May 23, 2022



Mr. Vatsal Patel, PE Senior Engineer City of San Carlos 600 Elm Street San Carlos, CA 94070

Crosswalk Warrants for Alameda de Las Pulgas/Hilltop Drive and 1650 Industrial Road

Dear Mr. Patel;

As requested, W-Trans has prepared a warrant analysis to determine the potential need for new pedestrian crosswalks at two locations in the City of San Carlos: Alameda de Las Pulgas/Hilltop Drive and midblock near 1650 Industrial Road (24-hour Fitness). The purpose of this letter is to document the existing conditions, data obtained, analysis performed, and present the results of the evaluation.

Existing Conditions

A site evaluation was conducted on Friday, February 25, 2022, to confirm the physical characteristics of the roadway and observe the behavior of all users, including pedestrians and motorists.

Alameda de Las Pulgas/Hilltop Drive is an offset four-way intersection with De Anza Avenue adding a *de facto* fifth leg just north of Hilltop Drive. Alameda de Las Pulgas is a two-lane minor arterial street traversing several residential neighborhoods in San Carlos. Alameda de Las Pulgas is 45 feet wide with 10.5-foot-wide travel lanes, 5-foot-wide bicycle lanes, and 7-foot-wide parking lanes on each side. The posted speed limit is 30 mph. Hilltop Drive and De Anza Avenue are both two-lane local streets with on-street parking available on both sides. At the intersection with Alameda de Las Pulgas, the Hilltop Drive and De Anza Avenue approaches are stop controlled. No crossings are currently delineated for pedestrians at the intersection and only two curb ramps currently exist, one at each corner of the northern Hilltop Drive leg. The unmarked crossing connecting these two ramps is approximately 75 feet long.

Industrial Road is a four-lane minor arterial street providing access to the abutting commercial businesses located along either side as well as connecting with Whipple Avenue, Brittan Avenue, Holly Street, and Harbor Boulevard. Industrial Road is 50 feet wide and has a posted speed limit of 35 mph. Each travel lane is 10-feet wide with 5-foot-wide Class II bicycle lanes in each direction. North of 1650 Industrial Road, intermittent parking bays are located along both sides of the street which widen Industrial Road by eight feet outside of the bicycle lanes.

Measured Speeds

At the time of the site visit, a spot speed survey sampling of 179 vehicles on Alameda de Las Pulgas (74 in the southbound direction and 105 in the northbound direction), resulted in an 85th-percentile speed of 35 mph for both directions. These observed speeds are about 5 mph higher than the posted speed limit of 30 mph. On Industrial Road, a speed survey sampling 174 vehicles (71 in the southbound direction and 103 in the northbound direction) resulted in an 85th-percentile speed of 39 mph for southbound and 41 mph for northbound travel. These observed speeds are about 5 mph higher than the posted speed limit of 35 mph. A summary of individual speed measurements is enclosed for both locations.

Vehicle and Pedestrian Counts

Vehicle counts on Alameda de Las Pulgas and Industrial Road were conducted on Wednesday, February 2, 2022, for a 24-hour period to establish typical travel patterns and levels of traffic demand. According to these counts, approximately 9,900 vehicles use Alameda de Las Pulgas on a typical weekday and 11,400 vehicles use Industrial Road. Summaries of these counts are enclosed.

Vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian turning movement counts were also conducted at Alameda de Las Pulgas/ Hilltop Drive on Wednesday, February 2, 2022, from 7:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. For both the a.m. and p.m. count periods, fourteen bicycle trips were observed through the intersection in addition to thirty-eight pedestrian trips, four of which were pedestrian trips across Alameda de Las Pulgas during the a.m. peak hour. A summary of the turning movement counts is enclosed.

A pedestrian crossing study was conducted on Wednesday, February 2, 2022, between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m. in the vicinity of 1650 Industrial Road to determine where pedestrians are choosing to cross and how many pedestrians are currently utilizing the unmarked crossing along the segment of Industrial Road between Washington Street and Bing Street. Thirty-six pedestrians and three cyclists were observed crossing this segment of Industrial Road during the p.m. peak period, with nineteen pedestrians and one cyclist crossing in the peak hour between 4:00 and 5:00 p.m. The most popular crossing location, with 26 pedestrian crossings, was observed to be between Washington Street and the 24-hr Fitness driveway, north of 1650 Industrial Road. A summary of pedestrian and cyclist crossings is provided in Table 1.

Table 1 – Observed Pedestrian/Cyclist Crossings at Industrial Road (4:00 to 6:00 p.m.)												
Segment Limits	N Pe	lumber edestria	of ans	Num	ber of C	yclists						
	EB	WB	Total	EB	WB	Total						
Washington St to 24-hr Fitness South Dwy	10	16	26	0	0	0						
24-hr Fitness South Dwy to Young's Auto Supply Center Dwy	0	3	3	0	3	3						
Young's Auto Supply Center Dwy to Bing St	2	5	7	0	0	0						
Total	12	24	36	0	3	3						

Note: EB = Eastbound, WB = Westbound

Collision Analysis

The collision histories for the study areas were reviewed to determine any trends or patterns that may indicate a safety issue. Collision rates were calculated based on records available from the California Highway Patrol as published in their Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) reports. The most current five-year period available is from May 1, 2016, to April 30, 2021. Caltrans computes collision rates at intersections based on the number of crashes per the number of vehicles entering the intersection (collisions per million vehicles entering, c/mve). Similarly, for segments the collision rate is measured as collisions per million vehicle miles (c/mvm), which considers the number of collisions, average daily traffic, and length of the segment. The collision rate for the five-year study periods was lower than the Statewide average as published in the *2018 Collision Data on California State Highways*, Caltrans, on Alameda de Las Pulgas/Hilltop Drive since there were no reported collisions during this period. This equates to a collision rate of 0.00 c/mve. Fifteen crashes were documented on the segment of Industrial Road between G Street and American Street, two involving pedestrian right-of-way violations. This segment of Industrial Road, which is approximately 0.39 miles long, had a crash rate of 1.85 collisions per million

Mr. Vatsal Patel, PE

vehicle miles (c/mvm), which is greater than the statewide average crash rate for similar facilities. A summary is provided in Table 2. The Collision Report Summaries for both locations are enclosed.

Table 2 – Collision Summary			
Location	Number of Collisions	Collision Rate	Statewide Average Collision Rate for Similar Facilities
Alameda de Las Pulgas/Hilltop Dr	0	0.00 c/mve	0.14 c/mve
Industrial Rd between G St and American St	15	1.85 c/mvm	0.94 c/mvm

Notes: c/mve = collisions per million vehicles entering; c/mvm = collisions per million vehicle miles

Sight Distance Evaluation

The stopping sight distance needed for a following driver to stop if there is a vehicle ahead is evaluated based on stopping sight distance criterion, the approach speed and slope of the street under evaluation.

For the measured critical speed of 35 mph with a positive grade on Alameda de Las Pulgas, the recommended stopping sight distance is 250 feet as stipulated in Table 201.1 of the *Highway Design Manual* published by Caltrans. The northbound Alameda de Las Pulgas approach to the Hilltop Drive intersection contains a crest vertical curve that ends at the limits of the intersection. The southbound approach follows level terrain. Sight distances along Alameda de Las Pulgas through the intersection were measured in excess of 300 feet. These sight distances are considered adequate as they are greater than the minimum required distance of 250 feet.

Sight distance along Industrial Road was evaluated to determine suitability for future crosswalk improvements and to judge sight requirements for turning movements into driveways from Industrial Road. The recommended sight distance on Industrial Road is 300 feet based on the observed critical speed of 40 mph. Since no horizontal or vertical curves exist along the Industrial Road alignment that would limit sight distance in either direction, sight lines exceed 300 feet in both directions and therefore the minimum sight distance requirement is met.

Crosswalk Warrant Analysis

As a preliminary step to evaluate the potential use of enhancements at crossings for pedestrians, warrant analyses were conducted for the study locations of Alameda de Las Pulgas/Hilltop Drive and Industrial Road relative to need for a High-intensity Activated crossWalK (HAWK), Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons (RRFB), or other intersection crossing enhancements.

The analysis was based on the HAWK warrants from the *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (CA MUTCD) as well as the "Guidelines for Pedestrian Crossing Treatments" from the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 562. These methodologies use the volume of pedestrian crossings, the volume of vehicle traffic, vehicle travel speeds and pedestrian crossing distance to determine whether enhanced pedestrian crossing facilities are appropriate. According to this calculation, neither of the study locations would currently meet the warrants for a HAWK signal. Alameda de Las Pulgas at Hilltop Drive does not meet any crosswalk warrants while the area near 1650 Industrial Road does satisfy the criteria for active/enhanced crossing treatments, such as rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFB), flashing warning lights, and/or traffic calming measures such as refuge islands. Additional warrants are generally not met since pedestrian crossing volumes are relatively low. However, given the lack of existing pedestrian infrastructure in the immediate area as well as input from the public describing a desire for additional pedestrian facilities, it is likely that the existing vehicle traffic conditions are a deterrent to pedestrians attempting to cross the street.

Mr. Vatsal Patel, PE

Therefore, a sensitivity analysis was conducted to determine the number of pedestrians that would need to be present during the peak hour for each location to meet warrants for enhancements. From this analysis it was concluded that sixteen additional pedestrians would need to cross Alameda de las Pulgas during the peak hour to meet the warrant for a crosswalk. The crossing at Industrial Road would meet the warrants for a HAWK signal with an increase of twenty-four pedestrians during the peak hour. Given the characteristics of the surrounding land uses and destinations (e.g., White Oaks Elementary School, Trinity Presbyterian Church, bus stops, commercial businesses), combined with the observed pedestrian activity, it is reasonable to assume that the number of pedestrian crossings at these locations would increase with improved pedestrian infrastructure creating a preferred pedestrian route. Therefore, a striped crosswalk is recommended at Alameda de Las Pulgas and a crosswalk with active/enhanced crossing treatments are recommended at Industrial Road.

Pedestrian Crossing Treatment

The recommended striped crosswalk across Alameda de Las Pulgas would need to be placed approximately 20 feet north of the northwest curb return due to utility conflicts. The installation should include advance warning signs (such as the R1-5, W11-2 and W16-9P signs) and pavement markings (crosswalk lines and appropriate yield lines) consistent with the most recent standards from the MUTCD, Chapter 3B. It is also recommended that the 70-foot crossing distance across the eastern leg of Hilltop Drive be reduced by installing a pedestrian refuge island consistent with the recommendations from the NCHRP P562 analysis. The island can be constructed using either standard raised concrete curbs or if desired, the Dura-Curb © Raised Separator System or similar product. It is also possible to stripe the center refuge island with hatched or decorative striping and provide flexposts to delineate the area. Modifications to the existing pavement striping to accommodate the new crosswalk and pedestrian refuge would be necessary. The NCHRP pedestrian crossing worksheets are enclosed.

For crossings across Industrial Road, it is recommended that a crosswalk be established in front of the 24-hour Fitness and placed south of the main driveway. The crosswalk can be positioned between existing tree wells to maintain existing trees. In addition to the crosswalk, advance warning signs (such as the R1-5, W11-2 and W16-9P signs) and pavement markings (crosswalk lines and appropriate yield lines) consistent with the most recent standards from the MUTCD, Chapter 3B should be installed. To further enhance pedestrian safety, solar-powered RRFB devices consistent with FHWA Interim Approval 21 should be placed adjacent to the crosswalk.

Example layout sketches for both locations are enclosed.

Conclusions and Recommendations

- Approximately 9,900 vehicles use Alameda de Las Pulgas near its intersection with Hilltop Drive and 11,400 use Industrial Road in the study area during a typical weekday.
- Observed speeds at both locations are approximately 5 mph higher than the posted speed limit.
- While the collision rate at Alameda de Las Pulgas/Hilltop Drive was lower than the Statewide average for similar facilities, the rate for Industrial Road exceeded the average rate.
- Based on the observed vehicle speeds, the sight distances are adequate along Alameda de Las Pulgas and Industrial Road.
- To accommodate safe pedestrian crossings across Alameda de Las Pulgas it is recommended that a crosswalk with advance signing be established north of the northwest leg of the intersection.
- Installation of a pedestrian refuge island on the eastern leg of Hilltop Drive at Alameda de Las Pulgas is recommended.

Mr. Vatsal Patel, PE

• An installation including a crosswalk with appropriate markings and RRFB is recommended on Industrial Road south of the main driveway to the 24-hour Fitness center.

Thank you for giving W-Trans the opportunity to provide these services. Please call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Nick Brunetto, EIT Assistant Engineer

Kenny Jeong, PE

Senior Engineer

uch Mark Spencer, PE

Senior Principal

MES/kbj/nb/SCA900-17.L1



Enclosures: Vehicle Speed Observations, Peak-Hour Vehicle Turning Movement Counts, 24-hour Vehicle Counts, P.M. Peak Pedestrian Crossing Counts, Collision Report Summaries, TCRP NCHRP Worksheets, and Conceptual Layout Sketches

San Carlos, CA

Speed Survey







San Carlos, CA

Speed Survey







Alameda de las Pulgas & Hilltop Dr

Peak Hour Turning Movement Count



Prepared by National Data & Surveying Services VOLUME

Alameda de las Pulgas Bet. Hilltop Dr & St Francis Way

Day: Wednesday Date: 2/2/2022 City: San Carlos
Project #: CA22_080035_001

	Р	AILV.	τοτ			NB	SB		EB		WB						Tot	al
	U.	AILT		ALS		5,398	4,447	1	0		0						9,8	45
AM Period	NB		SB		EB	WB	то	TAL	PM Period	NB		SB		EB	WB		тот	AL
0:00	3		0				3		12:00	115		76				19	91	
0:15	0		2				2		12:15	92		68				16	60	
0:30	1	6	1	7			2	12	12:30	98	204	88	276			18	86 02	720
1:00	1	0	4	/			2	15	12:45	105	594	73	520			1	<u>05</u> 78	720
1:15	Ō		Ō				ō		13:15	96		91				18	87	
1:30	1		0				1		13:30	85		80				16	65	
1:45	1	3	0	1			1	4	13:45	96	382	75	319			17	71	701
2:00	1		0				1		14:00 14:15	68 97		94 74				10	62 71	
2:30	1		1				2		14:30	95		88				18	83	
2:45	1	5	0	2			1	7	14:45	130	390	100	356			23	30	746
3:00	0		1				1		15:00	131		87				2:	18	
3:15	1		0				1		15:15	106		102				20	08	
3:30	1	5	0	1			1	6	15:30	131	507	90 104	383			24	21 43	800
4:00	0	5	0				0	0	16:00	138	507	104	305			24	45	850
4:15	2		Ō				2		16:15	119		89				20	08	
4:30	2		0				2		16:30	110		90				20	00	
4:45	2	6	7	7			9	13	16:45	122	489	98	384			22	20	873
5:00	3		2				5		17:00	110		105				22	15 14	
5:30	10		9				10		17:30	132		84				2	14 16	
5:45	5	21	11	29			16	50	17:45	136	487	88	382			22	24	869
6:00	6		12				18		18:00	114		97				2:	11	
6:15	11		21				32		18:15	87		63				15	50	
6:30	18	70	14 34	81			32 69	151	18:30	/1 08	370	50	268			12	27 50	638
7:00	22	70	41	01			63	151	19:00	63	570	35	200			9	<u>)</u> 8	030
7:15	65		52				117		19:15	62		32				9	94	
7:30	82		85				167		19:30	52		55				10	07	
7:45	97	266	94	272			191	538	19:45	51	228	34	156			8	35	384
8:00	114		119				233		20:00	40 20		35				1	'5 :0	
8:30	115		94				208		20:30	31		30				6	50 51	
8:45	96	447	72	371			168	818	20:45	29	139	20	114			4	9	253
9:00	87		69				156		21:00	28		31				5	59	
9:15	72		66				138		21:15	24		15				3	19	
9:30	92	227	82 72	200			1/4	617	21:30	18	80	15	71			3	33	160
10:00	71	J27	71	230			142	017	22:00	19	03	11	/1			3	10	100
10:15	80		66				146		22:15	12		8				2	20	
10:30	88		73				161		22:30	10		7				1	.7	
10:45	102	341	69	279			171	620	22:45	5	46	4	30				9	76
11:00	/6 00		68 95				144		23:00	/ >		4 1				1	.⊥ 7	
11:30	85		68				153		23:30	3 7		4				1	.1	
11:45	102	361	83	304			185	665	23:45	2	19	2	14			4	4	33
TOTALS		1858		1644				3502	TOTALS		3540		2803					6343
SPLIT %		53.1%)	46.9%				35.6%	SPLIT %		55.8%		44.2%					64.4%
						NB	SB		EB		WB						Tot	al
	D	AILY	TOTA			5.398	4 447	,	0		0						9.8	45
									0								-9,0	
AM Peak Hour		7:45		7:45				7:45	PM Peak Hour		15:30		15:15					15:15
AM Pk Volume		448		393				841	PM Pk Volume		527		403					917

M Peak Hour	7:45	7:45			7:45	PM Peak Hour	15:30	15:15			15:15
M Pk Volume	448	393			841	PM Pk Volume	527	403			917
Pk Hr Factor	0.918	0.826			0.902	Pk Hr Factor	0.948	0.942			0.936
7 - 9 Volume	713	643	0	0	1356	4 - 6 Volume	976	766	0	0	1742
- 9 Peak Hour	7:45	7:45			7:45	4 - 6 Peak Hour	16:00	16:30			16:00
- 9 Pk Volume	448	393			841	4 - 6 Pk Volume	489	398			873
Pk Hr Factor	0.918	0.826			0 902	Pk Hr Factor	0.886	0.948			0 891

Prepared by National Data & Surveying Services **VOLUME** Industrial Rd Bet. Washington St & Bing St

Day: Wednesday Date: 2/2/2022 City: San Carlos
Project #: CA22_080035_002

DAILY TOTALS				NB	SB		EB		WB						Тс	otal		
	U.		1017	ALS		7,252	4,129)	0		0						11	,381
AM Period	NB		SB		EB	WB	TC	TAL	PM Period	NB		SB		EB	V	VB	тс	TAL
0:00	6		5				11		12:00	138		79					217	
0:15	1		0				1		12:15	141		79					220	
0:30	7	10	6	10			13	21	12:30	138	553	78	221				216	074
1:00	4	18	2	13			11	31	12:45	156	553	69	321				221	874
1:15	0		2				2		13:15	144		78					222	
1:30	1		3				4		13:30	130		67					197	
1:45	0	4	4	17			4	21	13:45	140	570	64	278				204	848
2:00	3		3				6		14:00	144		78					222	
2:15	2		2				4		14:15	146		/2					218	
2:30	2	٩	2	10			5	19	14.50	106	523	73 95	318				200	841
3:00	5	5	5	10			10	15	15:00	131	525	82	510				213	
3:15	4		2				6		15:15	137		83					220	
3:30	3		10				13		15:30	143		106					249	
3:45	7	19	6	23			13	42	15:45	127	538	76	347				203	885
4:00	5		6 14				11		16:00	144		109					253	
4.15	13		14				25		16:30	124		100					250	
4:45	20	40	10	42			30	82	16:45	156	568	79	401				235	969
5:00	23		20				43		17:00	127		70					197	
5:15	21		11				32		17:15	149		86					235	
5:30	38	420	12				50	402	17:30	150		71	205				221	055
5:45	47	129	17	64			50 50	193	17:45	124	550	<u> </u>	305				202	855
6.00	62		26				88		18:15	96		55					151	
6:30	53		17				70		18:30	73		50					123	
6:45	101	258	47	107			148	365	18:45	105	394	61	232				166	626
7:00	90		40				130		19:00	80		40					120	
7:15	101		34				135		19:15	51		30					81	
7:30	104	115	49 71	10/			153	609	19:30	65	264	28	122				96	307
8:00	138	415	48	174			186	005	20:00	45	204	26	155				71	557
8:15	112		51				163		20:15	45		19					64	
8:30	138		72				210		20:30	37		37					74	
8:45	128	516	60	231			188	747	20:45	38	165	27	109				65	274
9:00	121		70				191		21:00	3/		24					61	
9.15	105		55 65				172		21:15	23		10					40 34	
9:45	127	458	78	268			205	726	21:45	18	108	11	62				29	170
10:00	116		74				190		22:00	16		9					25	
10:15	114		66				180		22:15	13		12					25	
10:30	123	407	81	201			204	770	22:30	4	20	3	24				7	60
10:45	175	497	69	ZÕI			204	//8	22:45	- Э 14	38	/ 	31				12	69
11:15	132		84				216		23:15	7		2					9	
11:30	136		93				229		23:30	3		5					8	
11:45	146	589	82	328			228	917	23:45	5	29	3	14				8	43
TOTALS		2952		1578				4530	TOTALS		4300		2551					6851
SPLIT %		65.2%		34.8%				39.8%	SPLIT %		62.8%		37.2%					60.2%
		A 11 - X- 3	TOT4			NB	SB		EB		WB_						To	otal
	D			ALS		7,252	4,129)	0		0						11	,381
AM Peak Hour		11:00		11:15				11:00	PM Peak Hour		16:45		16:00					16:00

AM Peak Hour	11:00	11:15			11:00	PM Peak Hour	16:45	16:00			16:00
AM Pk Volume	589	338			917	PM Pk Volume	582	401			969
Pk Hr Factor	0.841	0.909			0.940	Pk Hr Factor	0.933	0.920			0.958
7 - 9 Volume	931	425	0	0	1356	4 - 6 Volume	1118	706	0	0	1824
7 - 9 Peak Hour	8:00	7:45			7:45	4 - 6 Peak Hour	16:45	16:00			16:00
7 - 9 Pk Volume	516	242			750	4 - 6 Pk Volume	582	401			969
Pk Hr Factor	0.935	0.840	0.000	0.000	0.893	Pk Hr Factor	0.933	0.920	0.000	0.000	0.958

Crosswalk, Jaywalking Study

Location: Industrial Rd Bet. Washington St & Bing St City: San Carlos

			Ре	ds		
TIME	Zon	ie 1	Zor	ne 2	Zor	ne 3
	EB	WB	EB	WB	EB	WB
4:00 PM	0	3	0	1	2	2
4:15 PM	2	1	0	1	0	0
4:30 PM	1	1	0	0	0	1
4:45 PM	2	1	0	0	0	1
5:00 PM	1	2	0	0	0	0
5:15 PM	2	1	0	0	0	1
5:30 PM	0	2	0	1	0	0
5:45 PM	2	5	0	0	0	0
Totals	10	16	0	3	2	5



Date 2/2/2022

Day Wednesday



Alameda de Las Pulgas at Hilltop Dr San Carlos, San Mateo County

Collision Report Summary

2/8/2022 Date Range Reported: 5/1/16 - 4/30/21 Total Number of Collisions: 0 Total Numberof Persons Injured: Total Number of Persons Killed:

Page 1

Damanti	Data	Time	Lesstian	Dist. Dir	Type of	Motor Veh.	Dir. of	Movement	Dir. of	Movement	DOF	
Report#	Date	Time	Location	Dist. Dir.	Collision	Involved With	Travel 1	Prec. Coll. 1	Travel 2	Prec. Coll. 2	PCF	inj. Kii.

Industrial Rd from G St to American St San Carlos, San Mateo County

Collision Report Summary

2/8/2022 Date Range Reported: 5/1/16 - 4/30/21 Total Number of Collisions: 15 Total Numberof Persons Injured: 14 Total Number of Persons Killed: 0

Page 1

Report#	Date	Time	Location	Dist	. Dir.	Type of Collision	Motor Veh. Involved With	Dir. of Travel 1	Movement Prec. Coll. 1	Dir. of Travel 2	Movement Prec. Coll. 2	PCF	Inj. I	Kil.
8063623	5/16/16	13:48	Industrial Rd & Bing St	222'	South	Broadside	Other Motor Vehicle	North	Making U Turn	Not Stat	Proceeding Straight	Improper Turning	0	0
8168947	8/31/16	00:57	Industrial Rd & Center St	0'	In Int.	Head-On	Other Object	South	Ran Off Road	Not Stat	Not Stated	Improper Turning	2	0
8182527	9/22/16	14:30	Center St & Industrial Rd	0'	In Int.	Sideswipe	Other Motor Vehicle	Not State	Making Left Turn	East	Not Stated	Unsafe Speed	0	0
8182855	9/29/16	05:55	Industrial Rd & Washington St	149'	South	Head-On	Other Motor Vehicle	North	Making Left Turn	North	Proceeding Straight	Auto R/W Violation	1	0
8172625	9/30/16	09:16	Industrial Rd & Washington St	0'	In Int.	Rear-End	Other Motor Vehicle	North	Crossed Into Opposing	North	Not Stated	Unsafe Speed	1	0
8163581	10/22/16	07:44	Industrial Rd & America St	30'	South	Hit Object	Fixed Object	East	Proceeding Straight			Driving Under Influence	1	0
8172161	11/4/16	09:50	Industrial Rd & Washington Av	175'	South	Vehicle - Pedestrian	Pedestrian	North	Proceeding Straight	East	Not Stated	Pedestrian Violation	1	0
8311216	2/17/17	19:18	Industrial Rd & Washington St	47'	South	Broadside	Other Motor Vehicle	North	Proceeding Straight	West	Making Left Turn	Driving Under Influence	1	0
8329169	3/10/17	16:42	Industrial Rd & Washington St	3'	North	Sideswipe	Other Motor Vehicle	South	Making Right Turn	South	Proceeding Straight	Unsafe Lane Change	1	0
8462447	8/10/17	14:54	Industrial Rd & American St	298'	South	Broadside	Bicycle	North	Not Stated	North	Proceeding Straight	Improper Turning	1	0
8854264	3/4/19	10:40	Industrial Rd & Washington St	132'	South	Sideswipe	Parked Motor Vehicle	South	Proceeding Straight	South	Parked	Improper Turning	1	0
8826176	3/14/19	06:37	American St & Industrial Rd	7'	East	Vehicle - Pedestrian	Pedestrian	East	Proceeding Straight	Not Stat	Not Stated	Ped R/W Violation	1	0

Page	2
------	---

Report#	Date	Time	Location	Dist	. Dir.	Type of Collision	Motor Veh. Involved With	Dir. of Travel 1	Movement Prec. Coll. 1	Dir. of Travel 2	Movement Prec. Coll. 2	PCF	Inj. k	Cil.
8946865	9/18/19	19:39	Industrial Rd & Washington St	151'	South	Head-On	Other Motor Vehicle	North	Making Left Turn	South	Proceeding Straight	Improper Turning	1	0
9082958	3/12/20	07:10	Industrial Rd & Washington St	12'	East	Broadside	Other Motor Vehicle	North	Making Left Turn	South	Proceeding Straight	Auto R/W Violation	1	0
9093669	4/7/20	10:06	Industrial Rd & Bing St	111'	South	Rear-End	Other Motor Vehicle	North	Proceeding Straight	North	Slowing/Stopp ng	i Unsafe Speed	1	0

GUIDELINES FOR PEDESTRIAN CROSSING TREATMENTS

This spreadsheet combines Worksheet 1 and Worksheet 2 (Appendix A, pages 69-70) of TCRP Report 112/NCHRP Report 562 (*Improving Pedestrian Safety at Unsignalized Intersections*) into an electronic format. This spreadsheet should be used in conjunction with, and not independent of, Appendix A documentation.



Blue fields contain descriptive information. Green fields are required and must be completed.

Tan fields are adjustments that are filled out only under certain conditions (follow instructions to the left of the cell). Gray fields are automatically calculated and should not be edited.

	,					
Analyst and Site Info	ormation					
Analyst	Nick Brunetto	Ma	ajor Street	Alameda de Las Pulgas		
Analysis Date	February 14, 2022	Minor Street o	r Location	Hilltop Drive		
Data Collection Date	February 2, 2022		Peak Hour	3:15 PM		
Step 1: Select works	sheet:					
Posted or statutory speed	limit (or 85th percentile speed) on the r	major street (mph)		1a	35
Is the population of the su	urrounding area <10,000? (enter YES or	or NO)			1b	NO
Step 2: Does the cro	ssing meet minimum pedestr	rian volumes	to be co	onsidered for a traffic	control de	vice?
Peak-hour pedestrian volu	ıme (ped/h), V _p				2a	4
Result: Consider ra	ised median islands, curb extension	ns, traffic calmi	ng, etc. as	s feasible.		
Step 3: Does the cro	ssing meet the pedestrian wa	arrant for a t	raffic sig	inal?		
Major road volume, total o	of both approaches during peak hour (ve	eh/h), V _{maj-s}			За	917
[Calculated automatically]	Preliminary (before min. threshold) pea	ak hour pedestrian	volume to	meet warrant	3b	309
[Calculated automatically]	Minimum required peak hour pedestriar	n volume to meet	traffic sign	al warrant	Зс	309
Is 15th percentile crossing	speed of pedestrians less than 3.5 ft/s	(1.1 m/s)? (enter	r YES or N	IO)	3d	NO
If 15th percentile crossing	speed of pedestrians is less than 3.5 ft/	/s %	rate of rec	duction for <i>3c</i> (up to 50%)	Зе	0%
(1.1 m/s), then reduce 30	<i>c</i> by up to 50%.	R	educed valu	ue or <i>3c</i>	3f	309
Result:		÷				
Step 4: Estimate per	destrian delay.					
Pedestrian crossing distan	ce, curb to curb (ft), L				<i>4a</i>	45
Pedestrian walking speed	(ft/s), S_p (suggested speed = 3.5 ft/s)				4b	3.5
Pedestrian start-up time a	nd end clearance time (s), t_s (suggestee	d start-up time =	3 sec)		4с	3
[Calculated automatically]	Critical gap required for crossing pedes	trian (s), t _c			4d	15.8
Major road volume, total t is present, during peak h	ooth approaches OR approach being cros nour (veh/h), V _{maj-d}	ssed if raised med	lian island		<i>4e</i>	917
Major road flow rate (veh/	/s), v				4f	0.25
Average pedestrian delay	(s/person), d _p				4g	188
Total pedestrian delay (h)	, D_p $$ The value in 4h is the calculated	estimated delay f	or all pedes	strians crossing the	4h	0.2
major roadway without has been measured at t	a crossing treatment (assumes 0% com he site, that value can be entered in 4i t	pliance). If the ac to replace the calc	tual total p ulated valu	edestrian delay e in 4h.	<i>4i</i>	
Step 5: Select treatr	nent based up on total pedes	trian delay a	nd expe	cted motorist compli	ance.	
Expected motorist complia	ance at pedestrian crossings in region: en	enter HIGH for H	igh Compl	liance or LOW for Low	5a	HIGH
Treatment	t Category: Conside	er raised medi	ian islan	ds, curb extensions, feasible.	traffic calm	ning, etc. as
700						



This worksheet provides general recommendations on pedestrian crossing treatments to consider at unsignalized intersections; in all cases, engineering judgment should be used in selecting a specific treatment for installation. This worksheet does not apply to school crossings. In addition to the results provided by this worksheet, users should consider whether a pedestrian treatment could present an increased safety risk to pedestrians, such as where there is poor sight distance, complex geometrics, or nearby traffic signals.

GUIDELINES FOR PEDESTRIAN CROSSING TREATMENTS

This spreadsheet combines Worksheet 1 and Worksheet 2 (Appendix A, pages 69-70) of TCRP Report 112/NCHRP Report 562 (*Improving Pedestrian Safety at Unsignalized Intersections*) into an electronic format. This spreadsheet should be used in conjunction with, and not independent of, Appendix A documentation.



Blue fields contain descriptive information. Green fields are required and must be completed.

Tan fields are adjustments that are filled out only under certain conditions (follow instructions to the left of the cell). Gray fields are automatically calculated and should not be edited.

	•										
Analyst and Site Info	ormation										
Analyst Nick Brunetto			Major Street		Alameda de Las Pulgas						
Analysis Date	February 14, 2022	Minor Street or Location Hilltop Drive									
Data Collection Date	February 2, 2022										
Step 1: Select works	sheet:										
Posted or statutory speed	1a	35									
Is the population of the su	1b	NO									
Step 2: Does the crossing meet minimum pedestrian volumes to be considered for a traffic control device?											
Peak-hour pedestrian volu	2a	20									
Result: Go to step											
Step 3: Does the cro	ossing meet the ped	estrian wa	arrant for a	traffic sig	gnal?						
Major road volume, total of	За	917									
[Calculated automatically] Preliminary (before min. threshold) peak hour pedestrian volume to meet warrant							309				
[Calculated automatically] Minimum required peak hour pedestrian volume to meet traffic signal warrant							309				
Is 15th percentile crossing	3d	NO									
If 15th percentile crossing speed of pedestrians is less than 3.5 ft/s				% rate of reduction for 3c (up to 50%)		Зе	0%				
(1.1 m/s), then reduce $3c$ by up to 50%.				Reduced val	ue or <i>3c</i>	3f	309				
Result: The signal warrant is not met. Go to step 4.											
Step 4: Estimate per	destrian delay.										
Pedestrian crossing distance, curb to curb (ft), L							45				
Pedestrian walking speed (ft/s), S_p (suggested speed = 3.5 ft/s)							3.5				
Pedestrian start-up time and end clearance time (s), t_s (suggested start-up time = 3 sec)							3				
[Calculated automatically] Critical gap required for crossing pedestrian (s), t _c							15.8				
Major road volume, total both approaches OR approach being crossed if raised median island is present, during peak hour (veh/h), V _{maj-d}							917				
Major road flow rate (veh/s), v							0.25				
Average pedestrian delay (s/person), d _p							188				
Total pedestrian delay (h), D _p The value in 4h is the calculated estimated delay for all pedestrians crossing the							1.0				
major roadway without a crossing treatment (assumes 0% compliance). If the actual total pedestrian delay											
nas been measured at ure site, unit value can be entered in 41 to replace the calculated value in 41.											
Step 5: Select field	ment based up on to		ti idil ueldy			ance.	[
Expected motorist compliance at pedestrian crossings in region: enter Figh for high compliance of LOW for LOW						5a	HIGH				
Treatment Category: CROSSWALK											



This worksheet provides general recommendations on pedestrian crossing treatments to consider at unsignalized intersections; in all cases, engineering judgment should be used in selecting a specific treatment for installation. This worksheet does not apply to school crossings. In addition to the results provided by this worksheet, users should consider whether a pedestrian treatment could present an increased safety risk to pedestrians, such as where there is poor sight distance, complex geometrics, or nearby traffic signals.

GUIDELINES FOR PEDESTRIAN CROSSING TREATMENTS

This spreadsheet combines Worksheet 1 and Worksheet 2 (Appendix A, pages 69-70) of TCRP Report 112/NCHRP Report 562 (*Improving Pedestrian Safety at Unsignalized Intersections*) into an electronic format. This spreadsheet should be used in conjunction with, and not independent of, Appendix A documentation.



Blue fields contain descriptive information.

Green fields are required and must be completed.



Analyst and Site Infor	rmation											
Analyst	Nick Brunetto		Major Street	Industrial Road								
Analysis Date	ebruary 14, 2022 Minor Street or L		t or Location	1650 Industrial Road								
Data Collection Date	February 2, 2022											
Step 1: Select worksheet:												
Posted or statutory speed li	1a	36										
Is the population of the sur	1b	NO										
Step 2: Does the crossing meet minimum pedestrian volumes to be considered for a traffic control device?												
Peak-hour pedestrian volun	2a	19										
Result: Go to step 3	Result: Go to step 3.											
Step 3: Does the crossing meet the pedestrian warrant for a traffic signal?												
Major road volume, total of	За	969										
[Calculated automatically] F	3b	109										
[Calculated automatically] Minimum required peak hour pedestrian volume to meet traffic signal warrant							109					
Is 15th percentile crossing	3d	NO										
If 15th percentile crossing speed of pedestrians is less than 3.5 ft/s				% rate of reduction for 3c (up to 50%)		Зе	0%					
(1.1 m/s), then reduce $3c$ by up to 50%.				Reduced value or 3c			109					
Result: The signal warrant is not met. Go to step 4.												
Step 4: Estimate ped	estrian delay.											
Pedestrian crossing distance	<i>4a</i>	50										
Pedestrian walking speed (ft/s), S_p (suggested speed = 3.5 ft/s)							3.5					
Pedestrian start-up time and end clearance time (s), t_s (suggested start-up time = 3 sec)							3					
[Calculated automatically] Critical gap required for crossing pedestrian (s), t _c							17.2					
Major road volume, total both approaches OR approach being crossed if raised median island is present, during peak hour (veh/h), V _{maj-d}							969					
Major road flow rate (veh/s), v							0.38					
Average pedestrian delay (s/person), d _p							1795					
Total pedestrian delay (h), D _p The value in 4h is the calculated estimated delay for all pedestrians crossing the							9.5					
major roadway without a crossing treatment (assumes 0% compliance). If the actual total pedestrian delay has been measured at the site, that value can be entered in 4i to replace the calculated value in 4h.												
Step 5: Select treatment based up on total pedestrian delay and expected motorist compliance.												
Expected motorist complian	nce at pedestrian crossing	s in region: er	nter HIGH for	High Comp	liance or LOW for Low	52	нісн					
Compliance						Ja	HIGH					
Treatment	Category:			АСТ	IVE OR ENHANCED							



This worksheet provides general recommendations on pedestrian crossing treatments to consider at unsignalized intersections; in all cases, engineering judgment should be used in selecting a specific treatment for installation. This worksheet does not apply to school crossings. In addition to the results provided by this worksheet, users should consider whether a pedestrian treatment could present an increased safety risk to pedestrians, such as where there is poor sight distance, complex geometrics, or nearby traffic signals.





ALAMEDA DE LAS PULGAS CONCEPT

SCA900-17 - MIDBLOCK CROSSINGS ANALYSIS

03/31/2022





INDUSTRIAL ROAD CONCEPT

SCA900-17 - MIDBLOCK CROSSINGS ANALYSIS

03/31/2022