

City of Rialto

Regular Meeting

Transportation Commission

Wednesday, October 6, 2021	6:00 PM	VIA ZOOM

AMENDED AGENDA - CORRECTED ZOOM LINK

CALL TO ORDER

In response to the COVID-19 Emergency, and in compliance with Social Distancing Protocols, the Transportation Commission will be participating in the meeting from remote locations via Zoom Video Conferencing or Teleconferencing within the guidelines of Governor Newsom's Executive order N-29-20. Members of the public may submit, at least 24-hours before the meeting time, comments on any agenda item or any item not on the agenda, in writing, via mail to City of Rialto "Attn: Public Works Department." 150 S. Palm Avenue, Rialto, CA 92376: by email to publicworks@rialtoca.gov: or may leave a recorded message at (909) 421-7279 of no more than five (5) minutes in length and the message will be played or read aloud during the agenda item.

Members of the public are afforded an opportunity to comment on any listed agenda items. Please notify the Public Works Department if you wish to do so. All agendas are posted in the City Hall Administration Building (150 South Palm Avenue, Rialto, CA 92376) at least 72-hours in advance of the meeting. All writings that relate to an agenda item for an open session of a regular meeting of the Transportation Commission distributed to all, or a majority, of the Commissioners also shall be made available, at the same time but not sooner than 72-hours before a regular meeting and on the City's website at www.yourrialto.com. Any person having a question concerning any agenda items may call the Public Works Department at (909) 421-7279 to make an inquiry concerning the nature of the item described on the agenda.

To attend the meeting via Zoom: https://zoom.us/j/82105024972 | Passcode: RialtoPW

To Call into the Live Meeting: (669) 900-6833 | Meeting ID: 821 0502 4972 | Passcode: 56615045

Based upon the open meeting laws (the Brown Act), additional items may be added to the agenda and acted upon by the Transportation Commission only if it is considered to be a "subsequent need" or "emergency item" and is added by a two-thirds vote. Matters raised under Oral Communications may not be acted upon at that meeting other than as provided above.

ROLL CALL

Chairperson Allan Kirst, Vice-Chairperson Joshua Holeman, Commissioner Kelvin Moore, Commissioner Stacy Augustine, Commissioner Johan Rodriguez, Mayor Deborah Robertson

MOMENT OF SILENCE/INVOCATION

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM REGULAR MEETING

1 <u>TC 21-0721</u> Minutes from the June 2, 2021 Transportation Commission meeting will be provided for approval at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

Approval of Minutes Regular Meeting - April 7, 2021 (ACTION ITEM) Attachments: 04-07-21.docx

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

POLICE DEPARTMENT LIAISON REPORT

RUSD LIAISON REPORT

NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

1 <u>TC 21-0702</u> Traffic Impact Analysis - Angelus Block End of Fortuna Way near Industrial Drive and Riverside Avenue (ACTION ITEM)

Attachments:Attachment 1.pdfAttachment 2.pdfAttachment 3.pdfAttachment 4.pdfAttachment 5.pdf

2 <u>TC 21-0705</u> Traffic Impact Analysis - Dutch Brothers Coffee & Express Wash on the Southwest Corner of Valley Boulevard and Riverside Avenue. (ACTION ITEM)

Attachments:Attachment 1.pdfAttachment 2.pdfAttachment 3.pdfAttachment 4.pdfAttachment 5.pdf

3 <u>TC 21-0703</u> Traffic Impact Analysis - Rialto Travel Center Southwest Corner of Casmalia Street at Alder Avenue. (ACTION ITEM) <u>Attachments:</u> <u>Attachment 1.pdf</u>

Attachment 2.pdf Attachment 3.pdf Attachment 4.pdf Attachment 5.pdf

ENGINEER'S REPORT

 1
 TC 21-0707
 Casmalia Street at Ayala Drive Restriping for Left Turn (INFORMATIONAL ITEM)

 Attachments:
 Casmalia Existing Striping.pdf

Casmalia Proposed Striping with minor raised median.pdf

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

 I
 TC 21-0718
 Future Agenda Items

 Attachments:
 Future Agenda Items List.pdf

COMMISSIONER REPORTS

ADJOURNMENT



Legislation Text

File #: TC 21-0721, Version: 1, Agenda #: 1

Minutes from the June 2, 2021 Transportation Commission meeting will be provided for approval at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

Approval of Minutes Regular Meeting - April 7, 2021 (ACTION ITEM)

REGULAR MEETING of the TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

MINUTES April 7, 2021

The regular meeting of the Transportation Commission of the City of Rialto was held via Zoom Video Conferencing on Wednesday, April 7, 2021.

000

This meeting was in accordance with the provision of the Government Code §54956 of the State of California.

		000
CALL TO ORDER	Chairperso	n Allan Kirst called the meeting to order at 6:09 p.m.
		000
ROLL CALL	The roll call	was taken by Commission Clerk, Michele Aguirre.
	Present:	Chairperson Allan Kirst
		Vice-Chairperson Holeman Commissioner Stacy Augustine
	Absent:	Mayor Deborah Robertson
		Commissioner Kelvin Moore
	Chairperson Moment of	n Kirst suggested forgoing the Pledge of Allegiance and Silence at this time and going directly to New Business
	items.	
	City Staff P	resent: Michael Tahan, Interim Public Works Director Gabor Pakozdi, Acting City Engineer Monae Pugh, Consultant Engineer Daniel Casey, Senior Planner
		000
APPROVAL OF MINUTES Regular Meeting of March 3, 2021	◆ The m Comm	inutes from the March 3 rd meeting were review by the ission and approved as written.
	 Vice-C minute 	nairperson Holeman made a motion to approve the s from the March 3rd meeting as written
	♦ Comm	issioner Augustine seconded the motion.
	 ♦ The m 3, 202 	otion was carried to approve the minutes from the March 1, meeting as written.
		000
ORAL COMMUNICATIONS	None	
		000
POLICE DEPARTMENT LIAISON REPORT	No report.	
		000
RUSD LIAISON REPORT	No Report.	

NEW BUSINESS

Revised Traffic Impact Analysis – Contractor's Equipment Yard and 1,200 Square Foot Administrative Building on the Westside of Sycamore Avenue between Slover Avenue and Cameron Way

ENGINEER'S REPORT

000

Michael Tahan briefly discussed the tasks that have transpired regarding this project and introduced Monae Pugh.

Pugh re-reviewed the updated staff report and recommendations.

Tahan added that Daniel Casey and Karen Peterson of Community Development met with the applicant to review the intersections for the project as the northwest corner is in the City of Colton. Advised will be working Victor Ortiz, City Engineer for the City of Colton to address concerns of the Commission.

Questions & Comments

Pugh, Landin, and Hsu answered questions and responded to comments regarding:

- What the additional paving and striping was.
- Chair Kirst offered an apology to the applicant regarding the additional requirements that were previously requested. He stated that if the Commission was aware that part of the project was within the City of Colton, the Commission would not have burdened the applicant with the additional requirements.

Action

- Commissioner Augustine made a motion approve the project with staff's recommendations and the additional paving and center line striping.
- Vice-Chair Holeman seconded the motion.
- All voted in favor of approving the project with staff's recommendations and the additional paving and center line striping.

Request

- Chair Kirst requested that when other projects are presented that may include joint jurisdictions, a clear definition of those areas and who they belong to.
- ٠

000

Tahan introduced Gabor Pakozdi, Acting City Engineer, who is helping Public Works while the recruitment process is being completed for a City Engineer.

Tahan briefly reviewed the discussion of previous issues that were brought up regarding timings at various intersections and advised that Iteris and St. Francis were asked to attend to address and/or understand those concerns to develop a game plan for the City.

• Chairperson Kirst commented on the timing and how it works when on coordination vs when they are not on coordination. He

discussed the various issues that have been experienced at various locations throughout the City.

Tahan introduced Tim Byrne from SBCTA, Bernard Li of Iteris, and Jill Petrie, Andy Briones, and Lance Alms of St. Francis Electric.

- Li provided an overview of the San Bernardino Valley Coordinated Traffic Signal System (SBVCTSS) program and its goal. He advised as part of this program, the following six (6) major corridors in Rialto were included in the program:
 - Valley Boulevard
 - Foothill Boulevard
 - Baseline Road
 - Cedar Avenue/Ayala Drive
 - Riverside Avenue
 - Bloomington Avenue
- Li provided an explanation of why signals go out of coordination and deferred to Jill Petrie from St. Francis to respond to issues related to equipment.
- Tahan added that Iteris has a contract with the City for other timing issues when they arise.

Questions/Comments/Concerns

Tahan, Li, Petrie and Briones answered questions and responded to comments and concerns regarding:

- Who was responsible for ensuring preventative maintenance is completed.
 - Petrie provided an explanation of the tasks they perform for the traffic signals. She discussed the types of systems that exist and the issues that they have found at various locations. She advised that St. Francis is working on a survey to help resolve some of these issues.
- How often the signals and signal timings were reviewed.
- Coordination times.
- When free local timings are.
 - Discussion ensued regarding timings throughout the day and how they work. Petrie advised that 60-75% of intersections are running on timing sheets that are 10 to 15 years old.
- Why were there lead lags on all approaches as it causes confusions.
 - Li provided an explanation on how that works.
 - > A discussion ensued regarding lead lags and coordination.
- Comment on posted speed limits around the City and the issue that the coordination timing setups do not coincide with the speed limits.
 - Li provided an explanation on how Iteris designs coordination and what they are based on.
- If Iteris takes speed surveys during specific times to determine what the prevailing speeds are.

- Comment on the video detection systems and the issue of vehicles having to wait prior to the next phase to have a vehicle detected so a call could be placed into the system.
- If the survey that was being completed would address all the older systems that need to be updated with a recommendation to change them.
 - Petrie provided an explanation of what needs to be done to fix those issue.

Requests/Suggestions/Recommendations

- Vice-Chair Holeman requests compiling a list of signals that are not functioning correctly to get them addressed.
- Chairperson Kirst requested that current timing charts are kept in the controllers and should be a top priority.
- Tahan advised that he would work with St. Francis to address all the outdated information and see what is needed to update the timings.
- Vice-Chair Holeman suggested provided a list of locations that were discussed previously that were considered high priority.
- Chairperson Kirst suggested that the Commissioners send a list of locations to Michele Aguirre so that she could compile a list.
 - A discussion ensued regarding the list of locations which were:
 - Riverside and Walnut Avenues
 - Riverside Avenue and Ayala Drive
 - Riverside and Linden Avenues
 - Riverside and Randall Avenues
 - Valley Boulevard
 - Walnut Avenue
 - Easton Street
 - Ayala Drive and Renaissance Parkway
 - Riverside and Alder Avenues
 - Cactus and Rialto Avenues
 - Alder and Riverside Avenues
 - Linden Avenue and Casmalia Street
- Commissioner Augustine requested to see the completed survey that provides a total amount so that it could be provided to Council to show what is needed to bring the City up to par.
- Chairperson Kirst agreed with Commissioner Augustine's request.
- Petrie advised that when they get the list of the location they will review and resolve or send a report of issues if they are unable to repair.
- Aguirre asked the Commission to provide her all the locations and she would compile and send to St. Francis.

Tahan provided an update on the following projects:

- Easton Sidewalk
- Overlay Project
- ♦ Alder Avenue/SR210
- Pepper Avenue and Winchester Drive Traffic Signal

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

COMMISSIONER REPORTS

ADJOURNMENT

- Tahan informed the Commission that the City is working on a Traffic Study and a Truck Route Study and would be conducting a joint meeting with the Planning Commission for some time at the end of April.
- Chairperson Kirst advised that he would be available either before April 23rd or after May 4th as he would be on vacation.

000

- Commissioner Augustine No Report
- Vice-Chairperson Holeman No Report
- Chairperson Kirst No Report

- Vice-Chair Holeman made a motion to adjourn.
- Commissioner Augustine seconded the motion.
- The motion was carried, and the meeting adjourned at 7:06 p.m.



File #: TC 21-0702, Version: 1, Agenda #: 1

For Transportation Commission Meeting [October 6, 2021]

TO: Honorable Chairperson and Commission

APPROVAL: Michael Tahan, Interim Public works Director

FROM: Justin Schlaefli, Consultant Engineer, TKE Engineering

Traffic Impact Analysis - Angelus Block End of Fortuna Way near Industrial Drive and Riverside Avenue

(ACTION ITEM)

BACKGROUND:

In April 2021, the Project Scoping Agreement for the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was approved. The project is a proposed manufacturing plant consisting of 188,493 square feet. Access to the site is provided via a cul-de-sac at the end of Fortuna Way. There are two (2) one-way driveways spaced out within this cul-de-sac: one for entering and one for exiting. A secondary entrance is located at the end of Singleton Drive at the southern portion of the proposed site. This entrance is dedicated to construction vehicles and will not be used for daily operations once construction of the site is complete.

The first TIA was submitted on June 24, 2021, and it was reviewed with review comments prepared. On September 6, 2021, a revised second TIA was submitted and subsequently reviewed.

Consistent with City of Rialto Traffic Impact Analysis guidelines, study intersections were identified to include freeway interchanges within two (2) miles that were designated to take more than 40% of total traffic from the project & intersections which Project traffic contributed 50 or more peak hour trips. This included twelve (12) intersections as listed below:

- 1. S. Riverside Avenue at W Valley Boulevard
- 2. S. Riverside Avenue at I-10 WB ramps
- 3. S. Riverside Avenue at I-10 EB ramps
- 4. S. Riverside Avenue at Slover Avenue
- 5. S. Riverside Avenue at Santa Ana Avenue
- 6. S. Riverside Avenue at Industrial Drive
- 7. S. Riverside Avenue at Jurupa Avenue
- 8. S. Riverside Avenue at Resource Drive/Industrial Drive
- 9. S. Riverside Avenue at Singleton Drive
- 10. S. Riverside Avenue at Agua Mansa Road
- 11. Industrial Drive at Fortuna Way
- 12. Resource Drive at Enterprise Drive

This site appears to comply with zoning on the property.

The site location is shown on Page 4 of the TIA, which is included as Attachment 1, while the site plan is shown on Page 6 of the TIA, which is included as Attachment 2.

The Project is within the City of Rialto within one (1) mile of the City of Colton, City of Jurupa Valley and County of San Bernardino.

Truck Turn Templates are on **Appendix I of the TIA** which is included as **Attachment 3**. As shown on the figures, all driveways will be one-way only.

- Driveway 1 will be enter-only and provide access to the entire site. All vehicles will enter via Driveway 1.
- Driveway 2 will be exit-only.
- Driveways 1 and 2 will be 26' wide.

The trip generation rate for this land use was determined using the 10th edition of the ITE "Trip Generation" manual.

Trips are shown on **Page 21, Table 6 and 7 of the TIA**, which is included as **Attachment 4**. Project daily trips from this development are estimated at 1,270 passenger car equivalent (PCE) trips with the AM/PM peak hour being 196/213 trips.

Study intersection historical counts were collected in 2018 & 2019 due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic in conjunction with a 2% growth rate (compounded annually) to reflect 2021 conditions. The data was collectively normalized to include recent area studies.

The TIA identified three (3) intersections which the Project contributes to cumulative impacts:

- S. Riverside Avenue and I-10 EB Ramps
- S. Riverside Avenue and Slover Avenue
- S. Riverside Avenue and Santa Ana Avenue

ANALYSIS/DISCUSSION:

The TIA included cumulative impacts when added to other proposed projects in the area at three (3) intersections. In addition, five (5) roadway segments on S. Riverside Avenue were found to operate at an excessive level of service on a daily basis. However, when evaluated on a peak hour basis, the segments were found to operate acceptably. The three (3) intersection impacts are considered significant based on City policy. These impacts require the payment of a fair share towards mitigation as shown on **page 47**, **Table 19** of the report. Table 19 has been labeled as **Attachment #5**

The resulting Fair Share Cost is \$724,397.81. The fair share will be allocated to mitigate impacts as specified and paid towards construction as the improvements become fully funded.

VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (VMT):

A separate VMT analysis was produced and is summarized in the TIA. This analysis is summarized in Table 13 below excerpted from the TIA:

	Reduction Strategy	Range of Effectiveness	VMT Reduction	Combined VMT Reduction	Results			
Commute Trip Reduction (CAPCOA)								
TRT-1	Implement Commute Trip Reduction Marketing	0.8 - 6.2%	4.16%	8.8%				
TRT-3	Provide Ride Sharing Program	1-15% 5.0%		8.8%	- <mark>1.86</mark>			
TRT-8	Preferential Parking Permit Program	N/A	N/A	8.8%				
		Baseline 2	022 Conditior	ns w/ Project	21.18			
Baseline 2022 Conditions w/ Project (CAPCOA Reduction)								
Local Hiring Reduction (25%)								
	Baseline 2022 Conditions w/	Project (Local Hirir	ig and CAPCO.	A Strategies)	17.0			

Table 13: VMT Analysis Results

With mitigation measures, it is expected that the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on VMT meeting the current County Guidelines.

Conclusion

This project will be accessed by two (2) driveways on Fortuna Way.

Intersections studied are projected to operate consistent with City of Rialto guidelines with deficiencies noted at three (3) locations as noted in Table 15 of the TIA. As noted in Table 16 of the TIA, segments evaluated along S. Riverside Avenue are also expected to operate at a deficient level of service.

The TIA concludes that payment of fair share fees totals \$724,397.81 for future intersection and segment improvements at the locations noted.

In addition, the proposed project intends to implement four (4) VMT mitigation strategies including, Commute Trip Reduction Marketing, Ride Sharing, Preferential Parking Permits and 25% local hire provisions.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff requests that the Transportation Commission:

- Provide recommendations related to approval.
- Recommend approval of a fair share contribution of \$724,397.81 and payment of any applicable development impact fees as adequate mitigation.
- Recommend Implementation of VMT Reduction Measures as described.
- Recommend approval to the Planning Commission.

Figure 1. Vicinity Map



The proposed site is located on the 8th subset within the Agua Mansa Specific Plan which is consisted of primarily general industry land-use with minimal residential. The project will involve the construction of a manufacturing plant building with 135,581 square feet, an office building with 10,018 square feet, a storage warehouse with 14,160 square feet, a mechanical shop with 7,200 square feet and a metal canopy with 21,534 square feet. The total area of these site components is 188,493 square feet. A copy of the site plan is provided on Figure 2. A full plan sheet is included in the Appendix C.

Access to the site is provided via a cul-de-sac at the end of Fortuna Way. There are two one-way driveways spaced out within this cul-de-sac: one for entering and one for exiting. A secondary entrance is located at the end of Singleton Drive at the southern portion of the proposed site. This entrance is dedicated to construction vehicles and will not be used for daily operations once construction of the site is complete.

The proposed site is expected to be completed in 2022 in a single phase. The location of the site as well as the study area is located with the City of Rialto and San Bernardino County. The site is also located within the sphere of influence of, or 1-mile from, the City of Colton and the City of Jurupa Valley.

A.5. Proposed Site Operations

Traffic Impact Study for Manufacturing Facility

NV5-2020086.00

The operation of the site includes the manufacturing of concrete blocks. Raw materials arrive in trucks (i.e., cement, sand) and are unloaded into the proposed manufacturing plant building. The raw



Traffic Impact Study for Manufacturing Facility NV5-2020086.00





C. Projected Future Traffic

C.1. Project Traffic

C.1.1. Project Trip Generation

The trip generation of the site was estimated using the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, 2017. The land use for "manufacturing" was selected as it best represents the use of the site. With this land use, the total daily trips as well as the peak hour trips are estimated. Because this site is considered a "truck intensive" land use, the project trips were converted into PCEs per the City of Rialto's *Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines and Requirements*. Forty percent of the trips associated with this site are considered truck trips. The vehicle mix in the PCE calculation is consistent with the City of Rialto's specifications. Again, a factor of 1.5 was used for 2-axle vehicles, 2 for 3-axle vehicles, and 3.0 for 4+axle vehicles. Tables 6 and 7 summarize the project trip generation expected to and from the development per the ITE Trip Generation as well as the conversion of the trip generation into PCE values. Ultimately, the PCE values were used in analysis.

Land Use ¹		Quantity	Unit	Doily	AM	Peak H	lour	PM Peak Hour			
		Quantity		Daily	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	
Trip Generation F	Rates			4.006	0.475	0.142	0.617	0.206	0.465	0.671	
Manufacturing		189.207 ²	KSF	758	90	27	117	39	88	127	
Passenger Vehicles	60%			455	54	16	70	23	53	76	
Trucks	40%			303	36	11	47	16	35	51	

Table 6: Project Trip Generation

¹Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition

²Site plan dated 2/2021 shows a total area of 188,493 SF of all manufacturing components. Quantity used in trip generation remains the same (a higher value) to match scope approved by City of Rialto.

	Vehicle	Daily	PCE	Doily	AM	Peak	Hour	PM Peak Hour			
venicie type	Mix1	Vehicles	Factor	Dally	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	
Passenger Vehicles	60%	455	1.0	455	54	16	70	23	53	76	
2-Axle Trucks	0.8%	6	1.5	9	1	0	1	0	1	2	
3-Axle Trucks	11.2%	85	2.0	170	20	6	26	9	20	28	
4+ Axle Trucks	28.0%	212	3.0	637	76	23	98	33	74	107	
	-	Total Truck P	CE Trips	816	97	29	126	42	95	137	
Total Project PCE Trips				1,270	151	45	196	65	147	213	

Table 7: Project Trips in Passenger Car Equivalents (PCE)

¹Source: City of Rialto Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines and Requirements, December 2013 Notes: PCE = Passenger Car Equivalent

SF = Square Feet

While the ITE Trip Generation Manual can estimate the number of daily, AM, and PM trips based on building square footage, it is still an estimate. The specific site operations indicate that there will be

Intersection/Segment	Unit Cost	Quantity ¹	Total
S Riverside Avenue at I-10 EB Ramps	\$ 355,200.00	1	\$ 355,200.00
Project Fair Share Percentage (E vs E+G+C+P) ²			8.5%
Project Cost			\$ 30,109.99
S Riverside Avenue at Slover Avenue	\$ 355,200.00	1	\$ 355,200.00
Project Fair Share Percentage (E vs E+G+C+P) ²			9.7%
Project Cost			\$ 34,398.85
S Riverside Avenue at Santa Ana Ave.	\$ 355,200.00	1	\$ 355,200.00
Project Fair Share Percentage (E vs E+G+C+P) ²			12.1%
Project Cost			\$ 42,842.77
I-10 EB ramps to Slover Ave	\$ 198,919.90	18.97	\$ 3,773,510.50
Project Fair Share Percentage (E vs E+G+C+P)			3.7%
Project Cost			\$ 140,515.34
Slover Ave to Santa Ana Ave	\$ 198,919.90	26.57	\$ 5,285,301.74
Project Fair Share Percentage (E vs E+G+C+P)			2.8%
Project Cost			\$ 147,985.56
Santa Ana Ave to Industrial Dr	\$ 198,919.90	17.11	\$ 3,403,519.49
Project Fair Share Percentage (E vs E+G+C+P)			3.1%
Project Cost			\$ 104,830.69
Industrial Dr to Agua Mansa Rd	\$ 198,919.90	65.19	\$ 12,967,588.27
Project Fair Share Percentage (E vs E+G+C+P)			1.7%
Project Cost			\$ 223,714.61
Total Project Cost			\$ 724,397.81

Table 19: Mitigation Fair Share Cost

 $^{1}\mbox{I}$ for intersections and measured in 100s of feet for roadway segments $^{2}\mbox{Higher}$ of AM or PM project fair share percentage





File #: TC 21-0705, Version: 1, Agenda #: 2

For Transportation Commission Meeting [October 6, 2021]

TO: Honorable Chairperson and Commission

APPROVAL: Michael Tahan, Interim Public works Director

FROM: Justin Schlaefli, Consultant Engineer, TKE Engineering

Traffic Impact Analysis - Dutch Brothers Coffee & Express Wash on the Southwest Corner of Valley Boulevard and Riverside Avenue.

(ACTION ITEM)

BACKGROUND:

In July 2021, the Project Scoping Agreement for the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was approved. The project is a Dutch Brothers Coffee & Express Wash Project (hereinafter referred to as Project). The project applicant proposes to construct a 950 square-foot (SF) Dutch Brothers Coffee with drive-through window and an express wash with a 130-foot wash tunnel. The project site is currently occupied by the vacant 10,000 SF Hometown Buffet and is located on the southwest quadrant of Riverside Avenue and Valley Boulevard in the City of Rialto, California.

The first TIA was submitted on August 30, 2021, and it was reviewed with review comments prepared. On September 10, 2021, a revised second TIA was submitted and subsequently reviewed.

Consistent with City of Rialto TIA guidelines, study intersections were identified to include freeway interchanges within two (2) miles that were designated to take more than 40% of total traffic from the project and intersections which project traffic contributed 50 or more peak hour trips. This included two (2) intersections as listed below:

- 1. Gateway Plaza at Valley Boulevard
- 2. Riverside Avenue at Valley Boulevard

This site appears to comply with zoning on the property.

The site location is shown on Page 4 of the TIA, which is included as Attachment 1, while the site plan is shown on Page 6 of the TIA, which is included as Attachment 2.

Truck Turn Templates are on page 24 of the TIA which is included as Attachment 3.

The site will be accessed through an existing signal at Gateway Plaza and Valley Boulevard.

The trip generation rate for this land use was determined using the 10th edition of the ITE "Trip

File #: TC 21-0705, Version: 1, Agenda #: 2

Generation" manual.

Trips are shown on **Page 11, Table 5-1 of the TIA**, which is included as **Attachment 4**. Project daily trips from this development are estimated at 674 passenger car equivalent (PCE) net new trips with the AM/PM peak hour being 103/62 net new trips. An adjustment to trip generation was made due to the existing Restaurant building/use to be demolished.

Study intersection historical counts were collected in February 2020 and June 2021 due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic in conjunction with a 2% growth rate (compounded annually) to reflect 2021 conditions. Newer counts were conducted where historic data was not available. The data was collectively normalized to include recent area studies. These adjustments are documented in Appendix B to the TIA.

The TIA identified an unacceptable level of service "E" in the PM peak hour at the intersection of Riverside Avenue and Valley Boulevard. However, no significant impact was identified as a result of the project.

A queueing analysis was required for both study intersections. The analysis is contained in Section 11.0 of the TIA. This analysis showed excessive queues exceeding storage at multiple locations as shown on **Page 28, Table 11-2 of the TIA**, which is included as **Attachment 5**.

ANALYSIS/DISCUSSION:

The TIA did not disclose any level of service-based impacts when accounting for the conversion of the existing use. Nonetheless, as discussed in the TIA, improvements are recommended at the intersection of Riverside Avenue/Valley Boulevard in order to improve the existing deficient storages at the intersection. The recommended improvements consist of restriping the number two (2) eastbound through lane to a shared through/right-turn lane. In addition to the restriping and associated signal modification improvements, it is recommended that the signal at Riverside Avenue/Valley Boulevard be improved through the installation of a Pan/Tilt/Zoom (PTZ) camera with remote connection from the camera and signal controller to the City, Public Works Department as well as associated signal re-timing improvements necessary to improve and balance queues at the intersection.

VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (VMT):

A VMT screening analysis is summarized in the TIA. As discussed in the TIA, VMT is a function of travel volumes multiplied by distance. Therefore, provision of needed services in a community may be found to reduce VMT as patrons have a shorter distance to travel. As such, OPR and SBCTA VMT Guidelines identify that Project types falling under the screening criteria includes the following:

- K-12 Schools
- Local-serving retail less than 50,000 square feet
- Local parks
- Day care centers
- Local serving gas stations
- Local serving banks
- Local serving hotels (e.g. non-destination hotels)
- Student housing Projects on or adjacent college campuses

- Local-serving assembly uses, Community Institutions
- Local serving community colleges
- Affordable or supportive housing, Assisted living facilities, Senior housing
- Projects generating less than 110 daily vehicle trips

The proposed project is considered a locally serving retail project falling in these screening criteria. Therefore, the project is expected to have a less than significant transportation impact based on VMT criteria. No mitigation measures are proposed.

Conclusion

This project will be accessed at the existing traffic signal at Gateway Plaza and Valley Boulevard. No improvements are proposed at this location.

Intersections studied are projected to operate consistent with City of Rialto guidelines. However, excessive queuing was noted at the intersection of Valley Boulevard and Riverside Avenue. Due to the excessive queuing, it is recommended that the eastbound through lane be restriped as a through/right turn lane to reduce queues and provide additional capacity for that movement. In addition, improvements including remote communications to the intersection and installation of a PTZ camera are recommended.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff requests that the Transportation Commission:

- Provide recommendations related to approval.
- Recommend approval of the conversion of the eastbound through lane to eastbound through/right turn lane at the intersection of Valley Boulevard and Riverside Avenue.
- Recommend approval of the installation of a PTZ camera with associated communications improvements allowing for the remote monitoring and re-timing of the intersection of Valley Boulevard and Riverside Avenue.
- Recommend payment of applicable DIF fees
- Recommend approval to the Planning Commission.







DUTCH BROTHERS COFFEE & EXPRESS WASH PROJECT, RIALTO



DUTCH BROTHERS COFFEE & EXPRESS WASH PROJECT, RIALTO

	Daily	AM	I Peak H	our	PM Peak Hour			
Description	2-Way	Enter	Exit	Total	Enter	Exit	Total	
Trip Generation Rates:								
• Empirical Trip Generation Estimation for Speed Wash (TE/LFWT) ³	8.663	0.275	0.204	0.479	0.450	0.463	0.913	
 931: Quality Restaurant (TE/TSF) 	83.84	50%	50%	0.73	67%	33%	7.80	
 937: Coffee/Donut Shop With Drive-Through Window (TE/TSF) 	820.38	51%	49%	88.99	50%	50%	43.38	
Existing Vacant Trip Generation Forecasts:								
• Hometown Buffet (10,000 SF)	838	4	3	7	52	26	78	
Pass-by Trips ⁴	<u>-84</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-13</u>	<u>-7</u>	-20	
Existing Restaurant Total	754	4	3	7	39	19	58	
Proposed Project Trip Generation Forecasts:								
 Dutch Brothers Coffee (950 SF) 	779	43	42	85	21	20	41	
Pass-by Trips ⁴	<u>-195</u>	<u>-11</u>	<u>-10</u>	<u>-21</u>	<u>-5</u>	<u>-5</u>	<u>-10</u>	
Dutch Brothers Coffee Subtotal	584	32	32	64	16	15	31	
 Express Wash (130 LFWT) 	1,126	36	26	62	59	60	119	
Pass-by Trips ⁴	<u>-282</u>	<u>-9</u>	<u>-7</u>	<u>-16</u>	<u>-15</u>	<u>-15</u>	<u>-30</u>	
Express Wash Subtotal	844	27	19	46	44	45	89	
Proposed Project Total	1,428	59	51	110	60	60	120	
Total Net Project Trip Generation	674	55	48	103	21	41	62	

TABLE 5-1 PROJECT TRIP GENERATION RATES AND FORECAST²

Notes:

TE/LFWT = Trip end per Linear Feet Wash Tunnel

TE/TSF = Trip end per 1,000 SF

Express Wash: Daily/AM peak hour/PM peak hour – Assume 25%/25%/25%

LLG Ref. 2-21-4426-1 Dutch Brothers Coffee & Express Wash Project, Rialto

² Source: *Trip Generation*, 10th Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), Washington, D.C. (2017).

³ Based on driveway traffic counts conducted on Friday (2/7/2014) at Victorville Speedwash (12147 Industrial Boulevard, Victorville). Refer to *Appendix B* for the Victorville Speedwash driveway traffic count details utilized to develop the express wash trip rates.

⁴ Pass-By Trips are trips made as intermediate stops on the way from an origin to a primary trip destination. Pass-by trips are attracted from traffic passing the site on adjacent streets, which contain direct access to the generator. For this analysis, the following pass-by reduction factors were used (Source: *Trip Generation Handbook*, 3rd Edition, ITE 2017):

 ^{931:} Quality Restaurant: Daily/AM peak hour/PM peak hour – Assume 10%/0%/25%

 ^{937:} Coffee/Donut Shop With Drive-Through Window: Daily/AM peak hour/PM peak hour – Assume 25%/25%/25%

Image: series of the																		
<table-container> Image: space space</table-container>				(2)			(3	i)			(4	4)			(:	5)	
<table-container> interpart <</table-container>			E	xisting With A	Ambient Growth		Existing With Ambient Growth With Project Traffic Conditions				Existing With Ambient Growth With Cumulative Without Project Traffic Conditions				Existing With Ambient Growth			
<table-container> Physical PACP PACP</table-container>			Wit	hout Project	Traffic Condition	S									With Cumulative With Project Traffic Conditions			
key binom b		(1) Estimated	AM Peak	x Hour	PM Peak	Hour	AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour	AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour	AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour
network <		Storage	Max. Queue/	Adequate	Max. Queue/	Adequate	Max. Queue/	Adequate	Max. Queue/	Adequate	Max. Queue/	Adequate	Max. Queue/	Adequate	Max. Queue/	Adequate	Max. Queue/	Adequate
Korstand (nde) Require (Nde) (Nde) Require (Nde) Require (Nde)		Provided	Min. Storage	Storage	Min. Storage	Storage	Min. Storage	Storage	Min. Storage	Storage	Min. Storage	Storage	Min. Storage	Storage	Min. Storage	Storage	Min. Storage	Storage
1. Grave place of widely booleword	Key Study Intersection	(feet)	Required ⁹	(Yes/No)	Required ⁹	(Yes/No)	Required ⁹	(Yes/No)	Required ⁹	(Yes/No)	Required ⁹	(Yes/No)	Required ⁹	(Yes/No)	Required ⁹	(Yes/No)	Required ⁹	(Yes/No)
Vally Boalevard $$	1. Gateway Plaza at																	
Northbound Left-Tune Lune 66' 0' Yes 0' Yes 1' Yes	Valley Boulevard																	
NB Shared Throughkight-Turn Lune 65' 0' Yes 0' Yes 48' Yes 56' Yes Kashomal Left-Turn Lun 150' 9' Yes 27' Yes 9' Yes 9'' Yes 10'' Yes <	Northbound Left-Turn Lane	65'	0'	Yes	0'	Yes	26'	Yes	32'	Yes	0'	Yes	0'	Yes	26'	Yes	32'	Yes
Eastbound Left-Turn Lam 150° 9° Yes 47° Yes 9° Yes 47° Yes 9° Yes 47° Yes 9° Yes 47° Yes 64° Yes 66° Yes 67° Ne 66° Ne <t< td=""><td>NB Shared Through/Right-Turn Lane</td><td>65'</td><td>0'</td><td>Yes</td><td>0'</td><td>Yes</td><td>48'</td><td>Yes</td><td>56'</td><td>Yes</td><td>0'</td><td>Yes</td><td>0'</td><td>Yes</td><td>48'</td><td>Yes</td><td>56'</td><td>Yes</td></t<>	NB Shared Through/Right-Turn Lane	65'	0'	Yes	0'	Yes	48'	Yes	56'	Yes	0'	Yes	0'	Yes	48'	Yes	56'	Yes
Weshound Left- trund in the second	Eastbound Left-Turn Lane	150'	9'	Yes	47'	Yes	9'	Yes	47'	Yes	9'	Yes	47'	Yes	9'	Yes	47'	Yes
2. Riverside Avenue at Valley Boulevard r.r. k.r. k.r. <th< td=""><td>Westbound Left-Turn Lane</td><td>100'</td><td>6'</td><td>Yes</td><td>25'</td><td>Yes</td><td>64'</td><td>Yes</td><td>84'</td><td>Yes</td><td>6'</td><td>Yes</td><td>25'</td><td>Yes</td><td>64'</td><td>Yes</td><td>84'</td><td>Yes</td></th<>	Westbound Left-Turn Lane	100'	6'	Yes	25'	Yes	64'	Yes	84'	Yes	6'	Yes	25'	Yes	64'	Yes	84'	Yes
Valley BoulewardIncI	2. Riverside Avenue at																	
Northbound Dual Left-Turn Lane205'203'No381'No250'No386'No269'No431'No262'No438'NoSouthhound Left-Turn Lane205'95'Yes141'Yes95'Yes161'Yes162'Yes152'Yes95'Yes152'YesEastbound Left-Turn Lan120'659'No71'No71'No62'Yes71'No71'Yes18''No151'NoMethodun Left-Turn Lan185'242'No301'No21''Yes131'No659'No31''No31''No31''No31''No31''No31''No31''No31''NoNo31''No31''No31''NoNo31''NoNo31''NoNo31''NoNo31''NoNo31''NoNoNo31''NoNoNo31''NoNoNoNo31''NoNoNoNo31''No <t< td=""><td>Valley Boulevard</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Valley Boulevard																	
Southbound Left-Turn Lane $205'$ $95'$ Yes $141'$ Yes $141'$ Yes $100'$ Yes $152'$ <td>Northbound Dual Left-Turn Lanes</td> <td>205'</td> <td>239'</td> <td>No</td> <td>381'</td> <td>No</td> <td>250'</td> <td>No</td> <td>386'</td> <td>No</td> <td>269'</td> <td>No</td> <td>431'</td> <td>No</td> <td>262'</td> <td>No</td> <td>438'</td> <td>No</td>	Northbound Dual Left-Turn Lanes	205'	239'	No	381'	No	250'	No	386'	No	269'	No	431'	No	262'	No	438'	No
Lestbound Left-Turn Lane120'55'Yes156'No $73'$ Yes $171'$ No $62'$ Yes $171'$ No $77'$ Yes $187'$ NoLestbound Right-Turn Lane370'659'No712'No $675'$ No $742'$ No $683'$ No $802'$ No $678'$ No $831'$ NoWestbound Left-Turn Lane185' $242'$ No $301'$ No $242'$ No $242'$ No $301'$ No $250'$ No $251'$ No $319'$ NoWestbound Right-Turn Lane165'7''Yes128'Yes $210'$ Yes $212''$ Yes $212'''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''$	Southbound Left-Turn Lane	205'	95'	Yes	141'	Yes	95'	Yes	141'	Yes	100'	Yes	152'	Yes	95'	Yes	152'	Yes
Heatsbund Right-Turn Lang370'659'No712'No675'No742'No683'No880'No678'No678'No831'NoWestbound Left-Turn Lang165'24'No301'No24'No301'No250'No319'No251'No319'No310'<	Eastbound Left-Turn Lane	120'	55'	Yes	156'	No	73'	Yes	171'	No	62'	Yes	171'	No	77'	Yes	187'	No
Westbound Left-Turn Lane 185' 242' No 301' No 242' No 301' No 250' No 319' No 319' No Westbound Right-Turn Lane 165' 27' Yes 128' Yes 27' Yes 130' Yes 131' Yes 27' Yes 133' Yes 131'	Eastbound Right-Turn Lane	370'	659'	No	712'	No	675'	No	742'	No	683'	No	802'	No	678'	No	831'	No
Westbound Right-Turn Lane 165' 27' Yes 128' Yes 27' Yes 133' Yes Yes 133' Yes </td <td>Westbound Left-Turn Lane</td> <td>185'</td> <td>242'</td> <td>No</td> <td>301'</td> <td>No</td> <td>242'</td> <td>No</td> <td>301'</td> <td>No</td> <td>250'</td> <td>No</td> <td>319'</td> <td>No</td> <td>251'</td> <td>No</td> <td>319'</td> <td>No</td>	Westbound Left-Turn Lane	185'	242'	No	301'	No	242'	No	301'	No	250'	No	319'	No	251'	No	319'	No
\blacktriangleright With Improvements $ -$ <td>Westbound Right-Turn Lane</td> <td>165'</td> <td>27'</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>128'</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>27'</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>130'</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>28'</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>131'</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>27'</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>133'</td> <td>Yes</td>	Westbound Right-Turn Lane	165'	27'	Yes	128'	Yes	27'	Yes	130'	Yes	28'	Yes	131'	Yes	27'	Yes	133'	Yes
Northbound Dual Left-Turn Lane205' $-225'$ No $-363'$ No $-239'$ No $437'$ NoSouthbound Left-Turn Lane205' $-55'$ $55'$ $56'$ 56	> With Improvements																	
Southbound Left-Turn Lane $205'$ $$ $$ $$ $85'$ Yes $135'$ Yes $$ $$ $$ $90'$ Yes $150'$ YesEastbound Left-Turn Lane $120'$ $$ $$ $$ $66'$ Yes $171'$ No $$ $$ $$ $72'$ Yes $187'$ No Eastbound Through Lane $370'$ $$ $$ $$ $213'$ Yes $339'$ Yes $$ $$ $$ $216'$ Yes $342'$ YesEastbound Shared Through/Right-Turn Lane $370'$ $$	Northbound Dual Left-Turn Lanes	205'					225'	No	363'	No					239'	No	437'	No
Eastbound Left-Turn Lane120'66'Yes171'No72'Yes187'NoEastbound Through Lane370'213'Yes339'Yes216'Yes342'YesEastbound Shared Through Right-Turn Lane370'319'Yes339'Yes322'Yes350'YesEastbound Left-Turn Lane370'319'Yes339'Yes322'Yes350'YesWestbound Left-Turn Lane185'320'Yes30'YesWestbound Left-Turn Lane165'35'Yes163'Yes	Southbound Left-Turn Lane	205'					85'	Yes	135'	Yes					90'	Yes	150'	Yes
Eastbound Through Lane 370° $$ $$ $$ 213° Yes 339° Yes $$ $$ $$ 216° Yes 342° YesEastbound Shared Through/Right-Turn Lane 370° $$	Eastbound Left-Turn Lane	120'					66'	Yes	171'	No					72'	Yes	187'	No
Eastbound Shared Through/Right-Turn Lane 370° $$ $$ 319° Yes 339° Yes $$ $$ 322° Yes 350° YesEastbound Right-Turn Lane 370° $$ $$ $$ 319° Yes 339° Yes $$ $$ 322° Yes 350° YesWestbound Left-Turn Lane 185° $$ $-$	Eastbound Through Lane	370'					213'	Yes	339'	Yes					216'	Yes	342'	Yes
Eastbound Right-Turn Lane $370'$ $319'$ Yes $339'$ Yes $$ $322'$ Yes $350'$ YesWestbound Left-Turn Lane $185'$ $$ <t< td=""><td>Eastbound Shared Through/Right-Turn Lane</td><td>370'</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>319'</td><td>Yes</td><td>339'</td><td>Yes</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>322'</td><td>Yes</td><td>350'</td><td>Yes</td></t<>	Eastbound Shared Through/Right-Turn Lane	370'					319'	Yes	339'	Yes					322'	Yes	350'	Yes
Westbound Left-Turn Lane 185' 214' No 264' No 225' No 273' No Westbound Right-Turn Lane 165' 32' Yes 161' Yes 35' Yes 163' Yes	Eastbound Right-Turn Lane	370'					319'	Yes	339'	Yes					322'	Yes	350'	Yes
Westbound Right-Turn Lane 165' 32' Yes 161' Yes 35' Yes 163' Yes	Westbound Left-Turn Lane	185'					214'	No	264'	No					225'	No	273'	No
	Westbound Right-Turn Lane	165'					32'	Yes	161'	Yes					35'	Yes	163'	Yes

TABLE 11-2 YEAR 2023 PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION QUEUING ANALYSIS

N:\4400\2214426 - Dutch Brothers Coffee & Express Wash Project, Rialto\Report\4426 - Dutch Brothers Coffee & Express Wash Project, Rialto TIA 09-10-21.docx

⁹ Queue is based on the 95th Percentile Queues and is reported in total queue length (feet) per lane for signalized intersections.

LINSCOTT, LAW & GREENSPAN, engineers



File #: TC 21-0703, Version: 1, Agenda #: 3

For Transportation Commission Meeting [October 6, 2021]

TO: Honorable Chairperson and Commission

APPROVAL: Michael Tahan, Interim Public works Director

FROM: Justin Schlaefli, Consultant Engineer, TKE Engineering

Traffic Impact Analysis - Rialto Travel Center Southwest Corner of Casmalia Street at Alder Avenue.

(ACTION ITEM)

BACKGROUND:

The project will involve the construction of a gas station with 16 fueling positions and associated convenience store, a 2,400 square-foot fast food restaurant with a drive-through, 6,375 square foot shop building, and a truck stop with 9 fueling positions on the currently vacant site. The project would also consist of a parking lot with 103 vehicle parking stalls and 91 truck parking stalls. The site is located within the Renaissance Specific Plan, which is located generally between Casmalia Street on the north, Baseline Road on the south, Ayala Drive on the east, and Tamarind and Palmetto Avenues on the west. The Renaissance Specific Plan (Specific Plan) area covers 1,445 acres, with 81 separate Planning Areas, and is approved for a variety of land uses, including residential, commercial, industrial, and employment uses. The Specific Plan was approved for build-out in three (3) separate phases, over a 20-year period. An amendment to the Specific Plan was approved in December 2016.

The project site is located within Planning Area 1 (PA 1) of the Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment. The existing land use designation is Freeway Incubator for PA 1. The proposed gas stations with convenience store and fast-food restaurant are permitted uses under the Freeway Incubator designation since it permits for large regional retail and business uses. Vehicular access provisions for the project site would consist of the following:

- Three (3) full-movement driveways on Sierra Lakes Parkway for the truck parking stalls and truck fueling positions.
- One (1) exit only driveway on Sierra Lakes Parkway for the truck fueling positions.
- One (1) driveway on Sierra Lakes Parkway for the vehicle fueling positions, convenience store, and fast-food restaurant.

The proposed opening year for the project is Year 2022. The project will be developed in a single project phase. The project site is located within 1 mile from the City of Rialto's border with the City of Fontana.

The first Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was submitted in July 2021 and was reviewed with review comments prepared. In September 2021 a revised second TIA was submitted and subsequently

reviewed.

Consistent with City of Rialto TIA guidelines, study intersections were identified to include freeway interchanges within two (2) miles that were designated to take more than 40% of total traffic from the project and intersections which project contributed 50 or more peak hour trips. This included the locations listed below:

Existing Intersections:

- 1. Alder Avenue at Sierra Lakes Parkway/Casmalia Street
- 2. Alder Avenue at SR-210 Westbound Ramps
- 3. Alder Avenue at SR-210 Eastbound Ramps
- 4. Alder Avenue at Renaissance Parkway

Future Driveway Intersections:

- 1. Sierra Lakes Parkway at Driveway #1 (Truck Stop)
- 2. Sierra Lakes Parkway at Driveway #2 (Truck Stop)
- 3. Sierra Lakes Parkway at Driveway #3 (Truck Stop)
- 4. Sierra Lakes Parkway at Driveway #4 (Truck Stop)
- 5. Sierra Lakes Parkway at Driveway #5 (Gas Station)

In addition, the following roadway segments were analyzed:

- Alder Avenue from Sierra Lakes Parkway to SR-210 EB Ramps
- Alder Avenue from SR-210 EB Ramps to SR-210 WB Ramps
- Alder Avenue from SR-210 WB Ramps to Renaissance Parkway

This site appears to comply with zoning on the property.

The site location is shown on Page 2 of the TIA, which is included as Attachment 1, while the site plan is shown on Page 4 of the TIA, which is included as Attachment 2.

Truck Turn Templates are on Appendix H of the TIA which is included as Attachment 3

As shown on the figure, driveway widths will vary between 41 and 70 feet wide.

Trip generation estimates for the project are based on daily and peak hourly trip generation rates obtained from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (10th Edition). ITE trip generation estimates for the project are based on the trip generation rates for the following ITE Land Uses: ITE Land Use 934 - Fast-Food Restaurant with Drive-Through Window; ITE Land Use 960 - Gas Station with Convenience Market; and ITE Land Use 950 - Truck Stop. It is assumed that trips generated by the fast-food restaurant and the gas station with convenience market are all passenger vehicle trips while trips generated by the truck stop are all truck trips. It should be noted that a daily trip generation rate for ITE Land Use 950 (Truck Stop) is not available. Therefore, sales data provided by the applicant for similar truck stop facilities, such as gallons of fuel sold on a monthly and daily basis and the average gallons of fuel filled for each truck, were used to determine an approximate number of trucks to visit the truck stop each day and to determine a custom daily rate for the project.

File #: TC 21-0703, Version: 1, Agenda #: 3

Due to the nature of the project as a retail use with multiple services onsite, internal trips were estimated as well as pass-by trip reductions consistent with City of Rialto procedures.

Trips are shown on **Page 21, Table 3 of the TIA**, which is included as **Attachment 4**. Project daily trips from this development are estimated at 5,532 passenger car equivalent (PCE) trips with the AM/PM peak hour being 553/515 trips.

Study intersection historical counts were collected in 2017 & early 2020 due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. The data was collectively normalized to include recent area studies.

Consistent with the Renaissance Specific Plan findings, the TIA identified four (4) intersections which the Project contributes to cumulative impacts:

TABLE 9 SUMMARY OF INTERSECTION OPERATION OPENING YEAR 2022 CUMULATIVE WITHOUT PROJECT										
Int. #	nt. # Intersection Traffic AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour									
1	Control Delay LOS Delay LOS 1 Alder Avenue at Sierra Lakes Parkway (Casmalia Street S 86.1 F 68.2 F									
2	Alder Avenue at SR-210 WB Ramps	S	90.0	F	113.9	F				
3 Alder Avenue at SR-210 EB Ramps S 98.2 F 73.7 E										
4	4 Alder Avenue at Renaissance Parkway S 81.5 F 88.1 F									
Note - Bo inter - At vehi	Notes: Bold and shaded values indicate intersections operating at an unacceptable Level of Service or significant impact to intersection per City standards. At a signalized intersection, delay refers to the average control delay for the entire intersection, measured in seconds per vehicle. 									
- At (hig	a two-way stop-controlled intersection, delay refers to the a hest delay) movement.	verage veh	icle <mark>d</mark> elay on	the worst						
- De S = U =	lay values are based on the methodology outlined in the Hig Signalized Unsignalized	hway Capa	city Manual,	(6th Edition	n).					

In addition, one (1) intersection, Alder Avenue at Casmalia Street was found to be impacted in the Opening Year, Existing plus Growth (direct) condition.

ANALYSIS/DISCUSSION:

The TIA included cumulative impacts when added to other proposed projects in the area at four (4) intersections. The four (4) intersection impacts are considered significant based on City policy. These four (4) intersections are being improved as part of the ongoing Alder Avenue/210 Interchange project. It is expected that the Interchange project, Phase 1, will be constructed in 2022 and open to traffic in 2023 shortly after the project opening day.

File #: TC 21-0703, Version: 1, Agenda #: 3

It is proposed that the project be conditioned to construct improvements at the intersection of Alder Avenue at Sierra Lakes Parkway/Casmalia Street including an eastbound to southbound right turn lane through widening of Casmalia Street subject to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The feasibility of this improvement is still being explored due to the potential utility conflicts with an overhead power line. Therefore, should the improvement be determined to be infeasible by the City Engineer, the applicant will complete other improvements as well as pay a fair share towards interchange improvements as recommended in the TIA. In addition to the proposed right turn lane, it is proposed that the project be conditioned to restripe the northbound approach to restripe one (1) of the through lanes to provide a shared through/left turn lane with associated signal modifications and re-timing.

In addition, it is proposed that the applicant provide a fair share contribution to the future Alder Avenue/210 Interchange project consistent with the requirements of the Renaissance Specific Plan. As this project is in the final design/permitting phase, the fair share contribution shown in the report will be revised to reflect the latest studies and cost estimates once complete. The fair share will be calculated following City standard procedures. The amount shown in the TIA is for illustration purposes only and may or may not be the final amount once updated costs and calculations are completed. It is recommended that the project be conditioned to pay these fees.

As discussed above, these impacts require construction of an eastbound right turn lane and restriping of the northbound approach at the intersection of Alder Avenue/Casmalia Street as well as payment of fair share fees and any applicable Development Impact Fee (DIF) payments. Mitigation is shown on **page 51, Table 16** of the report. Table 16 has been labeled as **Attachment 5**.

VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (VMT):

A VMT screening analysis is summarized in the TIA. As discussed in the TIA, VMT is a function of travel volumes multiplied by distance. Therefore, provision of needed services in a community may be found to reduce VMT as patrons have a shorter distance to travel. As such, OPR and SBCTA VMT Guidelines identify that Project types falling under the screening criteria includes the following:

- K-12 Schools
- Local-serving retail less than 50,000 square feet
- Local parks
- Day care centers
- Local serving gas stations
- Local serving banks
- Local serving hotels (e.g. non-destination hotels)
- Student housing Projects on or adjacent college campuses
- Local-serving assembly uses, Community Institutions
- Local serving community colleges
- Affordable or supportive housing, Assisted living facilities, Senior housing
- Projects generating less than 110 daily vehicle trips

The proposed project is considered a locally serving retail/gas station project falling in these screening criteria. Therefore, the project is expected to have a less than significant transportation impact based on VMT criteria. No mitigation measures are proposed.

Conclusion

This project will be accessed by five (5) driveways on Casmalia Street just west of the intersection with Alder Avenue.

Intersections studied are projected to operate consistent with City of Rialto guidelines with deficiencies noted at four locations as noted in Table 9 of the TIA.

Based on these conclusions, it is recommended that the applicant construct improvements at the intersection of Casmalia Street and Alder Avenue including an eastbound right turn lane through widening and a northbound shared through/left turn lane with associated signal modifications. In addition, it is recommended that the applicant pay fair share fees towards the construction of the Alder Avenue/210 intersection project.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff requests that the Transportation Commission:

- Provide recommendations related to approval.
- Recommend approval of a fair share contribution using the City standard methodologies.
- Recommend construction of an eastbound right turn lane via widening and a northbound through/left turn lane at the intersection of Casmalia Street/Alder Avenue.
- Recommend payment of applicable DIF fees.
- Recommend approval to the Planning Commission.



- 2 -





	SUMMARY OF PRO RIALTO T	TABLE 3 OJECT TRIP TRAVEL CEM	GENERATION NTER	N						
Trip Generation Rates										
L and Lise	ITE	Unit	Daily	A	M Peak Ho	ur	P	M Peak Ho	ur	
	Code (a)	- Unit	470.050	In 0.51	Out	Total	In 0.52	Out	Total	
Fast-Food Restaurant w Drive- Inrough window	934	KST	470.950	0.51	0.49	40.19	0.52	0.48	32.67	
Super Convenience Market/Gas station	960	FP 50	230.520	0.50	0.50	28.08	0.50	0.50	22.96	
Truck Stop	Data (d) / 950	۲۲	88.889	0.51	0.49	1.18	0.49	0.51	8.41	
	Project 1	írip Genera	ition							
Land Use	Quantity	Unit	Daily	A	M Peak Ho	ur Total	PM Peak Hour			
Passenger Car Trips				111	Out	TUtai	<u>nı</u>	Uut	TUtai	
Fast-Food Restaurant with Drive-Through			1,130	49	47	96	41	37	78	
- Internal Capture (c) (Daily: 10%, AM: 10%, PM: 10%)	2.400	ksf	-113	-5	-5	-10	-4	-4	-8	
Pass-By Trips (d) (Daily: 25%, AM: 25%, PM: 25%)	-		-254	-11	-11	-22	-9	-9	-18	
Super Convenience Market/Gas Station			3,688	225	224	449	184	183	367	
Internal Capture (c) (Daily: 10%, AM: 10%, PM: 10%)	16	FP	-369	-23	-22	-45	-19	-18	-37	
Pass-By Trips (d) (Daily: 25%, AM: 25%, PM: 25%)	-		-830	-51	-50	-101	-42	-41	-83	
Truck Trips (f) (g) (h)										
Truck Stop			800	33	32	65	37	39	76	
Pass-By Trips (i) (Daily: 5%, AM: 5%, PM: 5%)		50	-40	-2	-1	-3	-2	-2	-4	
PCE Truck Stop (PCE Factor = 3)	9	۲۲	2,400	99	96	195	111	117	228	
PCE Pass-By Trips (i) (Daily: 5%, AM: 5%, PM: 5%)			-120	-6	-3	-9	-6	-6	-12	
Total Driveway Trips	<u></u>	<u> </u>	6,736	345	340	685	313	315	628	
Passenger Car			4,336	246	244	490	202	198	400	
Truck PCE			2,400	99	96	195	111	117	228	
Total Primary Trips			5,532	277	276	553	256	259	515	
Passenger Car			3,252	184	183	367	151	148	299	
Truck PCE			2,280	93	93	186	105	111	216	
Notes: KSF = thousand square feet, FP = Fueling Position AM and/or PM rates correspond to peak of adjacent street traf	fic		•		<u>.</u>	•				
 (a) Trip Generation data for ITE Codes from <i>ITE Trip Generation</i>, 10th E (b) Daily Trip Generation data provided by Applicant (c) Internal capture rates from ITE Trip Generation Handbook, 3rd Editi (d) Pass-by rates from ITE Trip Generation Handbook, 3rd Edition for IT Market (e) Diverted trip rates from ITE Trip Generation Handbook, 3rd Edition 	dition ion NCHRP 684 Interna 7E LU 934 Fast-Food R for ITE LU 934 Fast-Fc	a Trip Captur estaurant W ood Restaura	re Estimation T ith Drive-Throu nt With Drive-	ool ıgh Window Through Wi	r and LU 945 ndow and LU	Gasoline/Se J 945 Gasolir	rvice Station ne/Service St) With Conve tation With (enience Convenience	

(f) Truck trips include trips to the Truck Stop land use portion only, using daily trip information obtained from similar facilities
(g) Peak hour information estimated using peak hour percentages from ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition
(h) No internal capture was assumed for the Truck Stop land use, as a truck stop is assumed to include a variety of services
(i) As there was no supporting data available to define the number of pass-by trips, pass-by rates were estimated to be 5%
(j) As there was no supporting data available to define the number of pass-by trips, diverted rates were estimated to be similar to a Super Convenience Market with Gas Station

TABLE 16 SUMMARY OF PROJECT TRAFFIC FAIR SHARE FOR RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS									
#1 - Alder Avenue at Sierra Lakes Parkway/Casmalia Street		Unit Cost	Quantity		Total				
Restripe one NB through lane to a NB shared through/left with Split signal phasing. Restripe the EB shared through/right to a dedicated EB right-turn lane with a right-turn overlap phasing.	\$	170,000 1	1	\$	170,000				
Project Fair Share percentage ²					45.5%				
Project Cost				\$	77,300				
#1, #2, #3, #4 = Alder Avenue Improvement									
Alder Avenue Improvement Project	\$	4,206,168 3	1	\$	4,206,168				
Project Fair Share percentage ⁴					21.8%				
Project Cost				\$	916,972				
		Total Projec	t Cost	\$	994,272				
 ¹ Source: San Bernardino County Congestion Management Program, Appendix G: Preliminary Construction Cost Estimates for Congestion Management Plan (2003) with 2% per year inflation applied to estimate 2021 costs. ² Higher of AM or PM project fair share percentage ³ Source: Draft City of Rialto Transportation/Traffic Impact Fee Nexus Study (March, 2017). Note: The improvements to intersections #1. #2, #3, and #4 are part of the larger Alder Avenue Improvement Project that calls for roadway widening and intersection improvements between Casmalia Street and Renaissance Parkway. 									

⁴ Blended fair share percentage between intersections #1, #2, #3, #4 based on the AM peak hour fair share percentage.

City of Rialto

Legislation Text

File #: TC 21-0707, Version: 1, Agenda #: 1

Casmalia Street at Ayala Drive Restriping for Left Turn (INFORMATIONAL ITEM)

- 10 INSTALL THERMOPLASTIC 4" WHITE PAINT LANE LINE.
- [11] GRIND EXISTING THERMOPLASTIC OR COLD PLANE CONFLICTING STRIPING AND LEGENDS

		SEAL-DESIGN ENGINEER
UNDERGROUND SERVICE ALERT		off COL
ALL FOR		S PROFESSIONAL
CALL:TOLL FREE		SIST TANK
		No. 42386
	MARK REVISIONS	CIVIL ANT
two working days before you dig	DESIGNED BY: <u>MXGO</u> DRAWN BY: <u>MXGO</u> CHECKED BY: <u>MTP</u>	OF CALIFOR

A-A24D.	
---------	--

SIGN LEGEND					
	R1-1	STOP SIGN			
	R3–5R	RIGHT TURN ONLY			
	R3–7(R)	RIGHT LANE MUST TURN RIGHT			
	R26A(S)(CA)	NO STOPPING ANY TIME			
	R81(CA)	BIKE LANE			
	R81A(CA)	BEGIN			
	R81B(CA)	END			
	W1-4(25)(RT)	REVERSE CURVE RIGHT			
	W3-1	STOP AHEAD			
	W3-3	SIGNAL AHEAD			
	W4-2(RT)	LANE ENDS RIGHT			
	W9-1	RIGHT LANE ENDS			
	W73A(CA)	RIGHT LANE TURNS RIGHT AHEAD			

				P	â	
R	DEPT.	INIT.	DATE	PREPARED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF:		PREPARED BY:
				2	3/2/2020	
		1	1	ROBERT A. KILPATRICK, RCE 42386, EXPIRES 03/31/20	DATE	• () · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
N I				RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL BY LOCKWOOD ENGINEERING:	1 ,	UUU DAVID EVANS
				Contacta Gallan	03/12/20	AND ASSOCIATES INC.
				CARLETON W. LOCKWOOD, JR., RCE 45935	DATE	
/				APPROVED BY: / //		DESCRIPTION RASS DISK IN TOP OF CURR LOCATED AT THE
				Sant Minh	3/16/20	AT THE INTERSECTION OF AYALA DRIVE AND CASMALIA STREET.
			+	SAVAT KHAMPHOU, CITY ENGINEER, RCE 62019	DATE	

DEPT.	INIT.	DATE	PREPARED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF:		PREPARED BY:
				06/09/20	1429
			ROBERT A. KILPATRICK, RCE 42386, EXPIRES 03/31/20	DATE	Victor
			RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL BY LOCKWOOD ENGINEERING:		DAVID EVANS
			-		AND ASSOCIATES INC.
			CARLETON W LOCKWOOD JR RCE 45935		
			APPROVED BY:	DATE	BENCHMARK: CALTRANS BENCHMARK BM No. BM-19-C-88
					DESCRIPTION: BRASS DISK IN TOP OF CURB LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF AVAILA DRIVE AND CASMALLA STREET
					AT THE INTERSECTION OF ATALA DRIVE AND CASMALIA STREET.
			T SAVAT KHAMPHOU, CITY ENGINEER, RCE 62019	DATE	

City of Rialto

Legislation Text

File #: TC 21-0718, Version: 1, Agenda #: 1

Future Agenda Items

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- 1. Discussion on Identifying a Plan for Improvements South of the I-10 Freeway
- 2. Transportation Planning/Funding Major Improvements
- 3. Information on Regional Discussions
- 4. Transportation Plan as it Relates to Active Transportation
- 5. Local Fees for Transportation Improvements
- 6. Future Improvements to Riverside Avenue, Sierra Avenue and the I-15 Junction
- 7. Riverside Avenue Bridge Widening Over the UPRR
- 8. Alder Avenue/SR-210 Proposed Feasibility Study
- 9. Traffic issue at Persimmon and Locust Avenues
- 10. Linden Avenue north of Casmalia Street Road Condition
- 11. Agua Mansa Corridor
- 12. Update on Sign Installations for Truck Traffic (Truck Routes)
- 13. Traffic Signal Timing throughout the City and Contracted Services