \#: MOSTLY CLOCKWISE FROM DUE NORTH
$2=$ TREE TYPE: COMMON NAME IE.W.O. $=$ WHITE OAK
$3=$ SCIENTIFIC NAME
4 = TRUNK DIAMETER @ 4'6"
$5=$ TREE CONDITION: $1=$ POOR, $10=$ EXCELLENT 6 = CONSTRUCTION STATUS: AVOIDED, IMPACTED, REMOVAL 7 = CRZ: PERCENT OF IMPACTED CRITICAL ROOT ZONE

8 = CONSTRUCTION IMPACT TYPE: GRADING, COMPACTION, TRENCHING
9 = MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS: FENCING, MONITORING, ROOTPRUNING,
$10=$ ARBORIST MONITORING REQUIRED: YES/NO
11 = PERSCRIBED PRUNING: CLASS 1-4
12= AESTHETIC VALUE
$12=$ FIELD NOTES
13= NORTH SOUTH/ EAST WEST CANOPY SPREAD

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TREE | TREE | SCIENTIFIC | TRUNK | TREE | CONST | CRZ \% | CONST | MITIGATION | MONT | PRUNING | AESTH. | FIELD | NS |
| \# | SPECIES | NAME | DBH | CONDITION | STATUS | IMPACT | IMPACT | PROPOSAL | REQUIRED | CLASS | VALUE | NOTES | EW |
| 141 | Vo | Q. lobata | 13 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | suppressed | 15/10 |
| 142 | Vo | Q. lobata | 7 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | suppressed | 10/12 |
| 143 | VO | Q. lobata | 26 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 40/45 |
| 144 | Vo | Q. Iobata | 26 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 60/55 |
| 145 | Vo | Q. lobata | 13 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 20/22 |
| 146 | VO | Q. Iobata | 13 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 23/20 |
| 147 | Vo | Q. lobata | 13 | 4 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | GOOD |  | 25/30 |
| 148 | VO | Q. lobata | 22 | 4 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | GOOD |  | 25/30 |
| 149 | Vo | Q. lobata | 13 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 12/12 |
| 150 | VO | Q. lobata | 25 | 4 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | GOOD |  | 25/25 |
| 151 | Vo | Q. Iobata | 30 | 4 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | EXCEL. |  | 50/60 |
| 152 | Vo | Q. lobata | 12 | 4 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | GOOD |  | 11/15 |
| 153 | VO | Q. lobata | 30 | 5 | I | 20\% | GR | F,M | YES | 11 | GOOD |  | 60/50 |
| 154 | BO | Q. doug. | 31 | 6 | I | 40\% | GR | F,RP,M | YES | 11 | EXCEL. | too much impact | 60/50 |
| 155 | BO | Q. doug. | 39 | 6 | R | 100\% | GR | NONE | NO |  | EXCEL. | try to save | 50/50 |
| 156 | Vo | Q. lobata | 7 | 5 | R | 100\% | GR | NONE | NO |  | GOOD |  | 10/8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | TREE \#: MOSTL TREE TYPE: CO SCIENTIFIC NA = TRUNK DIAMET TREE CONDITIO = CONSTRUCTIO CRZ: PERCENT |  | M DUE NORTH <br> XCELLENT , IMPACTED, R |  |  | $10=$ | CONSTRUCTION MITIGATION REQ ARBORIST MONI PERSCRIBED PR AESTHETIC VALU FIELD NOTES NORTH SOUTH/ | N IMPACT TYPE: GRA RUIREMENTS. FEN RUNING: CLASS 1-4 LUE $\qquad$ |  | ON, TRENCHING |  |  |  |
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| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TREE | TREE | SCIENTIFIC | TRUNK | TREE | CONST | CRZ \% | CONST | MITIGATION | MONT | PRUNING | AESTH. | FIELD | NS |
| \# | SPECIES | NAME | DBH | CONDITION | STATUS | IMPACT | IMPACT | PROPOSAL | REQUIRED | CLASS | VALUE | NOTES | EW |
| 21 | BO | Q. doug. | 29 | 2 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD | cavity | 41/18 |
| 22 | BO | Q. doug. | 23 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 30 n |
| 23 | BOX2 | Q. doug. | 14 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 12 n |
| 24 | BO | Q. doug. | 14 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | EXCEL. |  | 15 n |
| 25 | BO | Q. doug. | 8 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 8 n |
| 26 | BO | Q. doug. | 16 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 19 n |
| 27 | BO | Q. doug. | 10 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | suppressed | 22 n |
| 28 | BO | Q. doug. | 16 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | major deadwood | 28 n |
| 29 | BO | Q. doug. | 6 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 6 n |
| 30 | BO | Q. doug. | 17 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 21 n |
| 31 | BO | Q. doug. | 13 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 27 n |
| 32 | BO | Q. doug. | 13 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 20 n |
| 33 | BO | Q. doug. | 18 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 20 n |
| 34 | BO | Q. doug. | 12 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 19 n |
| 35 | BO | Q. doug. | 15 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 21 n |
| 36 | BO | Q. doug. | 25 | 6 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 15 n |
| 37 | BO | Q. doug. | 28 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 22 n |
| 38 | BO | Q. doug. | 6 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 16 n |
| 39 | BO | Q. doug. | 6 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | suppressed | 8 n |
| 40 | BO | Q. doug. | 16 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 26 n |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |






| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TREE | TREE | SCIENTIFIC | TRUNK | TREE | CONST | CRZ \% | CONST | Mitigation | MONT | PRUNING | AESTH. | FIELD | NS |
| \# | SPECIES | NAME | DBH | CONDITION | STATUS | IMPACT | IMPACT | PROPOSAL | REQUIRED | CLASS | VALUE | NOTES | EW |
| 121 | BO | Q. doug. | 36 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | EXCEL. |  | 55/60 |
| 122 | BO | Q. doug. | 29 | 7 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 45/55 |
| 123 | BO | Q. doug. | 9 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 10 s |
| 124 | BO | Q. doug. | 9 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 18s |
| 125 | BO | Q. doug. | 16 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD | embedded wire | 20 s |
| 126 | BO | Q. doug. | 7 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 12 s |
| 127 | BO | Q. doug. | 13 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 16 s |
| 127 | BO | Q. doug. | 6 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | suppressed | 10 s |
| 129 | BO | Q. doug. | 13 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | mistletoe | 10 s |
| 130 | BO | Q. doug. | 12 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 18 s |
| 131 | BO | Q. doug. | 13 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 18s |
| 132 | BO | Q. doug. | 16 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 25 s |
| 133 | BO | Q. doug. | 15 | 1 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | POOR | declining | 6 s |
| 134 | BO | Q. doug. | 26 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 25 s |
| 135 | BO | Q. doug. | 18 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | suppressed | 18 s |
| 136 | BO | Q. doug. | 33 | 5 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | EXCEL. |  | 56/60 |
| 137 | BO | Q. doug. | 32 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 4045 |
| 138 | BO | Q. doug. | 32 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 35/37 |
| 139 | BO | Q. doug. | 26 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | mistletoe | 30/45 |
| 140 | BO | Q. doug. | 26 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | mistletoe | 30/45 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TREE | TREE | SCIENTIFIC | TRUNK | TREE | CONST | CRZ \% | CONST | MITIGATION | MONT | PRUNING | AESTH. | FIELD | NS |
| \# | SPECIES | NAME | DBH | CONDITION | STATUS | IMPACT | IMPACT | PROPOSAL | REQUIRED | CLASS | VALUE | NOTES | EW |
| 141 | Vo | Q. Iobata | 13 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | suppressed | 15/10 |
| 142 | vo | Q. lobata | 7 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR | suppressed | 10/12 |
| 143 | Vo | Q. Iobata | 26 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 40/45 |
| 144 | Vo | Q. lobata | 26 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | GOOD |  | 60/55 |
| 145 | vo | Q. Iobata | 13 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 20/22 |
| 146 | Vo | Q. Iobata | 13 | 4 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 23/20 |
| 147 | vo | Q. lobata | 13 | 4 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | GOOD |  | 25/30 |
| 148 | Vo | Q. Iobata | 22 | 4 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | GOOD |  | 25/30 |
| 149 | vo | Q. lobata | 13 | 3 | A | 0\% |  |  | NO |  | FAIR |  | 12/12 |
| 150 | Vo | Q. Iobata | 25 | 4 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | GOOD |  | 25/25 |
| 151 | Vo | Q. Iobata | 30 | 4 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | EXCEL. |  | 50/60 |
| 152 | vo | Q. lobata | 12 | 4 | A | 0\% |  | fencing | NO |  | GOOD |  | 11/15 |
| 153 | Vo | Q. Iobata | 30 | 5 | I | 20\% | GR | F,M | YES | II | GOOD |  | 60/50 |
| 154 | BO | Q. doug. | 31 | 6 | 1 | 15\% | GR | F,RP,M | YES | II | EXCEL. |  | 60/50 |
| 155 | BO | Q. doug. | 39 | 6 | 1 | 15\% | GR | F,RP,M | YES | II | EXCEL. |  | 50/50 |
| 156 | vo | Q. Iobata | 7 | 5 | R | 100\% | GR | NONE | NO |  | GOOD |  | 1018 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## AFFIDAVIT

## OF MAIL NOTICES

## PLANNING COMMISSION/CITY COUNCIL PROJECT NOTICING

I, Susan DeCarli _, employee of the City of El Paso de Robles, California, do hereby certify that the mail notices have been processed as required for the "Destino Paso Resort" (PD 08-002, CUP 08-002, VTTM 2962 \& OTR 16-009) request on this 28th day of October, 2016.

City of El Paso de Robles
Community Development Department Planning Division


# THE <br> TRIBUNE 

3825 South Higuera • Post Office Box 112• San Luis Obispo, California 93406-0112•(805) 781-7800

In The Superior Court of The State of California
In and for the County of San Luis Obispo
AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION
AD \# 2797024
CITY OF PAS ROBLES

## STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SS.
County of San Luis Obispo
I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen and not interested in the above entitled matter; I am now, and at all times embraced in the publication herein mentioned was, the principal clerk of the printers and publishers of THE TRIBUNE, a newspaper of general Circulation, printed and published daily at the City of San Luis Obispo in the above named county and state; that notice at which the annexed clippings is a true copy, was published in the above-named newspaper and not in any supplement thereof - on the following dates to wit; DECEMBER 1, 2016 that said newspaper was duly and regularly ascertained and established a newspaper of general circulation by Decree entered in the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County, State of California, on June 9, 1952, Case \#19139 under the Government Code of the State of California.

I certify (or declare) under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

(Signature of Principal CI DATED: DECEMBER 1 , AD COST: $\$ 283.14$

Written comments on the proposed project and corresponding MND may be mailed to the Community Dovelopment Department, 1000 Spring Street, Pas Robles, CA 93446, or emailed to sclecarie proity,oom, provided that the comments are received prior to the time of the public hearing. Oral comments may be made at the hearing. Should you have any questions regarding this application, please call Susan DeCaril at (805) 287-3970 or email at sdecarlien prcity.com,

If you challenge this application in court, you may be limited to raising only those is sues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission at or prior to the pubic hearing.


Notice is hereby given that the Planring Commission of the City of El Pas de Robles will hold a Public Hearing on Tuesday, December 13, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. at the City of El Paso de Robles, 1000 Spring Street, Pas Robles, California, in the City Council Chambers, to consider a recommondation to the City Council to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration in accordlance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the following project:

The project includes an amendment to an approved Development Plan to establish a four hotels, with up to 291 rooms and ancillary support uses, including a restaurant, ballroom, outdoor patios and pool facilities. The applicaion does not include a request to increase the development intensity of the prior approved hotel project for this proparty. The application includes a request to remove six (6) oak trees.

The project site is 40 acres in area. It is designated in the General Plan Land Use Element and Zoned as Parks and Open Space, with a Resort/Lodging Overlay. The site is within the Paso Hobles Airport Land Use Plan, Safety Overlay Zones 2, 3, and 4.

The public review period for the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) began on September 10, 2016, and has been extended to December 13, 2016. This project was considered by the Planning Commission on October 11, 2016, and was continued to a future) Planning Commission meeting, date not unspecified. The traffic study for this project was re-evaluated and updated and traffic mitigation measures have been modified. The site plan for hotel \#4 was modified to eliminate the need to remove an oak tree.

The proposed MND may be reviewed at the Community Development Department, 1000 Spring Street. Pasco Robles, Californil. Copies may be purchased for the cost of reproduction. A copy of the MND is also available on the City website at: http:// www,proily.com/government/departments. commdevindex.asp.

## Attachment 9

## TO: Planning Commission

## FROM: Susan DeCarli, City Planner

SUBJECT: Destino Paso Resort Amendment - 291 room / 4 phase hotel development

- Planned Development Amendment (PD 08-002)
- Conditional Use Permit Amendment (CUP 08-002)
- Vesting Tentative Tract M ap 2962 (TR 2962)
- Oak Tree Removal (OTR 16-009)
- Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (M ND)

Location: 3350 Airport Road, APN 025-436-029 \& 025-346-030
Applicant: Karen Stier
DATE: October 11, 2016

Needs: $\quad$ For the Planning Commission to consider making a recommendation to the City Council to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), and approve Planned Development Amendment (PD 08-002), Conditional Use Permit Amendment (CUP 08002), V esting Tentative Tract M ap (VTPM 2962), and an Oak Tree Removal (OTR 16009) for the 291 room / 4 phase Destino Paso Resort proposed at 3350 Airport Road. See A ttachment 1, Location M ap.

Facts: $\quad$ 1. A resort complex was previously approved on the project site in 2009, under a previous ownership, which included a main hotel, individual casitas units, and ancillary improvements for up 291 rooms.
2. The property currently has an existing single-family home (that has not been approved for building occupancy) and accessory buildings, an old farmhouse and outbuildings, and a paved access road that extends from Airport Road and terminates at the eastern property line. The remainder of the property is undisturbed.
3. The applicant, Karen Stier, proposes to re-subdivide the project site into six (6) Iots, construct four (4) hotels (with a maximum of up to 291 rooms, consistent with the previously approved entitlement), demolish the existing single-family home, and maintain the existing farmhouse (on a separate parcel). The proposed lot sizes and improvements are provided below. See Attachment 2 - VTPM 2962, and Attachment 3 - Site Plan.

| Lot $1-0.9$ acres | (Vacant, no changes proposed) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lot $2-6.75$ acres | (Hotel \#3 - Limited services hotel, 28 rooms) |
| Lot $3-6.3$ acres | (Hotel \#2 - Limited services hotel, 80 rooms) |
| Lot 4-12.97 acres | (Hotel \#1 - Full service hotel, 136 rooms) |
| Lot 5-5.09 acres | (No new or changed land uses/maintain existing farmhouse) |
| Lot 6-5.00 acres | (Hotel \#4 - Limited services, 46 rooms) |

4. The existing access road, Destino Paso W ay, is proposed to be dedicated as a 50foot wide public right-of-way to serve lots 2,3 , and 4 . A separate access driveway from Airport Road would serve lots 5 and 6. No access is proposed for lot 1, which is a small parcel on the west side of Airport Road within Huer Huero Creek corridor.
5. The property is designated in the General Plan, Land Use Element and is zoned as Parks and O pen Space with a Resort Lodging Overlay, and an Airport O verlay. The proposed project is consistent with the applicable land use designation and zoning. The site is located partially in three different Airport Safety Zones, including zones 2,3 , and 4. An analysis of airport consistency is provided below.
6. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an environmental analysis/Initial Study and a draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (M ND) was prepared. See A ttachment 9, Initial Study/M ND.

## Analysis and

 Conclusion:
## Project Design

The applicant intends to subdivide the property and move forward with the first phase of development (hotel \#1, 136 room full-service hotel), on lot 4. This hotel is planned to be a high-quality hotel that would include a restaurant, bar/lounge, ballroom, and outdoor patios and gathering areas. Once this hotel is well established, the applicant anticipates moving forw ard on hotel \#2 on lot 3, across Destino Paso W ay, which is nearest to the primary hotel. This hotel is intended to compliment and be an extension of the primary hotel.

The other two hotels are anticipated to be smaller, more boutique-oriented hotels. The applicant does not intend to move forward on those hotels until after the initial hotels are completed and operational. Therefore, the proposal includes greater architectural details on the primary hotel, since development of the other three hotels will not occur for a few years.

The primary hotel (\#1) is proposed to be 3-stories, and up to 35 feet in height, (below the permitted height limit of 50 feet). The other three hotels are planned to be 2stories. The architectural theme of the primary hotel is contemporary, with "Prairie" architectural style influences. Building materials include wood siding, stone, smooth plaster and metal roofing. This building would be set deep into the
site on a slope toward the east side of the site. Hotel \#2 would al so be set deep into the site near the northeast corner of the property. The other two smaller hotels are proposed to be closer to Airport Road. See Attachment 4, View Renderings. These drawings show how the proposed hotels would be seen from Airport Road.

## Oak Trees

An arborist report was prepared for this project (See Attachment 9, M ND), which inventoried 155 oak trees on the project site. The applicant has requested removal of seven (7) oak trees to accommodate frontage improvements along Airport Road and parking lots. Three (3) of the trees proposed for removal are rated in poor condition, the other four (4) oaks are rated in fair to good condition. Tree protection measures are proposed to reduce potential impacts to existing oak trees within the development areas of hotels \#1, 2, and 4 that are not proposed to be removed. Oak tree replacements would be required to mitigate for the loss of oak trees approved for removal in compliance with the Oak Tree Protection Ordinance.

## Traffic

As provided in Attachment 12, a Transportation Impact A nalysis(TIA) was prepared for this project. The TIA studied four (4) intersections (i.e. Dry Creek Road/A irport Road, State Route 46 E/(SR46E)/Golden Hill Road, SR46E/Union Road, and SR46E/A irport Road), and evaluated their operations during weekday morning and evening periods, and Saturday mid-day, for existing, existing plus the project, nearterm, and near-term plus the project conditions. A ssumptions evaluated include trip generation, trip distribution and assignment. The TIA concludes that the project may result in potentially significant operational traffic impacts, and improvements necessary for alternative transportation facilities. The report provides recommended mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts.

The TIA indicates that under existing conditions the Level of Service (LOS) is unacceptable (LOS D, E or F) at SR46E/Union Road and SR46E/Airport Road. Specific impacts that may result with the project would further reduce the LOS at the same intersections. This is the same (e.g. worsened conditions) under the nearterm and near-term plus project conditions. The SR 46E/Airport Road intersection is controlled by Caltrans, which has a target of LOS C or better operations. The southbound approach currently operates at LOSE during the Saturday mid-day peak hour. Currently only two vehicles make the southbound left turn during the Saturday peak hour. The project would add 16 Saturday peak hour trips to the southbound left turning movement, substantially increasing delay on the southbound approach and potentially resulting in more aggressive maneuvers as drivers accept smaller gaps to make their turn. This condition worsens under Near Term Plus Project conditions, when both the southbound and eastbound left turn movements exceed capacity, resulting in excessive delay. The capacity is exceeded
upon occupancy of Hotel 2. Therefore, mitigations have been developed to address this condition prior to occupancy of Hotel 2.

The Planning Commission is requested to recommend either of two proposed mitigation measures to reduce operational impacts at the SR 46E/Airport Road intersection. As noted in the TIA, the applicant would be permitted to complete and occupy the first hotel ( 136 rooms), however improvements would be required to allow completion of hotels 2,3 , and 4 . Mitigation M easure TR-1 would result in the closure of the existing southbound left-turn movement from Airport Rd to 46E. This will impact existing traffic patterns. Mitigation M easure TR-2 would require the construction of a Huer Huero Creek crossing.

## SR 46E/Airport Road intersection mitigation options:

## Mitigation M easure TR-1: Southbound Left turn prohibition

Prohibit southbound left turns at State Route 46E/Airport Road to reduce conflict points at this intersection, reduce queuing, and reduce delay on the southbound approach prior to improvement of H otels 2, 3 , and 4 unless a local road connection is provided to W isteria Lane.

Until a local road connection is provided to W isteria Lane, prohibiting southbound left turns would require vehicles destined to travel east on State Route 46 to turn right onto westbound State Route 46 then perform a U-turn at Union Road or Golden Hill Road. The existing counts show that fewer than ten vehicles currently make the southbound left turn during the peak hours studied, and shifting these trips would have a negligible effect on operations at the nearby intersections of Union Road and Golden Hill Road.

## Mitigation M easure TR-2: Wisteria Lane Connection

Complete the local road connection from Wisteria Lane to Airport Road prior to occupancy of Hotels 2, 3, and 4. Upon completion, provide signage on the westbound approach to Destino Paso W ay/Airport Road to direct hotel visitors to the new local road connection instead of State Route 46E, and prohibiting westbound left turns out of Destino Paso W ay to avoid operational impacts to the State Route 46E/A irport Road intersection.

## W ater Resources

A W ater Supply Evaluation (W SE) was prepared for this project, which is provided in the CEQA analysis, (Attachment 9). As noted in the W SE, the projected water demand for this project is included in the assumptions of the 2015 Urban W ater M anagement Plan. W ater supply for the project will include City-supplied potable
water and recycled water (when it becomes available). Buildout water use of the project is estimated to be 35.32 acre-feet per year (AFY) of City-supplied potable water, and 3.94 AFY of recycled water in the future. In the interim, City-supplies of potable water will be used for hotel operations, irrigation, and water features. The study concludes that the City has adequate potable supply to provide reliable longterm water supply for the project under normal and drought conditions.

## Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) Consistency

The project location is within the planning impact area of the Paso Robles Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP), Safety Zones 2, 3, and 4. The ALUP includes a Land Use M atrix, Table 6, that describes land uses that may be compatible (e.g. "permitted") or prohibited in various zones. Land uses in Zone 2 are very restrictive. No development is proposed in Zone 2 with this project, therefore, the project would not conflict with ALUP Zone 2. ALUP Zones 3 and 4 permit certain types of uses, including hospitality land uses, such as hotels, restaurants, and indoor auditoriums \& convention centers (such as the ballroom). Per Table 6, of the ALUP, there are additional density-specific restrictions that apply to different zones, as follows:

- Zone 3 - The intensity of uses shall not exceed an average 60 persons per gross acre, maximum 120 persons per single acre, at any time. U sage calculations shall include all people (e.g., employees, customers/visitors, etc.) who may be on the property at any single point in time, whether indoors or outside.
- Zone 4 - The intensity of uses shall not exceed an average 40 persons per gross acre, maximum 120 persons per single acre, at any time. U sage calculations shall include all people (e.g., employees, customers/visitors, etc.) who may be on the property at any single point in time, whether indoors or outside.

Additionally, Appendix E includes development restrictions that apply to particular land uses and this project, as follows:

- Food and Beverage Service, Indoor Entertainment - 1 person/60 s.f. of gross floor area
- Public A ssembly - 1 person per seat or per 12 s.f. of gross floor area
- Transient Lodging - 1.8 person per room or group of rooms to occupied as a suit, plus (in addition to) 1 person per 60 s.f. floor area of any restaurants, bars, or night clubs, plus 1 person per 10 s.f. of floor area of meeting rooms.

The applicant provided an analysis that breaks down the site into one-acre measurements, and based on the site plan and intended land uses, calculated the number of people that would occupy an acre of land on average and the maximum. This is the accepted density calculation methodology of the San Luis Obispo County Airport Land Use Commission, and has been used on other similar projects within
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the City's ALUP planning area.
The analysis assumptions consider occupancy of all hotels at 100 percent. The analysis indicates that the project would be consistent with the density limitations established in the ALUP for the maximum number of people permitted per gross and per single acre, as well as the maximum number of persons permitted by use. See ALUP A nalysis, Attachment 6 and Exhibit I and J of draft Resolution B..

## Policy Reference:

Fiscal Impact

Options:

Paso Robles General Plan, Economic Strategy, Zoning Ordinance, CEQA Guidelines, Airport Land Use Plan, Urban W ater M anagement Plan.

Expansion of hotel and lodging accommodations is identified in the City's Economic Strategy. Hotels have been determined to have a net positive fiscal impact on the City's revenues due to receipt of transient occupancy taxes.

A fter opening the public hearing and taking public testimony and considering the staff report and proposed Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Planning Commission is requested to take one of the actions listed below:

1. Recommend the City Council approve the Destino Paso Resort project amendment by approving the following four resolutions by separate motions:
a. Approve Draft Resolution A, recommending the City Council certify M itigated Negative Declaration for the project, including identification of the recommended transportation mitigation measure for impacts to the SR 46E/A irport Road intersection, either M itigation M easureTR-1 or TR2; and
b. Approve Draft Resolution B, recommending the City Council approve Planned Development 08-002, Conditional Use Permit 08-002: and
c. A pprove Draft Resolution C, recommending the City Council approve Vesting Tentative Tract M ap 2962; and
d. Approve Draft Resolution D, recommending the City Council approve Oak Tree Removal 16-009.
2. A mend the above-listed action.
3. Refer this item back to staff or the DRC for additional analysis.
4. Recommend denial of either Draft Resolution A, B, C or D based on specific findings.

## Attachments:

1. Location M ap
2. Site Plan
3. Site Plan Comparison
4. A rchitectural Renderings
5. V esting Tentative Parcel Map 2962
6. A irport Land Use Plan A nalysis
7. City Engineer memorandum
8. Resolution A - Recommendation to City Council to adopt a M itigated Negative Declaration
9. Resolution B - Recommendation to City Council to approve a Planned Development A mendment 08-002, Conditional Use Permit A mendment 09-002
10. Resolution C - Recommendation to City Council to approve Vesting Tentative Tract M ap 2962
11. Resolution D - Recommendation to City Council to approve Oak Removal Permit 16-009
12. Exhibit A (Resolution A) Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study
13. Notices

# Agenda Item 1 <br> Public Comment 

## Attachment 10

 Public CommentsM onday, October 31, $2016 \quad$ 2:56 PM

| Subject | Destiny Paso proposed hotel complex |
| :--- | :--- |
| From | Keith Testerman |
| To | Planning |
| Sent | Monday, October 31, 2016 2:54 PM |

To whom it may concern:
I would like to express my opposition to this project. The traffic on Airport Road is already awful and this proposal would greatly add to the problems, especially when the water park is operating.
Thank you.
M arilyn Testerman
6010 Jardine Rd.
Paso Robles
238-1396
Sent from my iPad

| Subject | Destino Paso - Additional Comments |
| :--- | :--- |
| From | Susan DeCarli |
| To | Planning Commission; Monica Hollenbeck; Warren Frace |
| Sent | Monday, October 17, 2016 8:50 AM |

Susan,
The traffic is not the only issue. The main issue is over-building in the city.
How many hotels are currently under review by the City of Paso Robles? At what point is the city going to consider limiting further building in the city?

Thank you, in advance for the information.
Very truly yours,

## Kathryn Keeler

## Kathy Keeler

Rancho Azul y Oro
Award-Winning Extra Virgin Olive Oil
www.ranchoazulyoro.com
(T) 805-467-9470

From: Kathryn Keeler [mailto:kathrynkeeler1@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 13, 2016 2:01 PM
To: Planning [planning@prcity.com](mailto:planning@prcity.com)
Subject: Dissatisfied with reports of the Planning Commission allowing FOUR M ORE HOTELS
Ladies \& Gentlemen,
We read an article today that indicates there are four more hotels planned for the 46/Airport Road corridor. I understand the project is on hold temporarily until traffic mitigation studies can be done. The article did not say the Planning Department was considering denying the project for any reason, it just said until a traffic study was completed. We think any further requests for development should be denied because that would be the responsible thing to do for the people who live in this area.

We found it incomprehensible that the Planning Commission continued to allow hotels to be built in the last five years, due to the lack of water in the area. Airport Road is already a nightmare to attempt to get through from 4:00-6:00 when the Ravine is letting out. My guess is that the Planning Commission believes that the people who live here should just change our route and acquiesce to the needs of the developers and tourists. Every time we have to take a different route, it takes us more time. Attempting to drive into town on a weekend, due to Ravine overcrowding and their guests parking on every inch of berm on both sides of Airport Road and actually parking on a portion of the road on both sides has made it not only difficult driving, but dangerous.

I understand that the City will receive taxes from all of these hotels, so it is to the City's benefit to continue to allow rampant development I anticipate you will say that it is adding jobs, but quite frankly, adding FOUR MORE HOTELS to anywhere in Paso Robles would just continue to destroy the reason people love this area, because of its beauty.

You're already doing a fine job of destroying the City. Perhaps you could actually attempt to do something for the citizens of the city and the people who live in the surrounding areas and be responsible and limit any further continued growth. There are limited natural resources, and you're choosing to give them to people who do not even live here and reward developers for destroying the area we love.

We would urge you to reconsider allowing any further hotel development and demonstrate some intent to actually protect the natural beauty of Paso Robles, rather than continuing to allow developers to destroy the area. People come to Paso Robles to escape from places such as Los Angeles and San Francisco, and yet, continued unabated growth will cause it to be just like those cities in the not-too-distant future.

Very truly yours,
Kathy Keeler
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| Subject | FW: Destiny Paso proposed hotel complex |
| :--- | :--- |
| From | Susan DeCarli |
| To | Christy Gabler (christy@ northcoastengineering.com); Iwerner@ northcoastengineering.com |
| Cc | Joe Fernandez; Warren Frace |
| Sent | Tuesday, November 01, 2016 10:43 AM |

Fyi, more correspondence on the Destino project
Susan
-----Original M essage-----
From: Keith Testerman [mailto:mka2009@ymail.com]
Sent: M onday, October 31, 2016 2:55 PM
To: Planning <planning@ prcity.com>
Subject: Destiny Paso proposed hotel complex
To whom it may concern:
I would like to express my opposition to this project. The traffic on Airport Road is already awful and this proposal would greatly add to the problems, especially when the water park is operating.
Thank you.
Marilyn Testerman
6010 Jardine Rd.
Paso Robles
238-1396
Sent from my iPad

| Subject | FW: Airport Road and Hotel development |
| :--- | :--- |
| From | Susan DeCarli |
| To | Planning Commission |
| Sent | Monday, December 05, 2016 9:05 AM |

Good M orning,
Please the comments below received in regard to the Destino Paso project on the 12/13/16 agenda.
Best regards,
Susan
From: Jerry Oliver [mailto:slantws@ comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, December 04, 2016 12:19 PM
To: Susan DeCarli <SDeCarli@ prcity.com>
Subject: Airport Road and Hotel development

## Dear Sirs, <br> Please add my comment to the consideration of development at Airport Road and Hwy 46. Due to the high speed at which traffic flows on Hwy 46 as it approaches
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Airport Road, I think it wise to require traffic improvement at the start of any project in that area. While posted at 55 MPH, the traffic on Hwy 46 routinely exceeds that speed, which causes a dangerous situation while merging either west or east on Hwy 46 from the stop sign at Airport Road. I would suggest a traffic light, similar to that at Golden Hill Road be installed. To allow development that will increase traffic at that intersection without traffic improvement measures will result in more risk to motorists and pedestrians.
While my home address is just over the line into Monterey County, I do spend the largest share of my household dollars in San Luis Obispo County, largely in Paso Robles. I therefore travel through the intersection at Hwy 46 and Airport road routinely.
Thank you for your consideration.
Jerry Oliver
77824 Ranchita Canyon Rd.
San Miguel CA 93451
805 467-6038


[^0]:    Central Coast Transportation Consulting

[^1]:    Central Coast Transportation Consulting

[^2]:    Central Coast Transportation Consulting

[^3]:    L-1 LANDSCAPE SITE PLAN
    L-2 HOTEL 1 -LANDSCAPE SITE PLAN
    L-3 HOTEL 2 - LANDSCAPE SITE PLAN
    L-4 DESTINO PASO WAY - LANDSCAPE SITE PLAN
    L-5 HOTEL 3-LANDSCAPE SITE PLAN
    L-6 HOTEL 4 - LANDSCAPE PLAN
    L-7 SECTIONS \& MONUMENT SIGNAGE
    L-7.1 SECTIONS
    L-8 PRECEDENT IMAGES
    L-9 MATERIAL \& LIGHT FIXTURES
    L-10 PLANTING LIST AND IRRIGATION NOTES

